

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
January 3, 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, Craig Roberts, Catarina Echols, Steve Stone, Robert Allen, David Barr and Kim Harden.
Members Absent: Carolyn Hasser, Jim Wagoner, Nick Holmes III, and John Ruzic.
Staff Members Present: Bridget Daniel, Marion McElroy, Florence Kessler, and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Stone moved to approve the minutes from December 20, 2017. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.
3. Mr. Stone moved to approve the Midmonths. The motion received a second and was approved with one opposed, Mr. Allen.

B. MIDMONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Chris Phillips**
 - a. Property Address: 60 N. Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/13/2017
 - c. Project: Repair Wood work to match existing in profile, dimensions and materials. Repaint: Walls - White, Shutters - Navy, Door -Stained, and Ceiling - Haint Blue. Re-Roof with Architectural GAF Shingles. Repair windows & sills to match existing in all respects. Install interior Lot Privacy Fencing, not to exceed 6 feet.
2. **Applicant: James Hughes on behalf of 1st Choice Builders**
 - a. Property Address: 510 Monroe Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/13/2017
 - c. Project: Re-Roof - Repair & Replace to match existing Architectural Shingles.
3. **Applicant: Michael and Kelly Pruett**
 - a. Property Address: 14 S. Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/13/2017
 - c. Project: Construct garage at rear of lot according to setbacks using MHDC stock design. Garage will employ materials and details to match existing principal house. Windows will be aluminum clad..
4. **Applicant: Ben Cummings of Cummings Architecture on behalf of Hebrides, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 210 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/14/2017
 - c. Construct new fire escape on rear elevation with canopy over existing door. Add additional landscaping behind an existing fence.
5. **Applicant: Johnna Rogers**
 - a. Property Address: 256 N. Jackson Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/14/2017
 - c. Project: Install double door on West of existing outbuilding. Install canopy above door. Doors will be wood or aluminum clad with glass lite. Canopy will be constructed of wood with bronze metal.
6. **Applicant: National Society of the Colonial Dames of America**
 - a. Property Address: 104 Theatre Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/14/2017

- c. Project: Renewal of a certificate dated September 16, 2015 for the removal of insensitive alterations on a wall to West of Conde - Conde Charlotte Museum and construction interpretive center on site.
- 7. Applicant: Byron and Frances Cruthirds**
 - a. Property Address: 306 Charles Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/15/2017
 - c. Project: Infill the rearmost bay of a side gallery. The infill will be set behind existing columns and railings. A door, the only fenestration impacted, will be repurposed.
- 8. Applicant: Project 50, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 111 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/15/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof with TPO to match.
- 9. Applicant: Daniel and Courtney Brett**
 - a. Property Address: 1567 Bruister Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/15/2017
 - c. Project: Level foundation. Reconstruct foundation piers to match and repaint existing with appropriate mortar. Repair woodwork to match existing in dimension, profile, and material. Replace columns to match existing in order, profile, detail and materials. Reroof with 5V crimp.
- 10. Applicant: City of Mobile**
 - a. Property Address: 150 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/18/2017
 - c. Project: Remove non-contributing guard station at southwest corner of property.
- 11. Applicant: Larry Scott of Lit Cigar Lounge, Inc. on behalf of David Naman.**
 - a. Property Address: 258 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/18/2017
 - c. Project: Repaint building "Miller's Cove" (sage green) and doors black.
- 12. Applicant: Chrissi Moore**
 - a. Property Address: 113 Garnett Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/18/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof to match existing with architectural shingles.
- 13. Applicant: Louis Maisel**
 - a. Property Address: 18 N. Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/19/2017
 - c. Project: Construct shed on existing foundation behind pergola per plans. Shed will be 10'0" x 15'4" in footprint; clad with lap siding to match main house. A metal roof will surmount shed, and metal double doors will grant access from the pergola to the shed.

