

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**January 18, 2011 – 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:** Kim Harden, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, and Craig Roberts  
**Members Absent:** Gertrude Baker, Carlos Gant, Nicholas Holmes III, Jim Wagoner, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.  
**Staff Members Present:** Devereaux Bemis and Cart Blackwell.
2. Mr. Oswalt moved to approve the minutes of the January 4, 2012 meeting as amended by the Board. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Oswalt 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: ETP Inc., for Pat's Downtown Grill**
  - a. Property Address: 271 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/3/12
  - c. Project: Replace a vinyl awning with a canvas awning (all within the existing armature).
2. **Applicant: JVK Hospitality Group**
  - a. Property Address: 255 Church Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/28/11
  - c. Project: Paint the building per the submitted color scheme. The body will be one of three Sherwin Williams color schemes.
3. **Applicant: Dave Harbor**
  - a. Property Address: 1217 Elmira Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/28/11
  - c. Project: Reroof the house. Remove later asphalt siding. Repair, replace, and install wooden siding. Remove expanses of infill from the façade's second story porch (The fenestration, column, and siding, and decking survive intact. Only the infill will be removed. A surviving railing will be extended.).
4. **Applicant: Florida Certified Sign Erectors for PNC Bank**
  - a. Property Address: 1402 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/29/11
  - c. Project: Place temporary bag signs over existing signage until previously approved new signage is installed.
5. **Applicant: Helen H. Collins**
  - a. Property Address: 264 South Lawrence Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/4/12
  - c. Project: Replace two doors to match the existing. Replace railings to match the existing. Install storm windows.
6. **Applicant: Albert Pennington**
  - a. Property Address: 25 South Julia Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/9/12

- c. Project: Repaint per the existing color scheme. Repair any deteriorated  
woodwork to match the existing in profile and dimension.

**7. Applicant: Bernhardt Roofing**

- a. Property Address: 1562 Old Shell Road
- b. Date of Approval: 1/5/12
- c. Project: Reroof house using charcoal black Timberline shingles.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2012-4-CA: 1217 Elmira Street**

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for David Harbor & Patti Corder
- b. Project: Restore and rehabilitate a house; construct an ancillary structure; and  
instigate grounds improvements.

**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**2. 2012-5-CA: 300 McDonald Avenue**

- a. Applicant: Wanda Cochran
- b. Project: Remodel an ancillary building.

**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**3. 2012-6-CA: 1551 Old Shell Road**

- a. Applicant: Dawn Crow with Brown Chambless Architects for Dr. Philip Buttera
- b. Project: New Construction – Construct a medical office building.

**DENIED FOR LACK OF INFORMATION. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

- 1. January 24 CLG Meeting
- 2. Environmental Reviews
- 3. Guidelines
- 4. Discussion

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2012-04-CA: 1217 Elmira Street**  
**Applicant: David Harbor and Patti Corder**  
**Received: 1/3/12**  
**Meeting: 1/18/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Restore and rehabilitate a house; Construct an ancillary structure; and Instigate grounds improvements.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This house dates from 1904/05. In plan and elevation, the house represents a transition from a more complex Aesthetics Movement to a simpler Arts & Crafts informed design approach.

**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 applicants propose a comprehensive restoration and renovation of the main house. Grounds improvements and ancillary construction are also proposed.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Foundation screening should be recessed from the front of the foundation piers.”
  - 2. “The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality, and historic period. Particular care should be taken with masonry.”
  - 3. “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
  - 4. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
  - 5. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
  - 6. With regard to roofing, “materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
  - 7. Fencing “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet,

however, if a commercial or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face toward public view.”

