

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
February 6, 2013 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes III, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone.
Members Absent: Gertrude Baker, Kim Harden, Jim Wagoner, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Staff Members Present: Cart Blackwell, Keri Coumanis, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the January 16, 2013 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: Bobby Gipson**
 - a. Property Address: 309 Dexter Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/10/13
 - c. Project: Re-pave a driveway.
2. **Applicant: Barbara Thompson**
 - a. Property Address: 1407 Brown Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/10/13
 - c. Project: Install six-foot high interior lot fencing. Said fencing will not extend beyond the front plane of the house.
3. **Applicant: Neal Buckman**
 - a. Property Address: 1706 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/10/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.
4. **Applicant: Steve McColland**
 - a. Property Address: 360 Michigan Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/14/13
 - c. Project: After-the-fact-approval of a wooden picket – Retain a three foot wooden picket fence.
5. **Applicant: Chuck Dixon Home Improvements**
 - a. Property Address: 1506 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/16/13
 - c. Project: Repair a window. Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
6. **Applicant: A-1 Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 113 North Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/16/13
 - c. Project: Reroof an ancillary building. The roofing will match that approved for the ancillary building.

- 7. Applicant: Susan Goff**
- a. Property Address: 304 Congress Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/16/13
 - c. Project: Repair wood replacing as necessary. All wood will match the existing in profile, dimension, and materials. Paint the house in the current color scheme.
- 8. Applicant: Coulston Roofing for Charles and Patricia Hunter**
- a. Property Address: 210 Lanier Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/18/13
 - c. Project: Reroof the house to match the existing.
- 9. Applicant: Sailor B. Cashion**
- a. Property Address: 9 South Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/18/13
 - c. Project: Construct a single-story ancillary building. The building will meet setback requirements. The 12' x 16' building will rest atop a concrete slab foundation. The walls will be faced with hardiboard lap siding whose profile and dimensions will that of the main residence. The trim will match that found on the main residence. A pair of double doors will punctuate the North Elevation. A standing seam metal roofing panels will sheath the gable roof. The color scheme will match that of the main residence.
- 10. Applicant: Take Five Oil Change**
- a. Property Address: 1307 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/23/13
 - c. Project: Install temporary plastic sign advertising employment opportunities for the franchise to be constructed. The 4' high by 8' wide sign will be placed in the northeast corner of the property for thirty day period.
- 11. Applicant: Lou Evans**
- a. Property Address: 1150 Texas Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/23/13
 - c. Project: Replace rotten sills, repair foundation, and replace rotten wood.
- 12. Applicant: Melynda Forsythe**
- a. Property Address: 109 Chatham Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/23/13
 - c. Project: Install a six-foot high aluminum fence around a portion of the rear/side lot. The fence will not extend beyond the front plane of the house. The western expanse of fencing will feature a vehicular gate.
- 13. Applicant: Sara W. Kindt**
- a. Property Address: 1108 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/16/13
 - Project: Install a six-foot high aluminum fence around a portion of the rear/side lot. The fence will not extend beyond the front plane of the house. The western expanse of fencing will feature a vehicular gate. Install a sign on the façade of the building. The single-faced metal sign will measure 6 feet x 4 feet. The sign design will feature the name and an emblem advertising the establishment.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2013-07-CA: 210 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: John Switzer
- b. Project: Alterations to Approved Plans – Change a wall facing, front entrances, and rear fenestration.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2013-08-CA: 261 South Georgia Avenue

- a. Applicant: Lucy Barr with Lucy Barr Designs for Nicole Youell and Spencer Johnson
- b. Project: Fenestration – Change an upper story window.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2013-09-CA: 1102 Government Street

- a. Applicant: C. Dennis Carlisle with Dennis Carlisle Architect for the Boys and Girls Clubs of South Alabama
- b. Project: Renovate a commercial facade – Replace storefront units, construct a new entrance and a new monument sign.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2013-10-CA: 404 Marine Street

- a. Applicant: Kenneth Kiser
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a fire-damaged house.

DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

5. 2013-11-CA: 63 North Georgia Avenue

- a. Applicant: Rameh Dickens
- b. Project: Fenestration – Remove and replace unauthorized windows.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-07-CA: 210 Dauphin Street
Applicant: John Switzer
Received: 1/17/13
Meeting: 2/6/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Alterations to Approved Plans - Change a wall facing, front entrances, and rear fenestration.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to materials found within this property's MHDC file, this two-story commercial building was constructed circa 1885. As with most commercial buildings, the storefront has been altered. A 2004 fire gutted 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 March 19, 2008. At that time, the Board approved the restoration of the storefront and renovation of the vacant shell. The application was renewed on October 24, 2011. The applicant reappears before the Board with a revised proposal. Proposed changes include: the use of recessed front entrances; the stuccoing of the West Elevation; and the alteration of fenestration on the North (Rear) Elevation.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts the Lower Dauphin Commercial District Design Guidelines state, in pertinent part:
1. "Patterns and rhythms create visual harmony in commercial districts. New construction and alterations should respect the already established streetscape."
 2. "Lacking knowledge of the original storefront, a new design can be introduced taking the scale, style, and properties of the adjacent buildings and context of the district into consideration."
 3. "Doorways should reflect the age and style of the building."
 4. "The exterior of a building helps define its style, quality, and historic period. The original siding [facing] should be retained and repaired."
 5. "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. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing."
 6. "The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building."

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Make alterations to previously approved plans.
 - a. The ground floor storefront's doors will be recessed instead of in plane with the façade.
 - b. The balcony will not be constructed at this time.
 - c. The whole expanse of the West (Side) Elevation will be stuccoed instead of featuring a small expanse of brick veneer near the street.
 - d. Four upper windows approved the North (Rear) Elevation will not be constructed.
 - e. Two additional metal doors will be located on the North Elevation.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves approval of proposed changes to previously approved plans. First approved on March 18, 2008, the scope of work addressed the restoration and renovation of an unoccupied, fire-damaged building. The owner/applicant proposes the following: constructing recessed storefront level entrances on the façade instead of entrances located in plane with the façade wall; stuccoing the whole of the West Elevation (side/inner lot facing wall) instead of bricking the southernmost portion of that wall; installing a double door unit on North (Rear) Elevation's ground floor; and not constructing fenestration on the North Elevation's upper story.

With regard to alterations to the main storefront entrances, the Lower Dauphin Commercial District Guidelines state that new construction and alterations should respect the streetscape (See B-1). Lacking knowledge of the original storefront, a new design can be introduced taking the scale, style, and properties of the adjacent buildings and context of the district into consideration (See B-2). The original ground floor storefront has been altered several times since the building's construction. The survey photographs in the properties MHDC file record an unsympathetic treatment. Earlier photographs housed in the McCall Rare Book and Manuscript Collection record a recessed entrance. Documented and surviving examples of recessed entries exist. Numerous recessed entrances have been approved in recent restorations/renovations.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that the exterior of a building helps define its style, quality, and historic period; and original exterior facing should be retained and repaired (See B-4). The southernmost surviving portion of the West Elevation suffered further deterioration on account of exposure to the elements and delayed construction. The single remaining section of that inner lot elevation would be faced with stucco like that approved for the remainder of the West Elevation. Prior to the demolition of the adjacent building to the west of the subject property, this party wall would not have been visible. The Board has approved other applications calling for the stuccoing of previously unseen party walls.

The North (Rear) Elevation no longer stands. The approved plans called for a single metal door on the ground floor and clad wood windows on the upper story. This revised proposal calls for the installation of an additional double door unit on the ground floor and the removal of any fenestration on the upper story. Metal doors are allowed on the rear elevations of commercial buildings. With regard to windows the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that the location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building and that the size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building (See B-5 and B-6).

This Mobile Historic Development Commission (MHDC) holds an easement on this property; therefore, the application requires the approval of the MHDC's Properties Committee. The Properties Committee found that the removal of upper story fenestration would impair the architectural and the historical character of the building and the district. The remainder of the application meets with their approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval in part and denial in part

Based on B (1-4), Staff does not believe the alterations to the storefront entrances, West Elevation wall treatment, and North Elevation door configuration will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of that portion of the application.

Based on B (5-6), Staff does believe the alterations to the North Elevation's upper story fenestration, will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of that portion of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

John Switzer was present to discuss the application

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Switzer if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address.