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 2018-01-CA: 114 Saint Emanuel Street (115 South Conception Street)**
 - a. Applicant: Paul Frenkel with Radcliff Construction, Inc., on behalf of Christ Church Cathedral
 - b. Project: Phase II of a larger Campus Redevelopment – Construct a new entrance pavilion off of Church Street; construct a kitchen addition at the rear of the Cathedral garden; demolish and reconstruct a porch on side of one of the townhouses fronting South Conception Street; conduct site alterations in impacted areas; construct an addition within a largely inaccessible inner court.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2018-02-CA: 104 S. Warren Street

- a. Applicant: Nodar and Hania Gviniashvili
- b. Project: Alteration and Addition Related: Alter a later addition on secondary elevation; construct rear addition.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2018-03-CA: 1055 Elmira Street

- a. Applicant: Leroy Anderson
- b. Project: Demolition of a Residence - Demolish a single family residence.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Nomination and Approval for Chair/ Vice Chair

After discussion, Mr. Stone nominated Mr. Harris Oswalt as Chair and Mr. Robert Brown as Vice Chair. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

2. January 17th Meeting

Ms. Largue announced there were no applications for the second meeting of the month and therefore the meeting has been canceled.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-01-CA: 114 Saint Emanuel Street (115 South Conception Street)
Applicant: Paul Frenkel with Radcliff Construction, Inc., on behalf of Christ Church Cathedral
Received: 12/14/17
Meeting: 1/3/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5-2
Project: Phase II of a larger Campus Redevelopment – Construct a new entrance pavilion off of Church Street; construct a kitchen addition at the rear of the Cathedral garden; Demolish and reconstruct a porch on one of the Townhouses fronting South Conception street; conduct site alterations in impacted areas; construct an addition within a largely inaccessible inner court.

BUILDING HISTORY

Christ Church Cathedral is the old Protestant Episcopal parish in the state of Alabama and seat of the Diocese of the Gulf Coast. The multi-building compound features the following edifices: church sanctuary (1838-1840), a landmark di-style-in-muris/antis temple form house of worship designed by Cary Butts with a newly reconstructed steeple designed by Jim Barganier (2017); chapter house (1880s), late Greek Revival structure; old parsonage (1890s), Aesthetics Movement Queen Anne dwelling adaptively reused as a church office; two townhouses (1850s), Italianate attached side hall houses with engaged service wings; and miscellaneous additions/connectors.

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 2, 2016. At that time, the Board approved the reconstruction of church’s lost steeple. With application up for review, phase II of a two part campus plan (phase I being the reconstruction of the steeple), the parish proposes the construction of a new entrance pavilion, construction of a kitchen addition, demolition & reconstruction of a side porch, site changes to later fabric, and construction of an inner site addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. With regard to partial demolitions, the following criteria are taken into account: “architectural significance, physical condition, impact on the streetscape, and nature of any proposed redevelopment.”
 - 2. “Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site are retained.”

3. "Design the addition to be compatible with the color, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, and environment."
4. "Design the building components (roof, foundation, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture."
5. "Maintain the relationship of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building."
6. "Differentiate an addition from the historic structure using changes in material, color, and/or wall plane. Alternative materials, such as cement fiberboard, are allowed when the addition is properly differentiated from the original structure."
7. "If the style of the addition is different from the original, use a style that is compatible with the historic context."
8. The aforementioned allowed and borrowing from new construction, "this does not imply, however, that a new building/construction must look old. New designs should relate to the fundamental characteristics" of a historic site or district.

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

1. Demolish the side gallery located on the West Elevation of the old parsonage's (No. 115 South Conception Street, Northeast corner of Church &) former service wing.
2. Construct a new entrance pavilion or narthex on and in advance of the location of the aforementioned porch and the court-like parking area.
 - a. The entrance pavilion will be three part in composition: a partial reconstruction of two-tiered service porch in shuttered form to the West; a two-and-one-half-story open pediment central entrance; and a single-story shuttered porch-like hyphen.
 - b. The partial reconstruction of the porch comprising the westernmost portion of the entrance will be two bays in length to the East (abutting the chancel).
 - c. The aforementioned bays will feature shuttered fields (composite/cementitious board) framed by implied square section posts. The stuccoed foundation treatment will match that of abutting areas. The hipped roofed will be sheathed with shingles matching those employed on the body of the building.
 - d. Two pilasters with surmounting entablatures will bracket the central portion of the entrance pavilion.
 - e. The central portion of the entrance pavilion will be faced with stucco scored to match that found on the body of the chapter house.
 - f. Three cascading steps will telescope from the central portion of the entrance pavilion and
 - g. Flagstone pavers will be found within the court.
 - h. The first-story of the center portion of the entrance pavilion will feature a double wooden door flanked by sidelights and transoms with four-over four windows to either side (Some windows might be salvaged).
 - i. The aforementioned door will be situated in a bay that will advance from the larger central portion which it is situated.
 - j. A bracketed balcony will extend between the pilasters
 - k. Four four-over-four windows will comprise the central portion of the entrance pavilion's second-story fenestration. Said windows will match one located on the chapter house's principle or South Conception Street façade.
 - l. The aforementioned gallery will feature a picketed railing with newels interspersed at equidistant points.
 - m. The two innermost windows on the second-story will be located within the second-story portion of the advanced door bay rising from the first-story level.
 - n. An entablature will surmount the aforementioned.

