

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**January 7, 2015 – 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:** Catarina Echols, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes II, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone,  
**Members Absent:** Robert Allen and Robert Brown.  
**Staff Members Present:** Devereaux Bemis, Cartledge W. Blackwell, and Keri Coumanis.
2. Mr. Stone moved to approve the minutes for the December 3, 2014 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. Mr. Stone moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.

**B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.**

1. **Applicant: Alchemy Tavern**
  - a. Property Address: 7 South Joachim Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/7/14
  - c. Project: Install hanging sign from underside the building's gallery deck. The sign will be suspended in such a manner to meet height requires for the passerby. The double-faced wooden sign will feature the name of the establishment. Neither side of the sign will exceed a 10 square feet in dimension.
2. **Applicant: Marcella McCracken**
  - a. Property Address: 71 Fearnway
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/24/14
  - c. Project: Replace rotten boards to match, repaint house in existing color scheme.
3. **Applicant: Arvel Kiel**
  - a. Property Address: 111 North Ann Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/1/15
  - c. Project: Replace rotten wood and prime and paint exterior in existing color scheme. Replace missing roof shingles to match.
4. **Applicant: Joe Martin Army Aviation Center Federal Credit Union**
  - a. Property Address: 127 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/3/15
  - c. Project: Install a double-faced painted metal blade sign. The total square footage of each sign face will measure under 10 square feet (for a total of under 20 square feet). The sign will feature the name and logo of the occupying tenant. Install window graphics on the main entrance door advertising the name and hours of the occupying tenant.
5. **Applicant: Billy Singleton**
  - a. Property Address: 160 Houston Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/8/14
  - c. Project: Paint house in Vieux Carre colors; body Bienville Green, trim white.
6. **Applicant: Robert Harris**
  - a. Property Address: 161 Michigan Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/25/14
  - c. Project: Replace rotten to match existing, repaint house body white, trim Fort Gaines Blue (BLP chart); accents Monterey Dark Blue.

7. **Applicant: Mark Roberts**
- a. Property Address: 168 South Broad Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/20/14
  - c. Project: Erect framed metal sign in front of building, 4x8 feet and a banner on porch balcony, 4x6 (temporary).
8. **Applicant: Oakleigh Custom Woodwork**
- a. Property Address: 201 South Georgia Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/25/14
  - c. Project: Remove later doors. Install period appropriate doors at the front and rear doors (per submitted drawings).
9. **Applicant: Amanda Laurence**
- a. Property Address: 210 State Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/2/14
  - c. Project: Install a yard blade sign. Each side of the painted metal sign face will measure four (4) feet for a total of eight (8) feet of signage. Said sign will be located on the property's front lawn. Remove existing chain link fencing. Install a six foot aluminum fence behind the body of the main house (per submitted plans). The fence will extend from the northwest corner of the body of the house to the rear lot line. Additional sections of fencing of the same design and height would be located within the rear lot. An inward opening vehicular gate would comprise a stretch of fence.
10. **Applicant: Bryan Weeks**
- a. Property Address: 261 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/2/14
  - c. Project: Reroof with single ply membrane.
11. **Applicant: Thomas Roofing**
- a. Property Address: 1350 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/5/14
  - c. Project: Reroof flat roof.
12. **Applicant: Chad Miles**
- a. Property Address: 1507 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/4/14
  - c. Project: Renewal of the approval for the construction of an inner courtyard columbarium and fountain.
13. **Applicant: Sondra Dempsey**
- a. Property Address: 205 Congress Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/10/14
  - c. Project: Install interior lot (behind the front plane of the house) wooden privacy fencing. Said fencing will extend between existing brick posts and connecting existing fencing.
14. **Applicant: Carla Sharrow**
- a. Property Address: 1005 Augusta Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/12/14
  - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair and/or replace (when and where necessary) deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.
15. **Applicant: Allison Russo**
- a. Property Address: 350 Charles Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/12/14
  - c. Project: Install a wooden picket fence enclosing the front lawn
16. **Applicant: Erin Wheeler**
- a. Property Address: 257 Charles Street