Mr. Switzer explained to the Board that the alterations to the front entrances were mandated by code-related access requirements. He stated that the permitted plans depicted recessed entrances while the ARB plans did not.

Mr. Switzer then addressed the West Elevation. He told the Board that it was his initial intention to retain the remaining section of brick located near the street. He said that for structural and material reasons' this formerly unexposed section of brick should be covered with stucco like the reconstructed wall adjoining it.

Turning to the building's North/Rear Elevation, Mr. Switzer explained the reasons behind the proposed changes to the fenestration. He told the Board that he is in the process of renovating but not finishing out the building. Mr. Switzer stated that he wanted to give a potential buyer the opportunity to decide where to place and detail windows. He said that the money saved on windows could be better used elsewhere on the building.

Mr. Ladd thanked Mr. Switzer for taking on the project.

Mr. Roberts spoke to Mr. Switzer and the Board. He pointed out that the rear wall is new construction and could be treated in a modern manner. He said that it is not necessary to replicate a historical treatment or appearance in this instance. Mr. Roberts also added that it faces a parking lot.

Mr. Stone agreed with Mr. Roberts' observations.

Mr. Karwinski said that windows should be employed as a means to break up the mass.

Mr. Roberts stated that while he agreed with Mr. Karwinski in concept and appreciated his concern, he did not think it pertinent for the application up for review.

Mr. Karwinski redirected the discussion to the façade. He stated that he found issue with the storefront. Speaking of storefronts and streetscapes in general, Mr. Karwinski said that rhythms are very important. He told his fellow Board members, the applicant, and Staff that the proposed storefront does not carry through the vertical rhythms of the building and; therefore, pose a concern.

Mr. Karwinski distributed sketches depicting how the façade could be reconfigured to better reflect the rhythms of the building's bays and elements.

Mr. Karwinski pointed out that the engineering drawings were incorrect.

Mr. Ladd interjected. He explained to Mr. Switzer that Mr. Karwinski's drawings were only suggestions and that Board members do not have the jurisdiction which to redesign projects.

Mr. Karwinski said that he was not redesigning but only expressing his concerns in a graphic manner.

Mr. Switzer stated that spacing of the bays and the placement of the gallery had already been approved by the Board in 2008 and renewed by Staff in 2011. He said that he was amenable to providing some windows on the rear elevation for reasons of appearance and light, but that these considerations would best be addressed by a future owner/tenant. He said that he would like to use the money earmarked for fenestration on other spaces and surfaces. Noting that the vacant lot to the west of the subject property could be the site for new construction; therefore, his building had only two walls which could receive natural light.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any additional questions for Mr. Switzer. No further discussion ensued.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd 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 approved. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/6/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-08-CA: 261 South Georgia Avenue
Applicant: Lucy Barr with Lucy Barr Designs for Nicole Youell and Spencer Johnson
Received: 1/18/13
Meeting: 2/6/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fenestration – Alter an upper story window.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Arts and Crafts inspired “bungalow” was completed in 1913. The house features a full length gallery with bracketed porch piers.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on January 2, 2013. At that time, the Board approved the heightening of a side-facing gable. The alteration of upper story fenestration was proposed in the same application. That portion of the proposal was denied for lack of information. The applicant’s representative returns before the Board with additional imagery illustrating that portion of the scope of work.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, 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. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
 - 2. “The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Alter upper-story fenestration.
 - a. Remove a garret window.
 - b. Install a new window.
 - c. The window will measure 3’ in height, 1’ taller than the original window.
 - d. The increased height will be obtained by lowering the window.
 - e. The window’s lintel height will remain the same.

- f. The tripartite window configuration and overall width will remain the same, but the center portion will be slightly wider and the flanking windows will be consequently smaller than the existing windows..
- g. Surrounding siding will be repaired and replaced to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
- h. The work will be painted to match the existing color scheme.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the alteration of upper-story fenestration. The application first appeared before the Board on January 6, 2013. At that time, the Board requested a drawing clarifying the design and location of a garret level window.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts 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 and that original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing (See B-1). If alterations are to be made, the size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building (See B-2). The proposed alteration would entail the heightening of the garret's exiting tripartite window. The width of the window unit and the lintel height would remain the same. In order to meet egress requirements, the center window of the tripartite configuration would be widened and consequently the flanking side windows would become narrower.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2) Staff believes this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff does not recommend approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Lucy Barr was present to discuss the application

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Ms. Barr answered no but did say that the sole purpose of the project was to allow egress for an upper story bedroom. She said that she was within inches of meeting code while at the same time preserving the appearance of the façade.