- o. A single circular window with a diamond light pattern will punctuate the open pediment. Said window will match one located on the chapter house's principle or South Conception Street façade.
 - p. A cross will surmount the pediment.
 - q. The two bay easternmost portion of the entrance pavilion will feature the same implied post and by definition as the westernmost portion of the entrance pavilion. This easternmost portion will feature two two-part bays. The stuccoed foundation will match that found on the adjacent construction.
3. Remove, replace, and extend the existing curbcut and drive in advance of the new entrance pavilion.
 4. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated historic fabric to match the existing in composition, profile, dimension, and finish.
 5. Remove a later porch and enclosed additions, fire escapes and handicap ramps in the area impacted by the addition of a new kitchen located at the rear of the Cathedral garden.
 6. Construct an addition.
 - a. The addition will be located between the townhouses located at the Northwest corner of the campus and the garden located at the Southwest corner of the campus.
 - b. The stuccoed walls of the addition will be scored to match the Chapter Room's walls.
 - c. A beltcourse will be employed on the addition.
 - d. A cap will surmount addition's parapet.
 - e. Mechanical equipment will be relocated to an inset location within the parapet.
 - f. North Elevation
 - i. The addition's north elevation will be comprised of two wall planes.
 - ii. The easternmost of the aforementioned wall planes will be set in advance of the westernmost plane.
 - iii. The westernmost wall plane is so divided as to afford overall symmetry to the elevation as a whole.
 - iv. The easternmost wall plane will not feature fenestration.
 - v. A stoop and flight of steps with a railing matching that of Chapter's garden terrace will afford access to a door.
 - vi. The stair will be a dogleg in composition.
 - vii. An additional door and door and can door will also inform the North Elevation.
 - g. East Elevation
 - i. Pilasters will divide the East or Garden Elevation into three bays.
 - ii. A circular window will inform the central bay.
 - iii. Metal screening setback atop the roof will enclose chillers and air handlers.
 - h. Infill a window on a west-facing wall impacted by the addition. The window field will be stuccoed to match the existing. The sill and lintel will be retained.
 7. Alter the access of the Chapter Room's garden terrace.
 - a. Remove the existing flight of steps.
 - b. Construct a new handicap access ramp in a portion of the location of the aforementioned steps.
 - c. The ramp will feature railings matching those employed on the terrace.
 - d. The ramp will be designed to be coordinated with the appearance of the other ramp found in the garden, a construction which affords access to the sanctuary.
 - e. Remove a section of railing from the terrace at a location north of the existing steps.
 - f. Construct a new flight of steps in the aforementioned location.
 - g. The form, detail, and treatment of the steps will match that of the existing steps.
 - h. A wooden French door matching two existing doors accessing the terrace will be instated on axis with the new steps.
 8. Remove a side gallery.

9. Construct a new glazed enclosure on the location of the gallery.
 - a. The overall dimensions of the portion of the gallery abutting the rear elevation of the westernmost townhouse will remain the same.
 - b. The two-staged (height keyed to portions of the sizable rear service wing) sequence of the original portion will be retained in terms of height, but widened with regard to plan
 - c. Foundation level will remain the same.
 - d. A metal store front system replicating the placement of porch piers and railings on both tiers of the construction will be instated.
 - e. The simulation of the railing will not feature pickets.
 - f. Roof heights will be replicated
 - g. Roofing shingles will match the existing.
10. Conduct site changes to later features.
 - a. Remove a portion of non-historic wall from the westernmost portion of the property.
 - b. Said location is north of the porch to be reconstructed out of new materials.
 - c. Alter the right of way so as to create a service drop off in the aforementioned area.
11. Construct an inner building addition/connector.
 - a. Said construction will be situated between an existing enclosed inner gallery and the west wall of the Chapter room.
 - b. A memorial window will be sensitively removed and relocated (aforementioned window is not a historic window, but still an important dedicatory element whose relocation has been coordinated with the family who provided for its dedication.).
 - c. The stuccoed walls of the addition will match the treatment and finish of those found on the chapter house.
12. Construct an inner compound addition.
 - a. The addition will be located between the southernmost townhouse and the chapter room.
 - b. The addition's walls will be faced with stucco. The roofing will match that of adjacent areas.

