

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
February 7, 2018 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi-Purpose Room, 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. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Harris Oswalt, Robert Brown, Robert Allen, David Barr John Ruzic, Nick Holmes III. and Kim Harden.
Members Absent: Steve Stone, Craig Roberts, Catarina Echols, Carolyn Hasser, and Jim Wagoner.
Staff Members Present: Bridget Daniel, Marion McElroy, and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Brown moved to approve the minutes from January 3, 2018. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.
3. Mr. Holmes moved to approve the Midmonths. Mr. Allen noted that the second midmonth, 106 Scott Street, was issued to the City of Mobile, but the Church Street Graveyard Foundation was not involved in the rehabilitation process. Ms. Largue replied she would send a copy of the Certificate of Appropriateness to Mr. Allen. Concerns were raised over midmonth #12 and midmonth #17. Regarding midmonth #12, 206-208 Government Street, Ms. Largue confirmed the quantity of the approved sign was 1 (one). Pertaining to midmonth #17, 157 South Cedar Street, Ms. Largue stated she would send copies of the MHDC stock designs to the Board and noted the Board could revisit the Midmonth Resolution and address any necessary changes when felt appropriate. The motion received a second and was approved with one opposed, Mr. Allen.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: Jerry Graham of Jerry Graham Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 1353 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/27/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof building A and B to match existing.
2. **Applicant: City of Mobile**
 - a. Property Address: 106 S. Scott Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/28/2017
 - c. Project: Repair portion of southeast wall. Use lime/sand mortar mix to be compatible with historic mortar and breathe with existing old brick.
3. **Applicant: City of Mobile**
 - a. Property Address: 150 S. Royal Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/28/2017
 - c. Project: Roof repairs. All work is more structural in nature and will be recovered by timbers at the end of the project. As such it will not be in public view or it will appear as original mortar work.
4. **Applicant: Demetrius Callier**
 - a. Property Address: 1302 Virginia Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/3/2018
 - c. Project: Clean up fallen mansard roof on the west side. Leave remaining portion intact and power-wash.
5. **Applicant: John Willis**
 - a. Property Address: 1174 Texas Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/3/2017

- c. Project: Redeck roof, reroof with asphalt shingles, charcoal gray; repair/replace siding to match existing in profile and dimension; repair/replace sills/joists beneath house as necessary; replace rotten to match; add porch step rail out of wood to match MHDC drawing; four panel wood doors.
- 6. Applicant: Old Bay Rental**
- a. Property Address: 1725 Laurel Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/9/2018
 - c. Project: Remove unapproved fence and install metal fence.
- 7. Applicant: CGW Homes**
- a. Property Address: 120 Michael Donald Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/11/2018
 - c. Project: Secure windows and doors.
- 8. Applicant: Jonelle Brewster**
- a. Property Address: 1217 Elmira Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/10/2018
 - c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood and windows to match original, repaint to match existing. Place concrete apron at driveway.
- 9. Applicant: Crystal Owen**
- a. Property Address: 12 Straight Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/12/2018
 - c. Project: Reside house to match existing.
- 10. Applicant: Joanna Wilson**
- a. Property Address: 11 N. Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/12/2018
 - c. Project: Install two tire strips of cement for driveway.
- 11. Applicant: Warren Averett**
- a. Property Address: 3 S. Royal Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/12/2018
 - c. Project: Double sided hanging sign with panel size 28" by 51.5". Sign has a decorative mounting bracket, and panel contains raised graphics/lettering.
- 12. Applicant: Signarama on behalf of Hebrides, LLC.**
- a. Property Address: 206-208 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/24/2018
 - c. Project: Allow a quantity of one 120" x 24" single faced individual storefront sign with metal reverse lit letters to say "Hargrove" on primary frontage. Allow a quantity of one 120" x 30" single faced upper building sign with metal reverse lit letters to say "Hargrove Controls + Automation" on secondary frontage.
- 13. Applicant: Joseph Hall Jr.**
- a. Property Address: 1215 Texas Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/24/2018
 - c. Project: Repair roof to match existing. Repair and replace wood to match existing in dimension, profile and material. Repair rear window. Replace existing flush metal door with paneled metal door on enclosed back porch. Repaint to match.
- 14. Applicant: Joseph Hall Jr.**
- a. Property Address: 1213 Texas Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/24/2018
 - c. Project: Repair wood and roof to match existing on main house. Repaint to match existing. Repair roof with tab shingles to match on ancillary building. Repair one window on ancillary building.