- b. Date of Approval: 12/15/14
  - c. Project: Install interior lot privacy fencing. Said fencing will measure six feet in height. The aforementioned wooden fencing will be located on the side lot lines and will not extend beyond the front plane of the house.
- 17. Applicant: Z and S Partnership**
- a. Property Address: 1101 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/16/17
  - c. Project: Install interior lot (behind the rear plane of the building) wooden privacy fencing. One section of said fencing will extend from the southeast (rear corner) of the building to the southern lot line and another section will extend from the southwest corner of the building to the western lot line. A vehicular gate (for the dumpster) will punctuate the latter expanse.
- 18. Applicant: Sydney and Jaime Betheze**
- a. Property Address: 1210 Selma Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/17/14
  - c. Project: Renew a Certificate of Appropriateness dating from 11 January 2012 calling for reroofing and the removal of interior chimney stacks.
- 19. Applicant: William and Amanda Laurence**
- a. Property Address: 210 State Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/17/14
  - c. Project: Make repairs to the northern/rear-most window and casing on the building's East Elevation (side). Retain the casing, but infill opening of one of the house's three entrances. The siding will match the existing as per profile dimension and material. The work will be painted to match the existing color scheme.
- 20. Applicant: Z & S Partnership**
- a. Property Address: 1101 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/17/14
  - c. Project: Replace wood on flat roof, not visible from street.

## C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 2015-01-CA: 1501 Old Shell Road**
  - a. Applicant: Blitch-Knevel Architects for McGill-Toolen Catholic High School
  - b. Project: Renewal of an expired CoA for New Construction – Proceed with the construction of a new Student Center.

**APPROVED PENDING SUBMISSION, REVIEW, AND ACCEPTANCE OF FENCING DRAWINGS. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 2. 2015-02-CA: 856 Canal Street**
  - a. Applicant: Charles Rush for Adline Clarke
  - b. Project: Addition - Construct a side addition.

**APPROVED (PENDING VARIANCES). CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 3. 2015-03-CA: 1101 Dauphin Street**
  - a. Applicant: Z & S Partnership
  - b. Project: Commercial Renovation - Renovate a non-contributing commercial building.

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

D. **OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Window Guideline

The Board approved a revised window repair and replacement Guideline. See Addendum to the Minutes.

2. Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts – Mr. Bemis outlined the timeline and procedures informing the writing and approval of the new design review guidelines.
3. Discussion.

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

**2015-01-CA:** 1501 Old Shell Road (building will face Lafayette Street)  
**Applicant:** Blitch Knevel Architects for McGill-Toolen Catholic High School  
**Received:** 12/11/14  
**Meeting:** 1/7/14

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: B-2  
Project: Renewal of an Expired CoA calling for New Construction – Construct a Student Center.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

A number of buildings comprise the campus of McGill-Toolen Catholic High School. The Toolen Building dates from 1928. It ranks among Mobile's most impressive Spanish Colonial Revival building. The Administration/McGill Building dates from 1952. With its prominent setback and expansive façade, the building is a prime example of the so-called "Institutional Versailles" approach to planning. Several houses and the CYO hall complete the ensemble.

**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. The McGill-Toolen Campus last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on October 15, 2014. At that time, the Board gave concept approval for the introduction and expanding of parking lots located at 8-12 North Lafayette Street and 1563 Spring Hill Avenue. With this application, McGill-Toolen proposes the construction of a Student Center. The designs were approved on October 21, 2009. Said designs fall outside the three year period allotted to staff for the renewal of Board approved projects.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and New Construction Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. "Churches, schools, and other civic buildings represent a unique aspect of the community life and frequently have special requirements that relate to their distinctive use. For these reasons, these buildings are usually free-standing and their massing, scale, and architectural arrangements may be of a different nature than their residential and historic neighbors. However, their materials should blend with the character of the district and their site features, such as parking lots, should not overwhelm or intrude on adjacent historic residential areas"
  - 2. "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 “façade line”, a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the façade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape.”