Mr. Roberts and Mr. Stone expressed code-related concerns.

Mr. Roberts stated that while he realized the reasoning behind the recommendation, he said that the proportions and designs of the proposed window would not be incompatible with the gable.

Mr. Stone agreed with Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Stone asked for clarification regarding header height. Ms. Barr addressed Mr. Stone's concerns.

Mr. Ladd asked Ms. Barr if there was any other second story fenestration that might satisfy the egress requirement. Ms. Barr said no, not for the room in question.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any additional questions for Mr. Switzer. No further discussion ensued.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd 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 approved. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/6/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-09-CA: 1102 Government Street
Applicant: C. Dennis Carlisle with Dennis Carlisle, Architect for the Boys and Girls Clubs of South Alabama
Received: 1/22/13
Meeting: 2/6/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-1
Project: Renovate a commercial facade – Replace storefront units, construct a new entrance and a new monument sign.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two unit commercial building was constructed in the 1970s.

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 June 28, 1982. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a sign. The application placed before the Board calls for the construction of a new entrance and a monument sign.
- B. The Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Placement has two components: setback and spacing. New commercial construction should be placed so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.”
 - 2. “If the traditional façade line or ‘average’ setback is considerably less than that allowed under the zoning ordinance, the Review Board will support an application for a variance from the Board Adjustment to allow for new construction closer to the street and more in character with the surrounding buildings.”
 - 3. “Façade elements such as porches, entrances, and windows make the “face” or the façade of a building. New construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings. The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. In order to coexist in harmony with adjacent structures in historic districts, porches are strongly encouraged.”
 - 4. “Signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building.”
 - 5. “The height of free-standing signs shall be no higher than eight feet.”
 - 6. “The overall design of all signage including mounting and framework shall relate to the design of the principle building on the property.”

7. "The total maximum allowable signage for all signs is one and one half feet per linear front foot of the principle building, not to exceed 64 square feet.
8. The total allowable square footage for the display area of a monument sign is (50) fifty square feet."
9. With regard to signage materials, "metal is allowed."

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

1. Remove and replace metal storefront units
 - a. The storefront units will be medium bronze in color.
 - b. A brick knee wall would be constructed under the new storefront windows.
2. Remove and replace a stainless cap and flashing.
3. Construct an entrance porch on Façade (South Elevation).
 - a. The entrance porch will be on the location of an existing entrance pad.
 - b. The porch will measure 17' 4" in width and 5' in depth.
 - c. Like the principle building, the porch will rest atop a concrete slab foundation. The porch's foundation will feature a brick edged surround.
 - d. Four clustered steel supports will define the three bay porch.
 - e. Fixed steel louvers will extend between the upper portions of the porch bays.
 - f. A metal entablature will extend over the three bays.
 - g. The porch structure will be painted Valspar's Deep River Green.
 - h. A 5-V crimp or standing seam metal roof will surmount the porch.
4. Construct a monument sign
 - a. The monument sign will measure 3' 2" in height.
 - b. Each face of the double-faced sign will measure 3' 4" x 2'.
 - c. The monument sign's metal armature will be of the same design and construction as the new entrance.
 - d. The aluminum signage will feature the name and logo of the organization.
 - e. The sign field will be painted Valspar's Exultation.
 - f. The logo will be Valspar's Autumn Sky.
 - g. The lettering will be Valspar's Very Black.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of new front entrance and the construction of a monument sign on a non-contributing commercial property.