CLARIFICATIONS/REQUESTS

1. Provide designs of the gates that will secure pedestrian access points located on the campus's northernmost points of entry (about the service drop off).

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application is Phase II of a larger campus redevelopment for Christ Church - the Cathedral Church of the Episcopal Diocese of the Gulf Coast. Phase I resulted in the reconstruction of long lost steeple, as well as the ongoing replacement of protective covering for historic stained glass windows and installation of new up-lighting. The subject application calls for the following: construction a new entrance off of Church Street; construction of a kitchen addition at the rear of the Cathedral garden; alteration of a porch behind one of the townhouses; implementation of site alterations off of the aforementioned; and construction of an addition within an a largely inaccessible inner court.

The construction of the proposed new entrance off of Church Street would entail the demolition of a rear service wing that extends from the body of the old parsonage/present day office. With regard to demolitions, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's outline four principle criteria which should be taken into account when evaluating the removal of structures. The aforementioned considerations are as follows: architectural significance of the construction; condition of the construction; impact on the streetscape; and nature of any proposed redevelopment (See B-1.). As to architectural significance, the portion of the building in question served as the service wing to parish's parsonage. While no means

unsubstantial in design and construction in relation to other contemporary service wings, the construction is not of the same design and ornamental caliber as that of the principle building to which it is engaged. The wing is in a good state of repair. If authorized for demolition, a new entrance pavilion or narthex as it is being called would be constructed. See the ensuing paragraph for an analysis of said proposed redevelopment of the pertinent portion of the site.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that additions should be so designed as to preserve the overall characteristics of the site (See B-2.). An architectural component of lesser architectural and historical consideration than those surrounding it would be removed a new engagement with Church Street and Church Street East would be gained. Character and presence would only be enhanced by the proposed new construction (and in multiple respects). Currently there is no architectural or experiential connection between the campus and Church Street, an important downtown artery once referred to as the most aristocratic of Mobile Streets. The proposed new entrance pavilion harks to that heritage. It not only engages with the street itself, but also draws inspiration from buildings comprising the larger campus and construction methods in the nearby vicinity thereby achieving compatibility (See B-3.). Compatibility of color, material, and character would be afforded. From foundation to façade elements to details to roof, building components have referential context within the whole. The walls of the addition would be faced with stuccoed scored to match the finish and hue that of the main chapter house. As with the original Church Street entrance to the Chapter House, the proposed new addition would be two-story in height and feature a ground floor that would elevate a piano Nobile-like upper-story surmounted by an open gable (See B-4.). Solid-to-void sequences are responsive to patterns found on the old parsonage/present day office and chapter house (See B-5.). Pilasters with surmounting entablatures, large two-over-two windows, and a circular window are derived from the Church Street façade of said Chapter House. The advanced construction which the main door is set is drawn from the project bays that distinguished the South or Church Street Elevation of the body of the old parsonage/present day church office. Flanking spaces found to either side central entrance pavilion would maintain the foundation elevation of the church and former parsonage/present day church office to either side, as well as reference in appearance the former porch construction that occupied a portion of site impacted by the proposed new construction. Just as the inspiration of the South Conception Street elevation of the Chapter House serves to engender compatibility for the proposed new entrance pavilion within the larger compound, it also serves as subtle differential between old and new fabric on Church Street as the design would be set between the early Greek Revival Sanctuary and the Aesthetics Movement Queen Anne informed former parsonage/present day church office (See B-6.). Contextual compatibility and differentiation would be assured.

Construction of the new entrance pavilion off of Church Street would remove the current kitchen, which is located in the old service wing of the old parsonage/present day church office. The proposed kitchen addition would be located in the rear of the Cathedral garden. Said proposed construction would necessitate the removal a handicap access ramps, a later portion of porch, and other more recent constructions. When reviewing applications calling for partial demolition, the following criteria are taken into account: architectural significance of the subject portion of the construction; physical condition of the pertinent portion of construction; impact the demolition would have on the streetscape, and nature of any proposed redevelopment (See B-1.). As evidence by Historic American Building documentation (photographs, site plans, and elevations), Sanborn Maps, and physical examination, all of the additions proposed for removal date after 1955. A stable dating from the 1850s occupied the area until circa 1930. None of the work appears in the 1955 Sanborn Map. The constructions are not of the same architectural or historical character as the historic townhouses, chapter house, and sanctuary which they engage. The constructions are not in bad state of repair. They are minimally visible from the public view on account of their placement on the lot, proportions, and site conditions (namely the garden's North wall). By virtue of its location within the compound, the proposed new kitchen would not impair the overall characteristics of the site in terms of his historicity (See B-2.). Built density would be regained (and on the site within

the property where it once existed – the lost stable mentioned above). The proposed kitchen is so designed as to be compatible with the overall character of the lot. The colors and materials are drawn from those of the sanctuary and chapter house (See B-3.). Building components, such as the pilasters and scoring, are drawn from the same sources (See B-4.). Fenestration to be added and employed on the garden façade is based on either historic or existing windows. Variations in height and plane serve to differentiate the old between the new (See B- 6.). Mechanical units would be screened.