**C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):**

1. Install recessed, framed, and suspended wooden skirting between the foundation piers.
2. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated wooden siding to match the original in profile and dimension.
3. Repair and when necessary replace wooden windows to match the existing.
4. Remove the existing roofing. Install asphalt shingles.
5. North Elevation (Façade)
  - a. Straighten and clean the existing concrete steps and antepodia.
  - b. Repair the existing brick skirting using lime based mortar.
  - c. Repair and when necessary replace the existing drip moulds and watertable to match the existing.
  - d. Repair the existing porch railings to match the existing.
  - e. Repair and stabilize the roof structure of both the front porch and balcony.
  - f. Remove decking from the westernmost section of the balcony and extend the roof.
  - g. Remove a gas line.
  - h. Remove asphalt shingles from the dormer. Install wooden siding and roof flashing on the dormer.
  - i. Repair the chimney.
  - j. Finish removing the remains of the balcony infill. The column survives intact, as does the siding. Repair and extend the balcony railing. The railing will match that found elsewhere on the façade’s porch.
  - k. Remove a window from the recessed shed-roofed eastern bay. Face said space with wooden siding matching that found elsewhere on the house.
6. East Elevation
  - a. Remove a window from the first floor. Face said area with wooden siding that will be “feathered” to match that found elsewhere on the house.
  - b. Face the southern section of the house with beveled siding to match that found elsewhere on the house.
7. West Elevation
  - a. Remove four side windows from the first floor.
  - b. Face the spaces formerly occupied by the window with siding matching the existing.
8. South Elevation
  - a. Remove a window from the easternmost window from eastern section of the first floor. Remove a window from the second floor. Relocate a window on the second floor. Install the window sashes from one of the windows proposed for removal on the second floor in the damaged window of the first floor.
  - b. Face the former bays and affected areas with beveled siding that will be “feathered” to match the existing.
  - c. Install a door opening on the first floor. A glazed and paneled door will be located in said opening.
  - d. Install wooden handrails on the first and second floor porches.
  - e. Install wood framing and metal screening on the porches.
  - f. Remove later wooden overhangs that extend from the rear porches.
  - g. Remove a flight of later wooden steps. Install a new set of angled steps with a landing and a railing.
  - h. Face the window bays and affected areas with beveled siding that will feathered to match the existing.

9. Construct a Carport and Covered Passage.
  - a. The carport will be situated atop a 20' square concrete slab.
  - b. The East Elevation of the two vehicle carport will feature two square section wooden posts featuring capital and necking moldings.
  - c. The South Elevation will feature open and walled expanses. The walled expanse will feature wooden siding.
  - d. The West Elevation will be walled. A door opening will be located in the northern corner. A wooden door will be installed in said opening.
  - e. The North Elevation will feature a walled expanse punctuated by a door opening and an open expanse.
  - f. The open connector will feature two square section wooden posts matching those found on the carport. A railing (See C 8 g) will extend along the Eastern Elevation.
  - g. The connector will be surmounted by a two part gabled roof whose heights will reflect the porch and the passage portions of the two part open passage.
  - h. The roofing shingles of both the carport and connector will match those proposed for the house.
10. Install a gravel drive to be located between the carport and the sidewalk.
11. Install fencing.
  - a. A six foot wooden fence will commence at the northern corner of the East Elevation's projecting rear wing. The fence will continue to the eastern lot line where it will then extend in southerly direction along the whole of that section of lot line. A six foot wooden sliding gate will extend across the vehicular opening of this section of fencing. The fence will extend the full length of the southern lot line before wrapping the corner and extending along the western lot line. The fence will tie into the west elevation at a point approximate to said elevation's chimney stack. The north-facing sections of fencing will feature two iron pedestrian gates.
  - b. A three foot iron fence with fleur-de-lys finials will continue around the remainder of the lot. A double pedestrian gate will extend over the front walk and a single pedestrian gate will extend over the side service walk.
12. Remove the concrete pedestrian walk located between the sidewalk and front porch. Install a brick walkway in the location of the existing walkway.

#### CLARIFICATIONS/REQUESTS

1. Will the square section posts proposed for the carport and connector match those found on the front of the house?
2. Will the carport feature hardiboard or wooden siding?
3. Provide a detail of the railing if the design is different from that employed elsewhere on the building?

#### STAFF ANALYSIS

This house has been expanded and remodeled several times over the course of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Sometime after the 1920s, a centrally located rear wing was wrapped by a two story addition. Porches were enclosed and asbestos siding was installed. The new owner/applicants propose the restoration and renovation of the residence. Additional proposals include the construction of a carport with connector, the installation of fencing, and installation of paving and gravel.