The Design Review Guidelines do not specifically address additions to existing non-contributing commercial construction. With regard to the new front entrance, The Design Review Guidelines for New Commercial Construction state that new construction should be placed so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings (See B-1 and B-2). The proposed entrance porch would not adversely affect the façade line and would extend slightly beyond the existing overhang and slab. The Commercial Guidelines go on to state that façade elements such as porches, entrances, and windows make the façade of a building. New construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic building (See B-3). The proposed porch would be front of the building's western unit. The design, one modern in material and design, respects context and adopts proportions and elements typifying traditional architecture.

When reviewing signage applications, size, height, design, lighting, location, and materials are taken into account. The proposed sign does not exceed either the maximum allotment of 64 square feet signage allotment or the 50 square foot monument sign allotment (See B-7 and B-8). The proposed sign is designed to work in concert with the proposed porch entrance described above (See B-6). As listed in the

Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, metal is an approved signage material (See B-9). The location and orientation of the sign will not obscure the building or violate setback requirements (See B-4). The height of the sign is below 8' (See B-5).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recognizes this is not a historic building but is a building of its time. Based on B (1-9) Staff does not believe the application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district. However, Staff suggests the applicant consider retaining the floor length storefront units instead of placing a new storefront system above a knee wall and using a matching metal finish as opposed to painted treatment on the porch and sign armatures.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Dennis Carlisle was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Mr. Carlisle answered no.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask Mr. Carlisle.

Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Carlisle how the expanses of wall located behind the proposed louvers would be treated. Mr. Carlisle answered that those spaces would be stuccoed. Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Carlisle if he had considered using louvers in those locations as well. Mr. Carlisle said that use of additional louvers would be cost prohibitive.

Mr. Stone asked a query regarding the design of the storefront units. Mr. Carlisle addressed Mr. Stone's concern.

Mr. Stone inquired as to the reason behind the bulkhead. Mr. Carlisle answered that water buildup posed a concern at times.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any additional questions for Mr. Switzer. No further discussion ensued.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd 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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/6/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-10-CA: 404 Marine Street
Applicant: Ken Kiser
Received: 1/22/13
Meeting: 2/6/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition – Demolish a fire damaged house.

BUILDING HISTORY

This single story side hall house dates from circa 1897. The gabled roof dwelling originally featured full-length windows that opened onto a three bay front gallery.

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 house was set afire in summer of 2012. The owner/applicant proposes the demolition of the building.
- B. The 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 one-story side hall dwelling is a contributing structure in the Oakleigh Garden District. Smaller and less expensive than two-story brick counterparts located closer to the city center, single-story side hall houses were constructed both by middle class families or as rental/speculative properties.
 - iii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;

1. Located on stretch of Marine Street already altered by earlier demolitions and recent fires, this mid-block residential building contributes to the built density and historical character of Marine Street and the Oakleigh Garden District.
- iv. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced.
- v. 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. One-story side hall dwellings are found in and around Mobile's historic districts. Fire, neglect, and demolitions are reducing their numbers.
- vi. 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 granted demolition approval, the applicants would salvage the remaining materials from the building, demolish the building, level the site, and plant grass on the vacant lot.
- vii. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The then unoccupied property was acquired by the present owner in 1998. No purchase price was provided.
- viii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. Following the fire, the applicant states that he was informed not to work on the property. Given the extent of the damage, the applicant believes that demolition is the best course of action.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. The larger property has not been listed for sale.
- 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. Not applicable.
- x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 1. Not given.
- 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; and
 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 Application).
1. Demolish a fire-damaged residence.
 2. Remove the debris.
 3. Level the site.
 4. Plant sod.

STAFF ANALYSIS

When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into account the following: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the effect the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

This building is a contributing residential structure in the Oakleigh Historic District. The house type - a one-story, wood framed, side hall house – was one that was constructed across Mobile's urban areas during the latter half of the 19th-Century. This example featured a recessed side porch located on the South Elevation. The building was added to and altered at a later date.

Prior to the fire, this building was affected by demolition by neglect. The house had been unoccupied for a number of years. Portions of the roof had given way. The fire caused extensive damage to the West Elevation and the roof structure. Vandals have broken windows and removed architectural components. The building is capable of being restored.