Adjacent to the proposed kitchen at the innermost point in the Cathedral garden there is a terrace. The terrace constitutes recent construction. A flight of stairs would be removed and a handicap access ramp would be constructed in its place. New stairs would be constructed opposite a new door way. Ramp treatments, stair construction, railing pattern, and door would match the existing.

The two-tiered galleries extending the length of the westernmost townhouse’s service wing are proposed for demolition and reconstruction, albeit in an expanded footprint and modern materials. With regard to partial demolitions, the following criteria are taken into account: architectural significance of the subject portion of the construction; physical condition of the pertinent portion of construction; impact the demolition would have on the streetscape, and nature of any proposed redevelopment (See B-1.). While the galleries constitute original construction, they were never intended to be seen. The service alley which now exposes them to view was only concreated upon the demolition of the 1950s or 5th Mobile County courthouse and the construction of the new courthouse. Dwellings existed on the abutting site into the 1960s. The porch was altered when it was infilled. Said porch is not in an apparent bad state of repair. If approved for removal a new gallery would be constructed. Said gallery would adopt the same overall proportions as per elevation, but would be of greater depth in its larger easternmost expanse. The proposed new two-tiered gallery would be made of aluminum. New materials are authorized if they are compatible with the historic context (See B-7.). While the new construction would not feature the level of detail as the existing, floor levels, bays sequences, and roof forms would be replicated, but picket within implied rails and other details would not be employed. Simplification of detail and employ of modern materials would serve to afford differentiation with proportional continuity (See B-6.).

The inner complex addition will be virtually impossible to view from the public view. Wall surfaces and roofing treatment will match that found on adjacent areas.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-8), Staff does not believe this application will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the properties or district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The Very Rev. Beverly Gibson, rector of Christ Church Cathedral, Mr. Paul Frenkel, contractor; and Mr. Jim Barganier, architect were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant and representatives and asked if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Frenkel noted the application before the Board was part of a multi-phase plan to make the campus ADA compliant.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow Board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mrs. Gibson, Mr. Frenkel, or Mr. Barganier.

Mr. Roberts noted it was wonderful to see a thriving church in downtown Mobile. It was then confirmed for him that the two new round windows will match an existing window located in the courtyard. Mr. Roberts then asked if there was to be scoring on the new additions with stucco to match the church. Mr. Barganier noted the South elevation was scored below the baseline.

Mr. Frenkel confirmed for Mr. Stone a hamper and proper drainage will be located where a portion of the wall will be removed on the West elevation.

Mr. Roberts asked the timeline of the project. Mr. Frenkel responded as soon as possible. He continued by saying work on the North elevation will be completed before the South elevation. Mrs. Gibson stated the goal is to have all phases complete by 2022.

Mr. Barganier noted the first phase of this portion of the project will include a fire stairway that will serve the North elevation and an elevator to access between the “Twin houses” and Chapter house.

Ms. Harden inquired as to where the mechanical equipment will be relocated. Mr. Frenkel responded a chiller will be screened on the kitchen addition.

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. 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 building and the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration: January 5, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-02-CA: 104 S. Warren Street
Applicant: Nodar and Hania Gviniashvili
Received: 12/4/2017
Meeting: 1/3/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.1
Project: Alteration and Addition Related: Alter a later addition on secondary elevation;
construct rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Neoclassical house dating to 1904 was previously used as apartments. Details include a curving porch and ionic columns.

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.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site are retained.”
 - 2. “Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.”
 - 3. “Design the building components (roof, foundations, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
 - 4. “Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color, and/or wall plan.”
 - 5. “Place an addition so that it is subordinate to historic residential structure.”
 - 6. “Design an addition to be compatible with the historic residential structure.”
 - 7. “Design an addition to be compatible in massing and scale with the original historic structure.”
 - 8. “Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension, and material. Modern materials will be evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original structure on an individual basis.”
 - 9. “Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.”
 - 11. “Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure.”
 - 12. “Maintain the relationship of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building.”