The work proposed for the North Elevation (façade) largely consists of the repair and replacement of existing features. All of the proposed in kind replacements and sympathetic conservation measures meet the standards outlined in the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. Staff recommends

approval of all in repair and replacement of existing features, as well as the removal of the non-conforming alterations. Staff recommends approval of the extension of the balcony railing. Said extension will restore the original balcony. With regard to the extension of the porch roof over the western section of balcony, this intervention will prevent the further decay of structure and detailing of the porch/balcony configuration. Said alteration would be minimally visible. Staff recommends approval of the extension of the balcony roof. As per the removal and re-facing of the recessed eastern bay's upper story window, the Board has previously required that the frames of street-facing fenestration remain intact. Window openings are then shuttered. This treatment allows for the maintenance of original fenestration configurations on the exterior while allowing for increased usability within the interior. Staff recommends that window not be faced, but be shuttered.

With regard to the East Elevation, Staff recommends that the window bay proposed for siding and feathering be treated in the same manner as the aforementioned façade window, i.e. shuttered.

Four windows on the West Elevation are proposed for removal. The affected area of the proposed alteration faces the inner lot. This portion of the house is a later addition. Based on the affected areas lack of visibility and later period of construction, Staff recommends approval of the removal of the West Elevation windows.

The whole of the South Elevation is the result of a later addition. Staff does not believe the removal of later features or the alteration of fenestration on this addition will impair the architectural integrity of the building. Staff also recommends approval of the work proposed to the South Elevation, as well as the new carport and connector. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the ancillary construction will complement the main house.

As per the installation of both privacy and iron fencing, the proposed designs, heights, and materials meet the standards outlined in the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. Staff recommends approval of the fencing, along with the installation of the gravel driveway accessing the drive and the installation of brick walkway between the front steps and sidewalk.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-7), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. With the exception of the removal of the windows from the North and East Elevations, Staff recommends approval of the whole application. Staff recommends that said windows be shuttered in order to meet compliance with the Design Review Guidelines of Mobile's Historic Districts, provided herein as section B (3) of the Staff Report.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Blackwell notified the Board that the application had been amended. He informed the fenestration changes proposed for the East and West Elevations would not take place.

Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Kearley if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Kearley answered no.

Mr. Ladd asked if any of his fellow Board members had any questions to ask or comments to make.

Mr. Oswalt asked if the clarifications listed in the Staff Report had been addressed. Both Mr. Kearley and Mr. Blackwell answered yes.

Mr. Karwinski said that he had several comments to make. Speaking of the site plan, he stated that the proposed privacy fence would extend to the inner edge of the sidewalk. Mr. Karwinski noted that the Board had in past times recommended that privacy fences on corner lots be set back from the street. Mr. Bemis mentioned that Traffic and Engineering calls for twenty foot buffer area. That said, he added that the Historic District Overlay allowed for exceptions in certain cases. Mr. Blackwell stated that existing fencing located within 150' of the subject property allowed for the proposed placement of the fencing. Mr. Karwinski reiterated that it had been the previous practice of the Board to call for a setback. He said that a landscaped setback would soften the effect of any proposed fencing. He said that several feet would suffice.

Mr. Roberts raised the subject of the affect that the aforementioned setback would have on the rest of the site plan. He said that that parking situation looked slightly cramped in its current configuration; further diminution might make the plan infeasible. Mr. Roberts and Ms. Harden asked Mr. Kearley if the proposed carport could be shifted further into the lot to accommodate a possible fencing setback. Mr. Kearley said the proposed structure could be setback.

Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Kearley about the proposed fenestration changes on the side elevations. Mr. Kearley stated that the application no longer called for the aforementioned changes.

Turning to the drawing of the East Elevation, Mr. Karwinski pointed out that several elements and features were not shown. Mr. Kearley explained that with the exception of one omission all were previously covered by the recently removed asbestos siding.

Addressing the proposed alterations to the front porch, Mr. Karwinski stated that he did not believe the current roof structure and configuration to original. Mr. Kearley stated that in removing the asbestos siding ghost marks of the proposed railing had been uncovered. He cited a twin house located in the vicinity of South Georgia and Texas Streets. Mr. Kearley said that while the configuration could have been altered, the existence of the ghost marks provided physical evidence for the reinstallation. He added that work in question did pose maintenance issues. Mr. Karwinski suggested an eliminated the western section of railing. Mr. Kearley said that from a maintenance standpoint the suggestion was feasible.

