

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

July 11, 2012 – 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: Gertrude Baker, Kim Harden, Nick Holmes III, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswald, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Members Absent: Carlos Gant, Craig Roberts, and Jim Wagoner.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis and Cart Blackwell.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the June 20, 2012 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Oswald moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Robin Jackson**
 - a. Property Address: 909 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/13/12
 - c. Project: Repaint exterior, body light gray, underpinning dark gray, and a mix of grays on the decorative fishscales. All trim white.
2. **Applicant: Charles Allen**
 - a. Property Address: 116 North Hallett Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/13/12
 - c. Project: Install a new rear door matching the existing.
3. **Applicant: Terry Cross with A 1 Roofing and Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 70 South Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/15/12
 - c. Project: Reroof the dwelling with architectural shingles.
4. **Applicant: Cunningham Bounds, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 1550 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/18/12
 - c. Project: Reinstall gravel in the parking area (per submitted portion in the site plan).
5. **Applicant: Haden Oswald**
 - a. Property Address: 19 South Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/18/12
 - c. Project: Install interior lot fencing. Extend an existing six foot privacy fence and install a four foot picket fence. All fencing will be located behind the front plane of the house.
6. **Applicant: Matt Lamond**
 - a. Property Address: 568 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/18/12
 - c. Project: Install a canvas awning matching that installed at 564 Dauphin Street. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.

- 7. Applicant: Matt Lamond**
 - a. Property Address: 566 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/18/12
 - c. Project: Install a canvas awning matching that installed at 564 Dauphin Street. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.
- 8. Applicant: Gail Stillwell**
 - a. Property Address: 245 South Warren Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/18/12
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace windows to match the existing.
- 9. Applicant: David Norsworthy**
 - a. Property Address: 1569 West Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/18/12
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing. Repaint per the existing color scheme. Repair and when necessary replace windows to match the existing. Reroof the building.
- 10. Applicant: Larry Goodwin**
 - a. Property Address: 250 George Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/18/12
 - c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.
- 11. Applicant: Darlene Bryant Williams**
 - a. Property Address: 353 Flint Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/19/12
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.
- 12. Applicant: Ben Broadwater**
 - a. Property Address: 511 Eslava Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/19/12
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing.
- 13. Applicant: Alford, Boling, and Dowdy**
 - a. Property Address: 224 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/12/12
 - c. Project: Suspend a sign from the underside of the second story balcony. The double-faced wooden sign will measure a total of 16 square feet and feature the name of the establishment.
- 14. Applicant: Matt Golden**
 - a. Property Address: 551 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/20/12
 - c. Project: Install six-over-six wooden windows. Repair stucco-work to match the existing.
- 15. Applicant: Dr. Helen Campbell**
 - a. Property Address: 260 South Cedar Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/21/12
 - c. Project: Repair and replace windows to match the existing.
- 16. Applicant: Betty Champion**
 - a. Property Address: 116 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/21/12
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

- 17. Applicant: Larry Posner**
- Property Address: 162 Saint Emanuel Street
 - Date of Approval: 6/21/12
 - Project: Repair/replace rotten siding to match existing as necessary. Install ductless HVAC system, not to show from outside.
- 18. Applicant: Sign Pro for Mobile Infirmary**
- Property Address: 1772 Dauphin Street
 - Date of Approval: 6/25/12
 - Project: Replace a sign board within an existing monument board sign. The total square footage of the sign will measure 30 square feet. The design of the aluminum sign will feature the name of the institution.
- 19. Applicant: Beth Legett**
- Property Address: 1208 Selma Street
 - Date of Approval: 6/25/12
 - Project: Repaint in following Sherwin Williams color scheme: body Bunglehouse Gray (SW2845); trim white; door and shutters black; porch black, porch ceiling blue. Minor repair on porch roof.
- 20. Applicant: Sign Pro for the Bell Law Firm**
- Property Address: 958 Dauphin Street
 - Date of Approval: 6/20/12
 - Project: Affix a metal sign to an existing monument sign. The sign will fit within the existing frame. The sign will feature the name of the occupying tenant and will rely upon re-installed spotlights for illumination.
- 21. Applicant: Gulf Quest Equipment for the Mobile Archdiocese**
- Property Address: 351 Conti Street
 - Date of Approval: 6/25/12
 - Project: Replace rooftop mechanical devices to match the existing.
- 22. Applicant: Etsie Foreman**
- Property Address: 310 Saint Francis Street
 - Date of Approval: 6/25/12
 - Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
- 23. Applicant: Richard Dumas**
- Property Address: 114 North Julia Street
 - Date of Approval: 6/26/12
 - Project: Install lattice screening.
- 24. Applicant: Anthony J. Spencer**
- Property Address: 311 Chatham Street
 - Date of Approval: 6/26/12
 - Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork. Repair and replace roofing shingles. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
- 25. Applicant: Melody Glenn**
- Property Address: 202 South Catherine Street
 - Date of Approval: 6/25/12
 - Project: Repair / replace front porch decking with 1 x 4 T & G floorboards as necessary.