13. “Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Alter a later addition on South elevation.
 - a. Windows and doors will either be sensitively removed and repurposed, or replaced with wood.
 - b. The proposed extension and infill will maintain the elevation and mimic the foundation treatment of abutting areas.
 - c. Roof will be sheathed in shingles to match existing.
 - d. South (side) Elevation
 - a. Remove an existing window and door flanking an advanced portion of the elevation on the second story.
 - i. The aforementioned door and window will each be replaced by square windows.
 - b. Construct an extension of a later addition on the advanced central portion of existing elevation.
 - i. Remove a 29’0” flat roof expanse and balustrade in the central portion of the elevation and install shed roof.
 - ii. Enclosed spaces and open infill will extend in an easterly to westerly direction under new shed roof.
 - iii. The easternmost portion of the advanced section will be a porch.
 1. Wooden steps will afford access to the porch.
 2. A balustrade to match existing will be employed.
 3. A column will inform the termination of the porch.
 4. Porch materials will match that employed on the existing house.
 - iv. A door will be removed.
 - v. The altered bay sequence on the affected first floor will be as follows in an easterly to westerly direction: square window, one-over-one window, and paired one-over-one window.
 - e. East (rear) Elevation
 - a. Steps will access the porch.
 - b. A paneled wooden door with transom light above will be employed.
2. Construct a rear addition affecting the East (rear) and South (side) Elevations.
 - a. The addition will be 14’0” in width and 11’0” in depth.
 - b. The proposed addition will maintain the existing elevation and foundation treatment will be brick veneer.
 - c. Walls will be clad in lap siding to match existing.
 - d. Roof will be sheathed in shingles to match existing.
 - e. South (side) Elevation
 - i. A shed roof will be constructed off a preceding space.
 - ii. A set of square windows will be centrally located on the addition.
 - f. East (rear) Elevation.
 - i. A set of square windows will flank a set of paneled doors.
 - a. Doors will be on grade and feature a transom above.
 - ii. A shed roof will surmount the addition.
 - iii. A bank of steel windows will comprise the enclosed portion of the addition’s West Elevation.
 - iv. A hipped roof wooden awning truncating the shed roof will be installed over the double doors.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for alterations to and additions to later additions informing the side and rear portion of a contributing residence. Most of the proposed scope of work would impact the South (a side) Elevation and northern portion of an East (rear) Elevation. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, neither of the alterations to or the construction of addition would impair the overall site conditions (See B-1.).

The affected advanced, first story portion of the South elevation is not an original feature. Changes in wall plane, and roof structure, and new addition would be constructed in response to the original fabric. Said would be differentiated from, yet compatible with the existing fabric, be it historic or more recent (See B-4.).

Existing fenestration would be sensitively removed and reinstated or new windows would be constructed to match existing in lite configuration and composition. Alterations and new construction employs building components and associated wall facings that would match or be compatible with the historic architecture informing the property (See B-3.).

A new addition would engage with and extend from the portion of the South elevation discussed in the second paragraph. By virtue of its situation on the lot, relation to the house (historic and later), and design the addition is subordinate to the contributing building (See B-5.). The proposed addition is an enclosed space. Said portion of the addition would abut the South Elevation's porch and be located to the rear of the house. The proposed addition is so designed as to afford compatibility with and differentiation from the existing fabric (See B 4 & B-7.). Material surfaces reference historic conditions (See B-10.), Foundation elevation would be maintained. The proposed wooden lap siding walls would match the composition and finish of the existing/historic fabric (See B-8.). Proposed fenestration, that of a one lite configuration, would match that found on the main house.in composition. Truncated shed roofing forms with shingles to match existing are proposed. The materials of the roof are compatible with the historic fabric.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-4), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the property or the district. Staff recommends approval in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The owners, Mr. Nodar and Mrs. Hania Gviniashvili, were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicants and asked if he or she had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Gviniashvili stated Ms. Lague had explained the application.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow Board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. and Mrs. Gviniashvili.

Mr. Roberts asked the applicants who executed the beautiful drawings. Mr. Gviniashvili responded he had drawn the plans.

Ms. Largue confirmed for Ms. Harden the Sanborn maps had been referenced in finding the original footprint of the building.

Mr. Gviniashvili explained to Mr. Stone and the Board the roof would be similar to a gable when viewing the West elevation.