Mr. Kearley added that the house had been damaged during a fire.

Mr. Ladd asked if his fellow Board members if they had any further questions or comments. He asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. No comments ensued. 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, amending facts to note that the side elevation fenestration would remain the same and a three foot buffer would employed before the privacy fencing.

The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The Board recommended that the western section of the front porch balcony be removed and the roof be reconfigured.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/18/13**



**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2012-05-CA: 300 McDonald Avenue**  
**Applicant: Wanda Cochran**  
**Received: 1/3/12**  
**Meeting: 1/18/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Leinkauf  
Classification: Contributing (main dwelling)  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Remodel an ancillary building.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This high end Arts & Crafts inspired “bungalow” dates from circa 1913. The house’s garage was constructed contemporaneously with the main dwelling. The ancillary structure was remodeled in the 1940s.

**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 applicant proposes the renovation and expansion of an ancillary building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The exterior of a building helps define its style, quality, and period. The original siding should be retained and repaired.”
  - 2. “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.
  - 3. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
  - 1. Renovate and enlarge an ancillary building.
    - a. North Elevation and Addition.
      - i. Remove the existing garage doors.
      - ii. Construct a 17’ wide and 5’ deep addition.
      - iii. The addition will rest atop a stucco-faced foundation. The stucco will match that employed on the body of the garage.
      - iv. The addition will feature wooden casement windows matching those found on the second floor of the main house.

- v. The walls of the addition will be faced with wooden siding matching that employed on the body of the garage.
  - vi. A shed roof sheathed with asphalt shingles will extend over the addition.
  - vii. The apexes of the addition's shed roof will feature a latticed treatment matching that found on the main house.
  - viii. The North Elevation's existing double window unit will be retained, repaired, and re-glazed.
- c. West Elevation
    - i. Remove a later double window and face the affected area with siding. The siding will match the existing.
    - ii. Partially reopen a closed window
    - iii. Remove the siding from the apex of the West Elevation's gable. Install a lattice treatment with surrounding moldings matching that found on body of the main house. The same treatment is proposed for the addition.
  - d. South Elevation
    - i. Repair the existing garage doors.
    - ii. Repair and re-glaze the existing transom windows.
    - iii. Remove a door. Face said location with wooden siding matching that found elsewhere on the building.
  - e. East Elevation.
    - i. Remove two windows, door, and a flight of steps. Face the affected areas with wooden siding matching that found elsewhere on the building.
    - ii. Install a casement window matching those found on the second floor of the main house.
    - iii. Install a glazed double door unit.
    - iv. A gabled overhang will extend over the double door. Said overhang will feature brackets and lattice treatments matching that of the main house.
    - v. Remove the siding from the apex of the East Elevation's gable. Install a lattice treatment with surrounding molding matching that employed on the main house.
    - vi. Construct an 8' deep 19' 6" wide wooden deck off the East Elevation. Said deck will feature a continuous step about its exposed sides.

## CLARIFICATIONS

1. What is the proposed color scheme?

## STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the renovation of and the construction of an addition onto a garage. The garage was constructed contemporaneously with house. The building was altered in 1943. At that time, the East Elevation was altered as a consequence of the modifications made to an upper story apartment.

The proposed addition would be located off the garage's North or street-facing elevation. The masonry, siding, and roofing of the addition will match the existing. The windows and detailing will be based on that employed on the main dwelling. Existing windows will be retained, repaired, and re-glazed.

The West Elevation has been extensively altered. Windows have been added and window openings have been faced with siding. The proposed treatment of the West Elevation would involve the complete infill of two later windows and the partial opening of an earlier fourth window. These alterations would

partially restore the original window treatment for the double window unit which was slated for removal as part of the 1943 remodeling.

With the exception of the removal of the door, the work proposed for the garage's South Elevation involves the repair and when necessary, the replacement of existing features. Given the location of the door, Staff, does not believe its removal would impair the architectural or historical integrity of the building.