3. “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.”
4. “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. Pier foundations are encouraged for new residential construction. When raised slab foundations are constructed, it is important that the height of the foundation relate to that of nearby historic buildings.”
5. “Although roofs and foundations reinforce massing, the main body and wings are the most significant components. A building’s form or shape (a box) or a complex (a combination of many boxes or projections and indentations). The main body of a building may be one or two stories. Secondary elements, usually porches or wings extend from the main building. These elements create the massing of a building. Interior floor and ceiling heights are reflected on the exterior of a building and should be compatible with nearby historic buildings.”
6. “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 compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings. Additionally roof designs of new residential construction may incorporate eave overhang or trim details such as exposed rafters, cornice, fascia, frieze board, mouldings, etc. as those of nearby buildings.”
7. “The size of a building is determined by its dimensions which also dictate square footage. Scale refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings – large, medium, small. To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.”
8. “Façade elements such as porches, entrances, and windows make up the “face” or façade of a building. New construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.”
9. Elements such as balconies, cupolas, chimneys, dormers, and other elements can help integrate a new structure with the neighborhood when used at the proper scale.”
10. “The number of and proportion of openings – windows and entrances – within the façade 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 windows casements and door surrounds. Where a side elevation is clearly visible from the street, proportions and placement of their elements will have an impact upon the visual character of the neighborhood and must be addressed in the design.”
11. “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 districts. Historic buildings feature the use of materials for roofs, foundations, wall

cladding and architectural details and architectural details. In new buildings, exterior materials – both traditional and modern – should closely resemble surrounding historic examples. Buildings in Mobile’s historic districts vary in age and architectural styles, dictating the materials to be used for new construction. Traditional buildings which are not present on nearby historic buildings or buildings in the area that contain only Victorian-era houses, a brick ranch-style house would be inconspicuous and disrupts the area’s visual continuity. Modern materials which have the same textural qualities and character as materials of nearby historic buildings may be acceptable.”

12. “The degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings.” Although new buildings should use the decorative trim, window casings, and other building materials similar to nearby historic buildings, the degree of ornamentation should not exceed that characteristic of the area. Profile and dimensions of new material should be consistent with the examples in the district.”
13. The type, size and dividing light of windows, and their location and configuration (rhythm) help establish historic character of a building and compatibility with adjacent structures. Traditionally designed windows openings generally have a raised surround on frame buildings. New construction methods should follow this method in the historic districts as opposed to designing window openings that are flush with the wall.”
14. Often one of the most important decorative features, doorways reflect the architectural style of a building. The design of doors and doorways can help establish the character of a building and compatibility with adjacent facades. Some entrances in Mobile’s historic districts have special features such as transoms and decorative elements framing the openings. Careful consideration should be given to incorporating such elements in new construction.”
15. “New materials that are an evolution of historic materials, such as Hardiplank concrete siding or a simulated stucco finish, should suggest profile, dimension and finish of historic materials. True materials such as brick, wood siding, or stucco are encouraged. Some synthetic materials, such as fiberglass porch columns may be appropriate in individual cases as approved by the Review Board.”
16. “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. The appearance of parking areas should be minimized. “

C. Scope of Work:

1. Construct a one-story Student Center on West side of North Lafayette Street parking lot (atop an existing parking lot).
  - a. The building will measure a total of 26,700 square feet.
  - b. The walls of the building will be faced with stucco. Said treatment will match the Science Building.
  - c. Decorative brackets will extend around the eaves. The brackets will be of the same design as those located on the Science Building.
  - d. A glazed clerestory with a pyramidal hip roof will crown the building.
  - e. Multi-light windows will punctuate the wall planes of the clerestory.
  - f. Prefinished metal “Spanish” roof tiles will sheath the building’s roof. The roofing tiles will match those found on the Science building.
  - g. East Elevation (Façade)
    - i. A north-south oriented gable will extend the length of the East Elevation (minus an offset wing).