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. Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony; the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration: January 5, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-03-CA: 1055 Elmira Street
Applicant: Leroy Anderson
Received: 12/11/2017
Meeting: 1/3/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolish a single family residence. .

BUILDING HISTORY

While listed as non-contributing in 2007 expansion of the local boundaries of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District, it is said that the core of this dwelling dates circa 1855. The house was altered circa 1925 and reflects in its outward form and motifs a later vein of Arts and Crafts Movement. The core of the dwelling still maintains its antebellum shotgun and with side wing floor plan.

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 April 5, 2017. On the aforementioned date, the Board denied the application and requested the property be listed on MLS and plans for any redevelopment proposal. The application up for review calls for the demolition of the single family residence.

- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
 - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure:
 - 1. This property is defined an expanded shotgun dwelling situated in the local portion of the Oakleigh Garden District. The 19th-Century core is comprised of a shotgun with wing, a residential typology that was constructed across Mobile’s early western suburbs during the second half of the 19th Century.

- ii. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. The dwelling contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, historic character, and architectural integrity of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. As an early shotgun with wing, the house is one of a half dozen dwellings of the same typology to line the Oakleigh Garden District portion of Elmira Street.
- iii. 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 or acquired.
- iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 - 1. While shotgun dwellings represent a sizable percentage of the residential building typology of the southeastern portions of the Oakleigh Garden District, this example ranks among one of the oldest. In addition to its age, the building constitutes a sophisticated variant of the shotgun typology that it possessed a side wing.
- v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 - 1. If granted demolition approval, the applicant would demolish the building and level the site and begin constructing a single family residence within 60 days.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. The current owner acquired the property in 2014 for a price of \$2060.00.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. The owner has considered rehabilitating the property.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The property has been listed for sale for \$21,500.
- 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. The structure had been offered for relocation.
- x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. Construction of a single family residence would begin within 60 days of demolition. The proposed cost of project would be \$80,000 to \$85,000.
- xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
 - 1. Financial proof has been provided and a copy will be distributed at the meeting.
- 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 plans):

1. Demolish the dwelling.
2. Remove debris.
3. Level the site.
4. Construct single family residence.
 - a. Approval for new construction to be obtained at later date.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a principle building which is officially listed as a non-contributing structure in the local portion of a larger National Register district.

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

While listed as non-contributing, this dwelling is representative of a distinctive residential typology that is largely restricted to Mobile – the shotgun with wing. The building is much older than the date ascribed to it by the MHDC surveyor who researched the local expansion of the Oakleigh Garden District. The Oakleigh Garden District possesses more extant examples of this architectural type than any other area in Mobile. Though the typological significance is obscured by later changes, the building’s importance should be noted.

This building’s deteriorated condition can be attributed to deferred maintenance over many years. Deterioration of roof shingles and wood has allowed the elements to enter and therefore jeopardize the structure.

Located within a block of historic buildings, this house contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and historic character of the southern portion of the Oakleigh Garden District. Five buildings on the subject block have been restored in the past eight years. The block to the South benefitted from Board approved infill construction. The block to the North is experiencing similar restoration and renovation efforts.

The Board adopted a policy four years ago which requires applicants requesting the demolition of property’s principle building (if it is historic) to list the property on MLS for a period of six months before authorizing the demolition of said structures. The applicant listed the property for sale per the board’s request and also offered the structure for relocation.

If granted demolition approval, the applicant would demolish the house, remove debris, level the lot, and build a single family residence. Construction plans have been provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff acknowledges the applicant has submitted what the Board previously asked of him. Staff defers to the Board.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The owner, Mr. Anderson, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicants and asked if he or she had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Anderson explained the property had been purchased in 2014 in a tax sale and he had obtained the tax deed. Mr. Anderson stated at that time he was denied a demolition by the Board. Mr. Anderson further explained in April of 2017 he appeared again before the Board and the Board denied his application. He noted at that time the Board requested proof of financial capability and construction plans and is appearing before the Board with the information requested. Mr. Anderson expressed his property was not historically significant and was listed as non-contributing in a 1991 survey.

Mr. Roberts noted he understood his frustration, but stated the other factors in considering a demolition.

Discussion ensued. Ms. Largue stated the applicant previously provided a photo of a multi-family house as construction plans. She explained the neighborhood was not zoned for multi-family housing. She further explained the applicant has brought construction plans for a single family residence.

Mr. Oswalt reiterated the property was in a National Register District. Mr. Roberts further explained all demolitions, new construction and alterations are reviewed by the Board when located in a historic district.