Infill of existing fenestration and addition of new fenestration are proposed for the East Elevation. This elevation was altered at an earlier date. Staff does not believe that the addition of a new door, overhang, and window will impair the architectural integrity of the building or the district.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Wanda Cochran 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 Ms. Cochran if she had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Ms. Cochran answered no. She did add that she had neglected to include the removal of chain link fence in the submission. Ms. Cochran stated that she would like to replace said fence with a wooden picket fence. Mr. Roberts suggested that Ms. Cochran contact Staff regarding the fencing.

Addressing the Staff Clarifications, Ms. Harden asked what color scheme would be employed. Ms. Cochran answered that the building would be repainted gray and would feature white trim.

Mr. Karwinski said that he had several comments to make and questions to ask. He first addressed the building overhang. He asked for clarification as to whether the building wall or overhang would be in line with house. Ms. Cochran answered that walls would align. Turning to the proposed plan, Mr. Karwinski asked about the second story. Ms. Cochran stated that the second floor of the interior was not being reconstructed. She added that materials would be salvaged if possible.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any further questions to ask or comments to make. No further Board discussion ensued. Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. No comments ensued.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that the garage addition would be reduced to match the wall of the main house.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/18/13**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2012-06-CA: 1551 Old Shell Road**  
**Applicant: Dawn Crow with Brown Chambless Architects for Dr. Philip Buttera**  
**Received: 1/3/12**  
**Meeting: 1/18/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: B-1  
Project: New Construction – Construct a medical office building.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This non-contributing building dates from 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 July 14, 1994. At that time, the Board approved the construction of an addition within area occupied within an existing porte-cochere. In this application, the applicant’s representatives propose the construction of a new medical office building to be located to the south of the property’s existing building.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines for New Commercial Construction state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. **“Placement and Orientation:** Placement has two components: setback, the distance between the street and a building; and spacing, the distance between its property lines and adjacent structures. New construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings. New buildings should not be placed too far forward or behind the traditional “facade line”, a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the facade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape. Current setback requirements of the City of Mobile Zoning Ordinance may not allow the building to be placed as close to the street as the majority of existing buildings. If the traditional facade line or “average” setback is considerably less than allowed under the Zoning Ordinance, the Review Boards will support an application for a Variance from the Board of Adjustment to allow for new construction closer to the street and more in character with the surrounding historic buildings.

2. **MASS:** Building mass is established by the arrangement and proportion of its basic geometric components - the main building, wings and porches, the roof and the foundation. Similarity of massing helps create a rhythm along a street, which is one of the appealing aspects of historic districts. Therefore, new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
  - a. **FOUNDATIONS:** The foundation, the platform upon which a building rests, is a massing component of a building. Since diminished foundation proportions have a negative effect on massing and visual character, new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
  - b. **MAIN BODY AND WINGS:** Although roofs and foundations reinforce massing, the main body and wings are the most significant components. A building's form or shape can be simple (a box) or complex (a combination of many boxes or projections and indentations). The main body of a building may be one or two stories. Interior floor and ceiling heights are reflected on the exterior of a building and should be compatible with nearby historic buildings.
  - c. **ROOFS:** A building's roof contributes significantly to its massing and to the character of the surrounding area. New construction may consider, where appropriate, roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings.
3. **SCALE:** The size of a building is determined by its dimensions - height, width, and depth - which also dictate the building's square footage. Scale refers to the building's size in relationship to other buildings - large, medium, and small. Buildings which are similar in massing may be very different in scale. To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.
4. **FAÇADE ELEMENTS:** Facade elements such as porches, entrances, and windows make up the "face" or facade of a building. New construction should reflect the use of facade elements of nearby historic buildings. The number and proportion of openings - windows and entrances - within the facade of a building creates a solid-to-void ratio (wall-to-opening). New buildings should use windows and entrances that approximate the placement and solid-to-void ratio of nearby historic buildings. In addition, designs for new construction should incorporate the traditional use of window casements and door surrounds. Where a side elevation is clearly visible from the street, proportion and placement of their elements will have an impact upon the visual character of the neighborhood and must be addressed in the design.
5. **MATERIALS AND ORNAMENTATION:** The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples. The choice of materials and ornamentation for new construction is a good way for a new building to exert its own identity. By using historic examples as a point of departure, it is possible for new construction to use new materials and ornamentation and still fit into the historic district. Historic buildings feature the use of a variety of materials for roofs, foundations, wall cladding, and architectural details. In new buildings, exterior materials – both traditional and modern - should closely resemble surrounding historic examples.
6. **Fencing and Walls:** These should complement and not detract. Design, scale, placement, and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of fences in Historic Districts is generally limited to three

feet in front and six feet in the rear. In certain circumstances where a residential property adjoins properties with high traffic or commercial use (apartments, restaurants, etc.), an exception may be granted for an eight foot privacy fence. All fences should be finished with the good side facing the public view and neighbors. The City of Mobile Urban Development Department, in conjunction with the Traffic and Engineering Department must approve the placement of fences and gates at corners and driveways.