15.Applicant: David Miller

- a. Property Address: 1204 Old Shell Road
- b. Date of Approval: 1/25/2018
- c. Project: Renewal of COA date 12/8.2016: Restore rear elevation on main house including dormers. Install appropriate siding to match existing in dimension, profile, and material. Repaint as needed to match. Continue installing 8' privacy fence (lot is next to multi-family) with lattice and picketed fence in front yard.

16.Applicant: David Miller

- a. Property Address: 113 Michael Donald Drive
- b. Date of Approval: 1/25/2018
- c. Project: Extend 6' wooden privacy fence on southeast portion of lot to existing fence located at 1200 Old Shell Road. Remove portion of existing chain link fence.

17.Applicant: Douglas Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Guy Miller

- a. Property Address: 157 S. Cedar Street
- b. Date of Approval: 1/25/2018
- c. Project: Construct one story carport per drawings to meet setback requirements. Carport will feature hipped and gabled fronted roof, two aluminum clad windows, and set of double wooden doors to access storage on rear elevation. Building will employ hardiplank siding and 5V crimp metal roof to match the same dimension and profile of principal building.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2018-04-CA: 1507 Government Street

- a. Applicant: PC Wave, LLC
- b. Project: Two part Application. Repair east elevation to match west elevation. Install a fountain.
DENIED: FIRST PART OF APPLICATION. APPROVED IN CONCEPT: SECOND PART OF APPLICATION. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Largue announced no applications were submitted for the February 21st meeting of the ARB and therefore the meeting was cancelled. She noted the next meeting would be on March 7th.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-04-CA: 1507 Government Street
Applicant: PC Wave, LLC
Received: 1/18/18
Meeting: 2/7/18

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Two part Application. Repair east elevation to match west elevation
(East) elevation previously possessed attached port cochere). Install a fountain.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one and a half story brick veneered house with neoclassical elements dates from 1905. The front façade features a double door entrance and floor length windows.

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 not appeared before the Architectural Review Board according to the MHDC vertical files.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Design Review Guidelines are applicable to changes to building exteriors and site features of properties within Mobile’s locally designated districts.”
 - 2. “Changes to properties in locally designated historic districts that are covered by these guidelines include the following: Site planning elements (fences, free-standing lighting, paving, etc.); and repairs, replacements, and alterations to historic buildings.”
 - 3. “Significant features and stylistic elements should not be removed to the extent possible.”
 - 4. “If disassembly is necessary for repair or restoration, use methods that minimize damage to original materials and facilitate reassembly. .”
 - 5. “If replacement of a historic element is required, replace the historic element in kind, or with a product that is similar in visual character and durability to the original.”
 - 6. The following is the preferred sequence of improvements: preserve, repair, reconstruct, replace or compatible alteration.
 - 7. “For most historic resources, the front façade is the most important to preserve intact. Alterations are rarely appropriate. Many side walls are also important to preserve where they

- are highly visible from public streets. By contrast, portions of a side wall that are not as visible may be less sensitive to change.”
8. “The distinguishing original qualities or character of a historic building, structure, or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. Historic materials are significant and shall not be removed. The removal or alteration of any historic landscaping features, materials, or distinctive architectural features should be avoided.”
 9. Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in physical character and durability. Composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities should appear similar to the original material. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical or pictorial evidence.”
 10. “Maintain significant historic facades in their original form.”
 11. “Use alternative or imitation materials that match the style and detail of the original material to replaced damaged non-primary building materials.”
 12. Acceptable replacement for historic materials include those that “are the same as the original, or that appear similar in finish, scale, style and detail.”
 13. “An alteration made without approval may be required to be removed. Any after-the-fact approval, if it is granted, will be handled on a case-by-case basis.”
 14. “Preserve the original roof form of a residential structure. Avoid a new roofing system that permanently damages or alters an existing roof.”
 15. “New landscaping features should be consistent in character with landscaping seen in the historic district.”

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

1. Repair northern portion of east elevation (previously damaged and removed) to match northern portion of west elevation in dimension, profile and material.
2. Install fountain.
 - a. Fountain will be constructed of cast concrete or stone.
 - b. Fountain will be located in the center of an existing pathway.