Ms. Largue confirmed for Mr. Stone the requirements and powers given to the Board for reviewing demolitions located in the local ordinance and Rules and Regulations.

Mr. Anderson expressed his feeling of being treated unfairly by the Board because the code was in place to protect historic structures. He also noted he had listed his property for six months as requested by the Board. Ms. Harden replied a demolition was not guaranteed after listing the property for sale for the six month period. Mr. Anderson explained the house was not historic. Ms. Largue noted in the 1971 ordinance the Board was given authority to review all demolitions located in a historic district as set forth by the ordinance and Rules and Regulations. She further explained architectural significance is one of many things the Board considers when reviewing applications.

Discussion ensued. Mr. Anderson stated the oldest house on the street was dated 1890. Mr. Allen responded there are houses dated older than 1890 in the historic district and noted two houses on his street in the neighborhood date to 1840. Ms. Largue explained the house is in a National Register district and therefore listed on the National Register of Historic Places. She further explained both contributing and non-contributing buildings are listed on the register when in a district. Ms. Largue noted the consultant who prepared the nomination was mistaken in not noting the true age of the building.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment.

Corporal Chavis and Sergeant Lori Alford were present to speak for the application. Corporal Chavis said he was working the Mayor's blight initiative. He stated vagrants were entering through openings in the roof and the property is an emergency situation.

Mr. Jarrod White, on behalf of Restore Mobile, asked the Board not to approve the application. He expressed he had entered the property in 2013 and that it could still be restored. He noted in the state and local ordinance the Board has the authority to alter a property's contributing status. He stated the Board uses the same criteria when reviewing applications for a district. Mr. White commented the applicant has no obligation to build once the property is demolished. He noted other properties in close proximity that had been restored or relocated and then restored including 454, 457, 458, and 460 Chatham Street. He stated the property could be restored as a contributing bungalow or shotgun. Mr. White further explained the property had been listed for sale \$21,500.00 above market value and the applicant should reconsider the price.

Mr. Anderson responded with interested buyers and noted Restore Mobile was offered the structure for \$2500.00 if they relocated it. Discussion between Mr. White and Mr. Anderson ensued. Mr. Anderson stated he originally applied for demolition on behalf of an interested buyer and that the originally proposed duplex plan was the buyer's idea.

Mr. White noted Restore Mobile would relocate the structure if donated. Mr. White stated the property was a demolition by neglect. He further explained since the property was a tax sale it did not have a clear title, which is necessary to obtain funding by a bank if needed. Mr. Stone noted a similar issue with title occurred at 10 South Ann Street and the Board could not grant the request. Ms. Largue stated a clear title was not part of the Board's criteria.

Mr. Anderson stated it was the Board's responsibility to protect the rights and interests of the property owner. He noted he had furnished what the Board asked for at the previous ARB meeting.

Ms. Harden inquired as to if the applicant had purchased the property with the intent to demolish. Mr. Anderson replied it was his intent, and purchased the property for the site not the structure.

Mr. Oswalt asked what the lot was worth. Mr. Anderson stated a realtor had assessed the property at \$19,000. Sergeant Alford stated Mr. Anderson was trying to improve the neighborhood. Mr. Anderson commented the proposed construction on lot will be a single family residence for his son. Sergeant Alford stated the Fair Market Value of the lot according to the Tax Assessor Records is \$9,700.

Corporal Chavis stated Mr. Anderson possesses the third person tax deed.

Mr. Barr asked the condition of the house when first purchased. Mr. Anderson replied it was in a similar condition as the present. Ms. Harden asked if the blue tarp had been on the roof at time of purchase. Mr. Anderson stated it had been and that he had no intention of reroofing the house. Mr. White stated in 2013 the roof was in better condition and noted the later additions on the house were in poor condition. Mr. Anderson explained the original conditions of the site.

Mr. Anderson confirmed for Ms. Harden his intention to demolish the structure when first purchased. Mr. Anderson stated he received an estimate to repair the foundation for \$7,800.00 in the past twelve months.

Mr. Allen requested a legal opinion as to if the demolition could be granted since the property was purchased on a tax sale. Mrs. Kessler explained the tax deed gives the holder right of possession; therefore, a right to rehabilitate property is at his own risk. She further explained for purposes of ARB the applicant is the owner.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony; the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the building and the district, but taken into account the state of disrepair, financial ability, and construction plans, a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and with Mr. Barr, Ms. Harden and Mr. Allen in opposition. Mrs. Echols abstained from voting.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration: January 5, 2018