7. **Drives, Walks, Parking:** Modern paving materials are acceptable in the Historic Districts. However, it is important that the design, location, and materials be compatible with the property. Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting. Asphalt is not an appropriate material for walkways. Gravel, crushed stone or shells are preferred paving materials along with most of the grasspave and geoblock cellular confinement systems. The appearances of parking areas should be minimized.

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Construct a medical office building.
  - a. The building will measure approximately 13,452 square feet.
  - b. The building will be set back approximately 26' 3" feet from the right of way.
  - c. The two story brick veneered building will be elevated atop a 1'8" watertable.
  - d. The water table will be punctuated by foundation vents that will align with upper story fenestration.
  - e. The building will feature aluminum storefront windows with hardi-trim surrounds.
  - f. The building will feature ornamental wooden brackets.
  - g. The roof sloped portions of the truncated hip roof will be sheathed with asphalt shingles. The flat portions of the roof will be covered in tpo.
  - h. East Elevation (Street Façade)
    - i. The South Elevation will measure approximately 120.8 feet in length.
    - ii. The five part composition is comprised of a three part, two story main block featuring a recessed central bay with flanking advancing two story wings. A central one-story block occupies the space between the two advancing bays. Asymmetrically composed single story wings flank the main block.
    - iii. The East Elevation's first floor features eight fenestrated window bays and the second story features five fenestrated window bays.
  - i. South Elevation
    - i. The two part South Elevation is comprised of a southernmost single story that fronts the two story main block.
    - ii. A hipped roof porte-cochere will front the single story portion of the South Elevation.
    - iii. The South Elevation's first floor is comprised of six fenestrated bays. Paired and single storefront windows comprise five of the bays. A storefront entrance with sliding door will comprise the sixth unit. Said entrance will be located under the porte-cochere.
    - iv. Three windows will punctuate the South Elevation's second floor.
  - j. West Elevation
    - i. The West Elevation will feature two advanced single story portions that will front the building's two story main block.
    - ii. The first of the West Elevation will feature four single bay storefront units and a single aluminum door bay. The door will be surmounted by a wooden overhang featuring brackets like those found on the body of the building.

- iii. Two paired and two single windows will comprise the West Elevation's second story fenestration.
  - k. North Elevation
    - i. The North Elevation will feature an advanced single story that will front the two story main block as well as a recessed single story section to the west of the main block.
    - ii. A paired window unit will punctuate the easternmost section of the North Elevation's first story. A single aluminum door and a double metal door will be located within a recessed bay.
    - iii. Three single unit aluminum storefront windows will comprise the North Elevation's second story fenestration.
- 2. Install hardscaping.
  - i. One existing and one proposed curbcut will afford ingress and egress from Catherine Street. The new curbcut will measure 24' 8" in width.
  - ii. The drives and parking areas will be paved with asphalt. The walkways and curbing will be laid in concrete.
- 3. Remove trees (See site plan).
- 4. Install landscaping (See site plan).
- 5. Install fencing (See submitted photographs).
  - i. Install wooden fencing around a mechanical area located northwest of the building.
  - ii. Install perimeter fencing.