- 26. Applicant: Lebaron Byrd w/o MOWA Choctaw Services**
- a. Property Address: 206 Tuttle Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/25/12
 - c. Project: Remove exterior siding as necessary to allow for dense pack insulation; reuse and place existing exterior siding to match existing siding; install to roofjacks as necessary to accommodate fans.
- 27. Applicant: Matt Lemond**
- a. Property Address: 211 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/27/12
 - c. Project: Install new signage within the existing sign frame. The metal signage will feature signage applied lettering.
- 28. Applicant: Alver Carlson**
- a. Property Address: 1653 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/27/12
 - c. Project: Paint the house. The body will be Hotel Street St. Francis, the trim and accents will be Flaming Torch, the shutters will brown, the columns and balustrade will be white. Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing with regard to material, profile, and dimension. Reroof to match the existing. Remove later fretwork added to the house in the 1980s.
- 29. Applicant: Fred Renfrey with the Downtown Alliance for Bill Monahan**
- a. Property Address: 254-256 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/27/12
 - c. Project: Repaint the building per the existing color scheme.
- 30. Applicant: Laura Jensen**
- a. Property Address: 1413 Monroe Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/28/12
 - c. Project: Repair fencing to match the existing.
- 31. Applicant: Leona Singleton**
- a. Property Address: 3 Straight Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/28/12
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with architectural shingles.
- 32. Applicant: Martha Webb**
- a. Property Address: 250 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/28/12
 - c. Project: Repair/replace balusters above porch as necessary and replace newel at front steps.
- 33. Applicant: Gulf Equipment**
- a. Property Address: 951 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/29/12
 - c. Project: Replace rooftop mechanical devices to match the existing.
- 34. Applicant: Southern Foundation Repairs**
- a. Property Address: 30 Houston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/29/12
 - c. Project: Repair, replace sills and joists.
- 35. Applicant: Mack Lewis**
- a. Property Address: 23 Hannon Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/29/12
 - c. Project: Repair, replace siding and trim boards to match. Repaint to match existing.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2012-44-CA: 212 South Cedar Street

- a. Applicant: Lea Verneuille for Elizabeth S. Sanders
- b. Project: New Construction – Construct a rear addition, add dormers, and construct an ancillary structure.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2012-45-CA: 1660 Laurel Street

- a. Applicant: Greg Miller for J.C. Miller
- b. Project: New Construction – Construct a rear addition.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2012-46-CA: 255 McDonald Avenue

- a. Applicant: Mike Stricklin
- b. Project: New Construction – Construct side and rear additions.

DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-44-CA: 212 South Cedar Street
Applicant: Lea Verneuille for Elizabeth Sanders
Received: 6/18/12
Meeting: 7/11/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a rear addition, add dormers, and construct an ancillary structure.

BUILDING HISTORY

This center hall, hipped-roof dwelling was constructed during the last quarter of the 19th Century. The residence originally stood on north side of Church Street between Marine and South Broad Streets. The house was moved to the current site in 1981.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The new owner/applicant proposes the construction of a rear addition, the addition of two dormers, and the construction of an ancillary structure.
- B. 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 the property. The new 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.”
 - 2. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
 - 3. “An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measure by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”