The house is located one lot south of the intersection of Marine and Selma Streets. A vacant lot is located to the south of the house. Two additional vacant lots are located to the east of the property on the other side of Marine Street. If granted demolition approval, the applicant would demolish the house, remove the debris, level the lot, and plant sod.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes the demolition of this contributing building would impair the architectural and the historical character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application. In previous applications involving fire-damaged and/or deteriorated properties, the Board has required the property owner to list the property for sale. Staff suggests that the applicant remove debris from the building, secure the structure, and place the property on the market. If no offers are received after three months, the application can reappear before the Board.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ken Kiser was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He explained to Mr. Kiser that while the Board understands his predicament, the Board's mission is to preserve not demolish historic buildings. Mr. Ladd told Mr. Kiser that several fire damaged and/or derelict buildings had appeared before the Board in recent months. He said that in each of these applications a working solution had been made. Mr. Ladd stated that it was the Board's objective to work with as opposed to against applicants. He asked Mr. Kiser if he had any clarifications to address, comments to make, or questions to ask.

Mr. Kiser told the Board that he had received several tickets on the property.

Mr. Blackwell and Ms. Coumanis explained that if the Board denied the application and he secured the building, Staff could generate correspondence that would addresses the Court's concerns for the time being.

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 amended by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued. The building will be secured and a for sale sign with contact information will be placed on the property.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/6/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-11-CA: **63 North Georgia Avenue**
Applicant: **Rameh Dickens**
Received: **1/22/13**
Meeting: **2/6/13**

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fenestration – Remove and replace unauthorized windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story building was constructed between 1915 and 1920. The structure functioned as a corner grocery.

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 March 7, 2012. At that time, the Board approved the painting of the building, but denied authorize the after-the-fact-approval of aluminum windows. The one-over-one aluminum windows in question replaced nine-over-one wooden windows. With this application, the applicant proposes the installation of nine-over-one double-hung and double-paned wooden 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. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
 - 2. “The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted materials):
 - 1. Remove unauthorized one-over-one aluminum windows.
 - 2. Install nine-over-one double-paned wooden windows
 - a. The window configuration will match the original windows.
 - b. The windows will be double-paned in construction.
 - c. The original window casings and moldings will remain in place.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the removal and replacement of unauthorized aluminum windows. This house originally featured nine-over-nine light, single-paned, wooden windows. The proposed replacement windows would match the originals in all respects, but one – construction.

Double-paned windows have been approved for installation on contributing buildings on two recent instances. On May 4, 2011, the Board approved the installation of double-paned windows in the sanctuary of the Old Dauphin Way Methodist Church located at 1507 Dauphin Street. In that instance, the church's original plans called for double-paned windows. On January 2, 2013, the Board authorized the installation of double-paned aluminum clad windows on the upper stories of the Battle House Hotel located at 26 North Royal Street. In issuing that approval, the Board followed a National Park's Services exception regarding window placements on multistory buildings.

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. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing (See B-1). The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building (See B-2). Furthermore, Staff cannot recommend approval on account of setting a bad precedent. The original windows were removed without consultation of Staff or approval from the Board. While the proposed windows would be of the same material and feature the original design, approving these windows would open the path for similar actions involving after-the-fact approvals.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and the historical character of the building. Staff does not recommend approval of this application. Staff would recommend the use of single pane windows of the same design with storm windows, preferably interior.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Rameh Dickens was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Dickens if he had any clarifications to address, comments to make, or questions to ask.

Mr. Dickens addressed the Board. He said that the proposed windows would not only match original windows with regard to light configuration, material and construction, but would also be true-divided-light.

Ms. Coumanis noted that as stated in the Staff Report the original window surrounds would be reexposed. She added that one of the objections to the unauthorized replacement windows was the treatment of their surrounding casings.

Mr. Roberts said that this application involving the installation of replacement windows on a contributing building was one that the Board would see more of in the future. He said that the Board should keep abreast with new technologies so long as the visual character of buildings and districts remain the same.

Citing the two properties mentioned in the Staff Analysis, Mr. Karwinski stated that the Board had made allowance in times past. He said that he did not believe there was foundation for deviation in this instance on account of historical character.

Ms. Coumanis stated that both the historic district guidelines for New Orleans and Baltimore made allowances for new windows.

FINDING OF FACT

Carolyn 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 unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Hasser 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 approved. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/6/14