## **REQUESTS/CLARIFICATIONS**

1. Provide a more detailed landscaping plan. Include therein the depth of the landscape portions of the buffer. Provide a listing of the plantings proposed for installation.
2. Contact Urban Forestry with regard to the removal of any trees. Be prepared to explain which trees will be removed.
3. Determine the total square footage of the proposed hardscaping.
4. Indicate on the above or provide a plan showing the design, location and heights of the proposed fencing.
5. Provide a detail of the building's main entrance bay.
6. Provide any material samples and color palettes.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application calls for the construction of medical office building. The proposed building would be located to the south of an existing office building. The further development of the lot would also entail the installation of hardscaping, landscaping, and fencing. Though the Old Dauphin Way Historic District is primarily residential in nature, this area of North Catherine Street has been compromised through the years with a modern office building to the north, two parking lots on the corners to the north, and the McGill Toolen School complex across the street. Therefore, the context for this large office building must take into account historic residential character of the neighborhood while balancing the requirements of the structure.

The Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts require the review of the following design components: placement and orientation; mass; scale; façade elements; materials and ornamentation; fencing; and parking.



Placement involves of two aspects of building location, firstly the setback from the right of way and secondly the distance between buildings. The Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts state that the setbacks of new buildings should approximate those of nearby historic structures. The section of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District has been greatly altered in recent decades. The proposed location is in keeping with the residential character of the area and the placement of the areas nearby historical institutional buildings. Though the proposed design does not feature a street-facing entrance, the façade's pavilion-like composition would impart a strong sense of presence on the streetscape.

Building mass is determined by the relationship between and the proportions of building components. The Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts state that building massing should be compatible with nearby historic examples. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph, the proposed building's façade is influenced by the pavilion articulated divisions of beaux arts design system. The five part vertical division of the façade is complemented by a traditional horizontal layering comprised of water-table zone, wall expanse, and roof structure. Similar massing divisions informed by this approach typify other nearby historic institutional building, namely Raphael Semmes and Old Shell Road Schools. The massing of the building also takes positive direction from the successes and detriments of nearby infill construction. Staff recommends that applicant install windows in the easternmost bays of the North and South Elevation's second floors. Said inclusions would further break down the building mass.

Scale is established by the comparative relationship among a building and other buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts are directed toward preserving a visual continuity of building scale. The section of Catherine Street and Old Shell Road is devoid of historic structures. That said, the design's pavilion-like massing and horizontal banding break up the mass thereby begetting a more pedestrian sense of scale to the design. By employing a truncated roof, the proposed design is not a surmounted colossal roof structure that would overwhelm the building and its environment.

A façade is a building's primary elevation. The Design Review Guidelines for New Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts state the façades should employ the elements of nearby historic examples. This five part façade is comprised of symmetrical main block with asymmetrical wings. The detailing is derived and simplified from nearby historic examples. Staff recommends the façade's second story fenestration be dropped in height to match position of windows found elsewhere on the building.

With regard to materials and ornamentation, The Design Review Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts state that new construction should blend with the historic surroundings without creating a false sense of history. In adopting traditional building divisions and facings, the proposed design blends with nearby historic buildings while the use of simplified forms of historic detailing and the employment of storefront fenestration allow the building to read as a historically attuned infill project.

The Design Review Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts address the location, heights, and composition of fencing. The applicants propose fencing the southern and western lot lines. A photograph of the proposed fence design has been submitted. The proposed design and composition of the fencing meets the design standards. Given the residential nature of the surrounding properties, Staff recommends the use of an eight foot privacy fence about the perimeter of the property. Said fence would need to step down in height in compliance Traffic and Engineering requirements. Additional fencing would enclose the mechanical area located northwest of the building. Staff recommends a six foot height for fencing to be located about the mechanical enclosure.