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

1. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The addition will necessitate the demolition of an earlier shed roof addition.
 - b. The addition will rest atop brick foundations piers matching those found under the body of the house.
 - c. As in the case of the body of the house, recessed and framed lattice screening will extend between the foundation piers.
 - d. Existing corner boards will remain in place.
 - e. The main house's west-facing (rear) gable will extended over the northern portion of the addition.
 - f. Lower gables will telescope from the extended rear gable and about the existing rear ell.
 - g. The addition's wooden siding will match that employed on the body of the house.
 - h. The four-over-four and six-over-six wooden windows will match those found on the body of the house. The window framing will also match the existing
 - i. A fascia board corresponding to that extending around the body of the house will extend around the northern, western (portions of), and southern sides of the addition.
 - j. The roofing shingles will match those sheathing the existing.
 - k. The enclosed portions of the North Elevation will two four-over-four wooden windows.
 - l. Two porch bays will comprise the open portions of the North Elevation.
 - m. The West Elevation will feature an irregularly-shaped porch. The porch will be surmounted by telescoping gables.
 - n. The porch's square section brackets posts will match those employed on the façade.
 - o. A picketed railing will extend between the porch piers.
 - p. Framed porch screening will be employed.
 - q. A flight of wooden steps with flanking picketed railings will allow access to and from the porch.
 - r. Two glazed wooden French doors and two six-over-six windows will punctuate the West Elevation.
 - s. An enclosed bay and porch bay will comprise the South Elevation.
2. Add two dormers.
 - a. The gabled dormers will be located on the North Elevation.
 - b. The walls of the dormers will be faced with wooden siding matching those employed on the body of the house.
 - c. The six-over-six wooden windows and their surrounding frames will match those employed on the body of the house.
 - d. The roofing shingles will match the existing.
3. Construct an ancillary structure.
 - a. The L-shaped carport-cum-storage shed will feature open and enclosed volumes.
 - b. The storage shed portion of building will feature wooden siding matching that employed on property's main dwelling.
 - c. The building will rest atop a slightly elevated concrete slab.
 - d. The carport portion of the building will be surmounted by south-facing pedimented roof.
 - e. Square section posts with scroll sawn brackets matching those found on the main house and addition will be employed on the carport portion of the addition.
 - f. The roofing shingles will match those employed on the main house.
 - g. Both east-facing and west-facing pediments will be punctuated by a sunburst motif.
 - h. The East Elevation of the building will be comprised of an enclosed portion featuring a six-over-six window and an open vehicular bay.
 - i. The open, two bay North Elevation will feature three square section posts. The enclosed portion of the North Elevation will feature a glazed and paneled wooden door.
 - j. Minus the fenestration, the West Elevation will be a mirror reversal of the East Elevation.

- k. The enclosed portion of the South Elevation will feature a glazed and paneled door. A bracketed hood will extend over the door. A single bay will comprise the open portion of the South Elevation.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a rear addition, the addition of two side dormers, and the construction of an ancillary structure.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that new additions should be differentiated from yet compatible to the historic fabric. The Standards go on to say that compatibility can be achieved through massing, size, scale, and architectural features.

Construction of the proposed rear addition would necessitate the demolition an earlier shed roof addition. Not original to the building, the shed addition was constructed after its relocation to the present location. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, the proposed addition is both differentiated from and complimentary to the historic building. Corner boards will remain in place; thereby allowing differentiation between the old and the new. Matching wall sheathings, window types, architectural detailing, and roof surfacing will provide aesthetic continuity.

The proposed dormers would be located off the North Elevation. Side dormers have been approved by the Board on numerous occasions when their addition will minimally impact the historic character of the building.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that ancillary construction should complement the design of a property's principle building. Located within the rear lot, the proposed carport/storage shed would be minimally visible from the public view and compliant with setback requirements. Featuring siding, posts, and roofing matching those found on the main house, the building would blend into the architectural landscape.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Elizabeth S. Sanders and Lea Verneuille were 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. He asked Ms. Sanders and Mr. Verneuille if they had any comments to make, clarifications to address, or comments to make with regard to the Staff Report. Ms. Sanders and Mr. Verneuille said that they had nothing to add.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask to either the applicant or her representative.

Mr. Karwinski said he had one overall comment to make. Addressing his fellow Board members, Staff, the applicant, and her representative, he stated new work should clearly be differentiated from older

fabric. He asked where was the differentiation between the old in the new. He noted the Staff Report which calls lists item after item “matching the existing.”

Mr. Verneuille responded to Mr. Karwinski query. He said that while there was no offset in plan, the corner board on the North Elevation would remain thereby differentiating the old and the new.

Mr. Karwinski addressed the dormers. He asked how would a passerby know that they were not original. Mr. Verneuille said that since they were not an original feature he was not taking design queue from any existing element. He acknowledged that yes the proposed siding and window types would match, but the dormers would be new features.