- ii. A gabled porte-cochere featuring four stuccoed piers and four columns will front a thirteen (13) bay covered walkway extending east to Lafayette Street and west to the Science Building.
  - iii. A u-shaped (paved) drive will access the porte-cochere.
  - iv. Ten (10) multi-light window and four (4) door bays will open onto the covered walkway.
  - v. Five vented dormers will punctuate the roof.
  - vi. A five bay projecting gable wing will extend from the northern end of the façade.
  - vii. A gallery featuring stuccoed piers will wrap around the northern side of the gable-roofed wing.
  - viii. An aluminum fence with interspersed stuccoed piers will enclose a courtyard dining area located off of the gable-roofed wing.
- h. North (Side) Elevation
  - i. A gabled ell with a large louvered window vent will project from the North Elevation's gable end. Two smaller louvered openings will punctuate the main gable.
  - ii. A five bay exterior gallery will be located to the east of the projecting ell.
  - iii. Three window bays and a single door bay will open onto the gallery.
  - iv. Aluminum fencing enclosing the dining courtyard will front portions of the North Elevation. A portion of the aforementioned fencing will take the form of a stucco-faced wall articulated by pilaster-like strips/buttresses.
  - v. A door will provide access to the recessed western portion of the elevation abutting the Administration Building.
- i. West Elevation
  - i. The gabled roof and bracketed eaves will be visible.
  - ii. A door and window bay will comprise the fenestration (the Gymnasium obscures the remainder of the building).
- j. South Elevation
  - i. A rose window with tracery will occupy the gable.
  - ii. A nine bay walkway will project from the wall plane.
  - iii. The covered walkway will extend five bays east of the building toward Lafayette Street.
- 2. Demolish the existing covered walkways on the east and west sides of South Lafayette Street (See 1-j-ii & 1-j-iii.).
- 3. Construct an L-shaped walkway from the Toolen-Building.
  - a. Stuccoed piers will define the individual bays.
  - b. Prefinished metal "Spanish" roof tiles will sheath the building's roof (matching those found on the Science building).
- 4. Replace sidewalks.
- 5. Repave the drive along the northern side of the building that will function as service road.
- 6. Install landscaping.
- 7. Install privacy fencing around a dumpster.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a new Student Center. The plans submitted were approved by the Board on October 21, 2009. The approved designs reflect design changes discussed at a Design Review Committee and amendments reached during the meeting during which the application was



approved. As the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved over three years, Staff is not authorized to approve the project as a midmonth.

The Design Review Guidelines state that churches and other civic buildings represent unique aspects of the community life and frequently have special requirements that relate to their distinctive use. For these reasons, these buildings are usually free-standing and their massing, scale, and architectural arrangements may be of a different nature their residential and historic neighbors. However, their materials should blend with the character of the district and their site features, such as parking lots, should not overwhelm or intrude on adjacent historic residential areas (See B-1.).

The Design Review Guidelines for New Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts classify placement as both the setback from the building to the street and the spacing or the distance between buildings. In accord with New Construction Guidelines, the Student Center adopts the setback and spacing of nearby historic buildings (See B-2.). The setback of St. Mary's, a contributing house of worship located on the property to the north, is observed as the "façade line".

Building mass is established by the arrangement and proportion of its basic geometric components. Similarity of massing helps create a rhythm along a street, which is one of the appealing aspects of historic districts (See B-3). The overall massing is responsive to the massing of nearby historic buildings such as St. Mary's School. The foundation 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 (See B-4.). The foundation treatment reflects that of the historic Toolen Building located opposite the Student Center site. The wings are responsive to the McGill Building and the ceiling heights are the heights of traditional classrooms and ceiling heights are reflected on the exterior of a building and should be compatible with nearby historic buildings (See B-5.). 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 and compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings (See B-6.). The roof type, elements, materials, and detailing reflect the campus's Science Building.

The New Construction Guidelines define scale in reference to a building's size in relationship to other buildings. To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings (See B-7). The scale of the building is in keeping with nearby institutional buildings.

Façade elements such as entrances and windows make up the "face" or façade of a building. New construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings (See B-8.). Expensive window bays echo traditional institutional designs and the porte-cochere observes the traditional façade line (See B-10.). The clerestory is responsive to historic and more recent buildings occupying the subject block (See B-9.).

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. In accord with the New Construction Guidelines, the materials, finishes, and elements draw from historical precedent and the immediate context, but are simultaneously differentiated in material composition (See B-11 & 14.). The degree of ornamentation is neither excessive nor incompatible with the ornamentation found on nearby historic examples (See B-12.).

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-16), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural and historical character of the district. Staff recommends re-approval of this application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Father Bry Shields and Kay St. Amant were present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed McGill-Toolen's representatives. He asked Father Shields and Ms. St. Amant if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Father Shields stated that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full. He explained that the authorization of the new Student Center had simply elapsed and that now that funding was available McGill-Toolen looks forward to commencing this substantial improvement to their campus.

Mr. Ladd congratulated Father Shields on the initiative.

Mr. Holmes asked for clarification regarding the fencing enclosing the courtyard located off of the building's cafeteria. He said that while the enclosure was depicted in plan and described in the Staff Report, no designs were provide. Mr. Holmes stated that given the highly visible location of the fencing, a better idea of what it would look like would be advisable. Ms. St. Amant explained the design of the fence. She stated that the two part fence would feature a lower level coping wall whose design was inspired by coping walls at St. Mary's (next door) and upper level aluminum picketed fence sections.