STAFF ANALYSIS

On December 19, 2017, the Mobile Historic Development Commission (MHDC) received a Service Request Order (SRO) concerning the construction being completed without a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) being displayed for work being performed. Mr. John Sledge, staff of MHDC, went to the site and issued a Notice of Violation (NOV). Noticed at this time was the removal of the port cochere. The applicant’s tenant responded immediately to the NOV and explained via phone to Ms. Largue the port cochere had been damaged by a moving truck and had collapsed and debris was removed. Ms. Largue met with Mr. Mike Catanese, owner, on January 10, 2018 and discussed the guidelines and policy of the ARB. The applicant, Mr. Catanese, would not like to reconstruct the port cochere, but rather repair the east elevation to match the existing west elevation. He would also like to install a fountain in the front yard.

The first part of the application requests to repair the damages from the removal of the port cochere on the east elevation to match the facade west elevation. The property on Government Street is one of few remaining residential type buildings. The port cochere was original to the house as evidenced in the 1925 Sanborn Insurance maps. The Secretary of Interior’s Standards and Mobile’s Historic District Guidelines state characterizing features of a historic façade shall “not be destroyed” (See B1-8). The port cochere

was a prominent feature on both primary and secondary façades, particularly during the 18th and 19th century. The passageway was constructed to provide occupants of a carriage or vehicle protection. Primary facades are sensitive to alterations and should be maintained in their original form (See B1-7 and B1-10).

The Secretary of Interior’s Standards and Mobile’s Historic District Guidelines prefers for a feature to be repaired or reconstructed before being replaced (See B1-6). The Standards and Guidelines also state “significant features” of a building shall not be removed to the “extent possible” (See B1-3). However, if removal of a feature is necessary it shall be disassembled to diminish damage and aid in reassembly (See B-4). Said replacements must either match the existing in profile, dimension and material or match the material being placed in character, durability, scale, and detail (See B1-9 and B1-12).

The applicant would also like to install a fountain in the existing walkway. The walkway has evidence of a landscape feature previously existing in the proposed location. Proposed landscape feature would be irreversible and not out of character with other properties in the district or on Government Street such as 1056 Government Street (See B1-15).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-8), Staff does believe the first part of the application will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the properties or district. Staff recommends denial for this portion of the application. Staff does not believe the addition of a fountain will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the properties or district, and recommends approval this second portion of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicant was not present for the discussion.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Ms. Largue stated the application was submitted in response to a Notice of Violation (NOV) that was issued by staff. She explained a Service Request Order (SRO) had come in; notifying the office that work on a home was possibly underway without a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). Ms. Largue explained a NOV was issued when staff discovered no COA had been obtained for the removal of a port cochere. Ms. Largue stated the applicant’s tenant had called the MHDC office and she had spoken at length about the option to either rebuild using photographic evidence, or apply to appear before the ARB to request to repair the damage from the port cochere. The tenants had explained, the port cochere was removed after a moving van had severely damaged it. Ms. Largue explained, she then spoke with the owner by phone and met with him at the MHDC office to further discuss options.

Mr. Allen stated the Board and staff did not know the extent of the damage. He noted the damage might have been a convenient excuse to remove the port cochere. Ms. Largue stated she could not speak on behalf of the applicant.

Ms. Harden stated she had seen the damaged port cochere and believed it could have been repaired. Ms. Largue confirmed from her discussions with the tenants and applicant, remnants were still attached.

Ms. Largue informed the Board if someone calls because a structure is of a life safety concern then the constituent still needs to be issued a Certificate of Appropriateness before any demolition ensues. She further explained that in her experience photographic evidence or a site visit is made when necessary to obtain a COA for safety concerns.

Ms. Harden noted the port cochere was a defining feature of the house. She asked Ms. Largue what materials can be used. Ms. Largue responded that if materials are not salvageable that materials that look like the original can be used in this instance. She further explained stucco over concrete, CMU and wood composite columns could be employed when constructing to mimic the original port cochere.

Ms. Harden asked if the fountain requested had any specifications such as materials or dimensions. Ms. Largue replied only an image of the fountain was provided. Ms. Largue clarified for Mr. Brown that the fountain could be approved at staff level. Mr. Holmes suggested the Board could approve the fountain in concept.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Holmes 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. Holmes moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the first part of the application requesting the repair of the east elevation to match the west elevation does impair the historic integrity of the building and the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness cannot be issued; but, the second part of the application, the installation of a fountain, be approved in concept since it did not impair the integrity of the property or landscape.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.