Mr. Karwinski said that the dormers could feature a different siding, window type, and roof structure. By altering one or more of these features/elements they would “read” as new work. He asked Ms. Sanders if she had considered this alternative. Ms. Sanders said she had not and told the Board that she would like to proceed with the application as proposed.

Mr. Holmes stated while Mr. Karwinski’s comments were germane, the Board has repeatedly instructed applicants to employ features and finishes matching the existing. He said that retention of corner posts had been requested and seen as means of differentiating the old and the new. Mr. Holmes told Mr. Karwinski and his fellow Board members that while they may disagree with the criteria the determining factor in the application is whether or not the proposed work impairs a building or the district. He added that in this instance previous Board rulings should be taken into account.

Mr. Ladd concurred with Mr. Holmes.

Mr. Verneuille spoke concerning the application. He told the Board that while corner boards were a subtle means of differentiation, they serve to denote transition.

In speaking with Mr. Verneuille and Ms. Sanders, Mr. Ladd pointed out that the house had been moved. Mr. Verneuille said yes the house had been moved to the site in 1981.

Mr. Ladd asked Ms. Sanders and Mr. Verneuille if they had final comments to make or questions to ask. They answered no. Addressing the audience, he asked if there was anyone to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment. No further discussion ensued from the Board

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/11/13

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-45-CA: 1660 Laurel Street
Applicant: Greg Miller for
Received: 6/25/12
Meeting: 7/11/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one story “Craftsman” bungalow was constructed in 1927. The house features a gable-roofed porch accessed by way of an intermediate terrace-like landing.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicant proposes the construction of a rear addition.
- 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 the property. The new 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.”
 - 2. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The addition will measure 22’ 11” in depth and 22’ 3” in width.
 - b. The addition will be located in plan with the house’s slightly recessed rear wing.
 - c. Existing corner boards will remain in place.
 - d. The addition will feature wooden siding matching that found on the house.
 - e. The addition will rest atop brick foundation piers like those supporting the body of the house.
 - f. Framed and recessed latticed foundation skirting will extend between the foundation piers.

- g. The addition's gable roofed will extend from and maintain the same pitch of the existing rear wing's roof.
- h. The eave treatment will match that found on the body of the house.
- i. The roofing shingles will match those found on the main house.
- j. The color scheme will match the existing.
- k. The addition will feature wooden windows (some salvaged from the existing rear elevation).
- l. The West Elevation will feature a single light transom window and three-over one window.
- m. The North Elevation will feature a paired three-over-one window unit and a four light window salvaged from the existing rear elevation.
- n. The East Elevation will feature two three-over-one windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a rear addition.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that new additions should be differentiated from yet compatible to the historic fabric. The Standards go on to say that compatibility can be achieved through massing, size, scale, and architectural features.

The proposed rear addition would extend from a recessed rear wing. Not visible from the public view, the addition's outline would replicate that of the existing rear wing. Existing corner boards would remain in place; thereby in accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards providing differentiation between the historic fabric and the new construction. The foundation treatment, siding material, window types, and roof sheathing will match those found on the body of the house. Original windows punctuating the rear wing will be salvaged and reused in the addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Greg Miller was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Miller if he had any comments to make or clarifications to address. Mr. Miller replied by saying that he was present on behalf of his son. He noted that the proposed addition would be small in size and barely visible from the public view.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant's representatives. Mr. Karwinski said he had several questions regarding the scope of work. Addressing Mr. Blackwell, he asked what fenestration would be employed on the West Elevation. Discussion ensued. Mr. Miller explained that a single door would be employed as illustrated in the elevation drawing, but a transom window would be used instead of a sash window. Mr. Holmes suggested that an elevation by elevation breakdown be done in an effort to better visualize the proposed fenestration. Mr. Blackwell and Mr. Miller explained the fenestration elevation by elevation.

It was determined that the windows would be salvaged and the casings would be replicated.

Mr. Karwinski recommended the salvage and reuse of the rear gable's louvered vent.

Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Miller if he had any further comments to make or questions to ask. Mr. Miller answered no.

Addressing the audience, Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak either for or against the application. No comments ensued from the audience. Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any final comments or remarks.