With regard to paving materials, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts allow the use of modern paving materials. That said, the design, location, and materials employed in parking areas should be compatible with the site. Landscaping greatly assists in creating a setting sensitive to the historical environs. The proposed parking area would be located to the rear of the main building. It would adjoin an existing parking lot that services the property's existing building. The applicant is applying for a PUD that would allow of shared parking after the property has been subdivided. Like the existing lot, the proposed parking extension would feature asphalt paving, concrete curbing, and concrete walks. The materials meet the design standards. While the parking is appropriately relegated to the rear of building, said parking abuts a residential neighborhood. A ten foot buffer is required. No constructions or installations (such as garbage dumpsters) are allowed in said buffer zone. Parking is allowed. In addition to aforementioned recommendation regarding the height of fencing, Staff recommends the installation of extensive landscaping about the perimeter of the site and the base of the building. There should also be internal landscaping adequate to break up the extensive expanses of paving. Components of the plantings should be overstory. As depicted on the site plan, existing trees would have to be removed. Removal of any trees would have to be approved the office of Urban Forestry.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-7), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the historic district. Pending submissions pertaining to landscaping & materials, approvals from other City departments (Urban Development, Urban Forestry, and Traffic & Engineering), clarifications regarding fencing, paving and details, and recommendations regarding fenestration, Staff recommends approval of this application.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Don Brown with Brown Chambless Architects were 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 him to introduce himself to the Board. Mr. Brown did so. Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Brown if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Brown said that his firm had done several projects in the Mobile area, including several dialysis centers of which one being proposed for the subject site. He said that the proposed building differed from the projects in that the proposed design calls for a two-story building. Mr. Brown stated the height was a request of the owner, who also owns the existing building located to the north of the proposed site. He said that the owner is seeking a re-subdivision of the larger property. Mr. Brown said that he and his designers were cognizant of the historic context and guidelines. He noted the location of the proposed building and mentioned the diminished integrity of the streetscape. Mr. Brown said that the initial design submitted to Staff looked to property's existing office building as its design source. He stated the design before the Board was inspired by nearby historic examples in terms of its massing and scale. That said, he noted that the proposed building would be new in terms of its construction and use. Mr. Brown then addressed the landscaping of the site. Referencing the site plan, he said that an effort had been made to retain the oak trees. Regarding the site's perimeter, Mr. Brown stated that he believed the removal of underbrush and the installation of fencing would improve the appearance of the property and district.

Mr. Roberts reminded Mr. Brown that he would have to make an application to the office of Urban Forestry regarding the removal of any trees.

Mr. Roberts then asked for clarification regarding the proposed building's main entrance. A discussion of the main entrance ensued.

Mr. Roberts complemented the overall design. Mr. Brown said that the project had been a challenge. He said that the second story made the stair towers a necessity, adding that fenestration in those utilitarian/service areas would be difficult.

Ms. Harden asked for clarification regarding the setbacks.

Mr. Karwinski said he had several comments to make and questions to ask. He stated that there was too much verticality in the window designs. He said that the elevation's featured nothing which recalled a cornice. Mr. Karwinski noted that the horizontality of a cornice would help to balance the verticality of elements of the design. He also suggested the use of beltcourses to further break down the composition. Mr. Karwinski pointed out when that when landscaping was installed, the plantings would obscure the watertable. He suggested employing a horizontal element at sill level instead of the proposed treatment.

Mr. Ladd stated that the Board is not authorized to redesign applications only rule on impairment.

Mr. Roberts said he thought use of additional horizontal elements such as a cornice would improve the design.

Ms. Harden suggested that the window heights be regularized. Mr. Bemis said that regularized window heights were part of the Staff Recommendations.

Mr. Brown told the Board that he valued their suggestions regarding the cornice. He said he could adjust elements. Mr. Brown told the Board that he had considered a modern treatment instead of the submission which up for review. Mr. Roberts said that more avant-garde designs are encouraged. Discussion as to contemporary treatments ensued.

The discussion then returned to the proposed design. Discussion ensued as to the location and height of windows.

Mr. Roberts made suggestions regarding the types and finishes of exterior brickwork. Mr. Bemis stated that sample materials should be provided. He said that a more accurate landscape plan would be necessary as well.

Mr. Karwinski stated that the design did not properly engage the street. He said that the area is pedestrian oriented and found that a disconnect between the building's entrance and the street was disappointing. Mr. Roberts suggested a sidewalk. Mr. Brown said that a sidewalk could be employed.

Mr. Karwinski also requested a more complete plan showing all proposed landscaping. Mr. Bemis stated that overhanging plantings should be included.

Mr. Brown thanked Staff for their assistance.

Mr. Bemis informed the Board as to the history of the application and noted that the proposal before them was the third set of plans they had reviewed.

## **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, amending facts to note that revised drawings had been provided.

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 district on account of lack of information and that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued. The Board recommended that the final revised application needs to include modifications to the watertable and windows, the addition of a cornice, the submission of landscape plan with overhanging plantings, a lighting schedule that did not invade surrounding residential properties, the inclusion of sidewalk accessing the entrance, and the provision of material samples.