Mr. Bemis interjected by saying that if there were no other concerns or possible objections to the renewal, imagery of the proposed fencing could be provided to staff and emailed to the Board for speedier review.

Mr. Holmes stated that the course of action outlined by Mr. Bemis was the same which he was approaching.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any further questions for Father Shields or Ms. St. Amant. No questions ensued from the Board. Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as 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 upon the receipt, review, and authorization of renderings depicting the cafeteria court's fencing.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

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

**2015-02-CA:** 856 Canal Street  
**Applicant:** Charles Rush for Adline Clarke  
**Received:** 12/2/14  
**Meeting:** 1/7/14

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Church Street East  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: T-3  
Project: Construct an addition.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This single-story, wooden side hall dwelling with recessed wing dates circa 1901.

**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 in 1991. At that time, the Board approved the painting of the dwelling. The application up for review calls for the construction of a side wing.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
  - 1. Construct a side wing.
    - a. The addition will rest atop a raised foundation measuring the same height and featuring the same treatment as that of the main house.
    - b. The walls of the addition will be faced with hardiboard siding. Siding will match main house’s wooden siding as per profile and dimension.
    - c. The addition will two-over-two aluminum clad wooden windows.
    - d. Wooden shutters sized to reflect the reveals and openings will be employed.
    - e. Fascia board and cornice treatments will match those employed on the body of the house.
    - f. A grouping of gable roofs will surmount the addition.
    - g. Asphalt roofing shingles matching those employed on the body of the house will be employed.
    - h. Façade (South Elevation)

- i. The addition's façade will measure a total of 63' 6" in length.
  - ii. The façade will be divided into four sections. From west to east the sequence is as follows: a recessed connector/hyphen; an intermediate block; a recessed entry fronted by a porch; and a terminal block
  - iii. The gable roofed intermediate block (roof slightly taller) will feature a brick chimney stack with corbelled shoulders and decorative top flanked by two-over-two windows.
  - iv. The recessed entry will be located the beneath the gable of the intermediate block. A four light wooden will be accessed by way of a flight of concrete steps flanked by railings and fronted by engaged turned posts (both posts and railings matching those found on the main house)
  - v. A street-facing gable will surmount the terminal block. Three two-over-two windows will be located within the terminal block.
- i. East Elevation
  - i. The East Elevation will feature a single two-over-two window.
- j. North (Rear) Elevation
  - i. Two two-over-two windows will punctuate be located on the intermediate block.
- 2. Remove an existing curbcut.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the construction of a side wing. The irregularly shaped upon which the subject dwelling stands does not allow for the construction of a rear addition. The application up for review calles for the construction of a rear addition.

This application was first reviewed by City Staff during a predevelopment meeting in late October of the preceding year. As first submitted to Staff and discussed in a predevelopment meeting, the portion of the addition abutting the house was located in advance of the front plane of the body of the dwelling. During the predevelopment meeting the applicant's representatives were advised to recess the addition behind the front plane of the dwelling. On account of the shape of the lot, location of the house thereon, and plan of the aforementioned, an advanced recess proved impossible. A recess was introduced. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, said recess serves to differentiate the old from the new (See B-1.).

City Staff also encouraged a compartmentalized treatment of the façade. Breaking up the façade into distinctive components was recommended as a means of reestablishing a rhythmic sequence of massings that would benefit the streetscape and complement the house. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation the massing, scale, and detailing of the addition are compatible with the principle dwelling. Foundation, siding, roofing, and window types will match those employed on the main house. Staff recommends that instead of turned engaged posts and an elaborately paneled door, that simple chamfered posts and a less detailed door be employed, as well as plain pipe railings. The aforementioned changes would serve to direct attention to and respect the primacy of the original/main entrance and porch.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff does believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Pending the applicant's amenability to the use of simpler doors, posts, and railing and the issuance of the necessary variances for possible deviations from the Downtown Development District Guidelines, Staff recommends approval of this application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Adline Clarke and Charles Rush present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant and her representative. Speaking to Ms. Clarke, he stated that he understood that she and Mr. Rush had worked closely with Mr. Blackwell in bringing the project forward. Ms. Clarke answered yes. Mr. Ladd asked Ms. Clarke and Mr. Rush had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Ms. Clarke thanked the Board for their time and efforts. She informed those assembled that the project up for review was one ten years in the making. Ms. Clarke expressed her enthusiasm for the proposal.

Mr. Roberts thanked Ms. Clarke for her submission.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Blackwell for clarification as to the nature of a predevelopment meeting. Mr. Blackwell addressed Mr. Roberts query and thanked Ms. Harden for her contributions as per the predevelopment process (as germane to the application up for review).

A discussion of the instigation of the additions' entrance ensued. Ms. Clarke explained that she wanted the second entrance and elaborated as to her rationale.

Mr. Bemis raised the subject of the doors and entrance located on the addition.

Mr. Blackwell apologized to the Board. He explained that he had neglected to mention that the applicant was amendable to using chamfered posts and a simpler door. Mr. Rush articulated the same.

Parking was briefly discussed.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any further questions for Ms. Clarke or Mr. Rush. No questions ensued from the Board. Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to not the use of chamfered posts and a simpler door.

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 not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued upon the issuance of any possible variances.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/7/16**

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

**2015-03-CA:** 1101 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Shahid Abbasi with Z & S Partnership  
**Received:** 12/9/14  
**Meeting:** 1/7/14

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Commercial Renovation - Renovate a non-contributing commercial building.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This single-story commercial 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 (Old Dauphin Way) on May 10, 2000. At that time, the Board approved installation of signage. The application up for review calls for the painting and reroofing of the building. The application appears before the Board as result of a 311 call of December 7, 2014.
- 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.”
  - 2. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch, and color.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted materials):
  - 1. Paint the building per the submitted Valspar color scheme.
    - a. The lower portions of the walls will be Rustic Oak.
    - b. The upper portions of the walls will be Holmes Cream.
  - 2. Reroof the building with the metal roofing sheets.
    - a. The roofing panels will be 5-V crimp in profile
    - b. The roofing panels will “Patriot” (red) in color.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the painting and the reroofing of a non-contributing commercial building.



While the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state the exterior of a building helps define its style, quality, and period, they do not specifically address the painting of brick walls (See B-1.). Unpainted historic surfaces should not be painted for reasons of the character defining qualities of the brick (hue, texture, striking, etc...) and the conservation of masonry surfaces (possibility of sealing in moisture). This building is a non-contributing commercial structure constructed a generic brick that is not in keeping with the historic context. Portions of the walls have already been painted. The proposed color scheme is not out of keeping with the surrounding district.

The Design Review Guidelines state that roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch, and color (See B-2.). Metal roofs are approved on a case by case basis. In addition an assessment of the subject building's style, period, and significance, an examination of the roof type and the proposed metal roofing are taken into consideration when reviewing applications for metal roofs. Steeply pitched and clipped roof pitches on three of its four elevations wrap around three sides of this non-contributing strip development like commercial building. 5-V crimp metal roofing panels have been approved on period and typologically appropriate buildings. In October of 2009, the Board approved the installation of a metal roof on 1204 Dauphin Street, a building of similar period and appearance. Brightly colored metal roofs have never been approved. Solid red metal roofing panels were not employed. Staff recommends that a burnished/bronze color scheme and possibly the use of individual metal roofing tiles (constructed in panel form).

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval in part and denial in part.

Based on B (1), Staff does not believe the painting of exterior wall surfaces will impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the aforementioned portion of the application.

Base on B (2), Staff believes the installation of red-colored roofing panels would impair the architectural and historical character of the surrounding district. As proposed, Staff does not recommend approval of the aforementioned portion of the application. Pending the applicant's amenability to using a burnished/bronze color and possibly a compartmentalized tile panels, Staff would recommend approval of this application.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Larry Coulter was present to discuss the application.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that the applicant was amenable to employing to employing burnished bronze metal roofing panels.

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

Mr. Coulter answered no.

Mr. Stone expression his appreciation on account of someone taking the initiative and making the effort to fix up the building.

Mr. Roberts asked if the colors of the bollards could be changed. Mr. Coulter explained that it was his understanding that the color was selected so to match the color of the roof.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any further questions for Mr. Coulter. No questions ensued from the Board. Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd 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, amending facts to note that burnished copper metal roofing panels would be employed. The Board also suggested repainting the bollards to match the color of the approved roofing.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Stone 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 motion received a second and was approved. Mr. Roberts voted in opposition.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/7/16**