Mr. Kawinski stated that it would have been nice if the applicant had a professional design proper elevation drawings.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that West Elevation would feature a transom window and a single door, the North Elevation would feature salvaged three-over-one sash windows as well as the existing louvered vent, and that the window trim would match the existing.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Oswalt 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 unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/11/13

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-46-CA: 255 McDonald Avenue
Applicant: Mike Stricklin
Received: 6/22/12
Meeting: 7/11/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct side and rear additions.

BUILDING HISTORY

This “Stockbroker Tudor” style residence exemplifies the 1920s/early 1930s penchant for picturesque evocations of Medieval architecture. The half-timbered and stone-faced dwelling was constructed for Harry Toulmin. The rough cut granite blocks likely came from the 1839 Mobile County Jail.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The new owner/applicant proposes the construction of side and rear additions
- 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 the property. The new 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.”
 - 2. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Construct a side addition.
 - a. The side will be located off of the South Elevation.
 - b. The addition will measure 10’ 1 ½” in width and 9’ 2” with depth.
 - c. The addition will take the form of a hipped roof dormer.
 - d. The walls of the dormer will feature exposed timbering framing and stucco fill matching that of the body of the house.
 - e. The roofing shingles will match those employed on the house.

- f. The slope of the hipped roof will match that of the main roof's southern slope.
 - g. The West Elevation will feature a framed and filled treatment matching that of the body of the house.
 - h. The South Elevation will feature one six-over six window set within framing and filler matching that found on the body of the house.
 - i. The East Elevation will match the West Elevation.
4. Construct a rear addition.
- a. The rear addition will measure 19' in depth and 22' 5" in width.
 - b. The rear addition's first floor will be faced with stucco. The stucco will match that found on the body of the house.
 - c. The rear addition's second floor will feature wooden framing and stucco fill matching that of the body of main house.
 - d. The rear addition's ground floor level South and North Elevations (side elevations) will not feature fenestration.
 - e. The addition's East Elevation (rear elevation) ground floor will feature a pair of six-over-six wooden windows.
 - f. The upper story of the rear addition will maintain the roof pitch of the existing rear wing.
 - g. Roofing shingles will match those employed on body of the house.
 - h. The upper story of the rear addition's South Elevation will feature one six-over-six window.
 - i. The upper story of the rear addition's East Elevation will feature a large multi-light window and a louvered vent.
 - j. The upper story of the rear addition's North Elevation will feature one six-over-six window.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. Will windows be salvaged and reused on site?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of side and rear additions.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that new additions should be differentiated from yet compatible to the historic fabric. The Standards go on to say that compatibility can be achieved through massing, size, scale, and architectural features.

The proposed side addition would project from the South Elevation's hipped roof. Located above an enclosed porch and extending from a recessed dormer, the addition would not be visible from the public view. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the proposed new construction would employ the architectural details and the roof would adopt the scale of the body of the house. Matching treatments include the wall facing and window type. Side dormers and other larger scale constructions have been approved by the Board. The proposed work is based on and complements the design and scale of the main residence.

The proposed rear addition would not be visible from the public view. Extending from an ell located off the northeast corner of the house, the proposed rear addition would feature a first floor faced with a smooth coat of stucco and a second story featuring half-timbered construction. The undifferentiated stuccoed expanses of the ground floor would provide differentiation between the historic fabric and the new construction. The roof pitch would be maintained and continued. The existing south-facing recessed

dormer would be extended eastward. The outline of the existing rear wing would be maintained in the proposed extension.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Michael Stricklin was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Mr. Stricklin explained to the Board that he was out of the country when his designer submitted the application. Unbeknownst to him, the architect did not place all the windows proposed for the rear addition in the submitted elevation drawings and plans. He said that the granite sills and window sashes located in the affected areas would be salvaged and reused. Mr. Stricklin stated that he had spoken with Mr. Blackwell in regard to improving the design by way aforementioned considerations that were not reflected in the plans, as well as, the reuse of the historic rough cut granite.

Mr. Stricklin distributed a preliminary set of revised drawings to the Board that indicated revised locations of additional fenestration.

Mr. Ladd noted that the house's stonework resembled that found on 102 Levert Avenue, a house in the Ashland Place Historic District. Mr. Stricklin said that his and the Levert Avenue house were constructed out of stone salvaged from the 1839 Mobile Co. Jail Building.

Mr. Holmes asked Mr. Stricklin how much of the stone would be available for use. Mr. Stricklin provided the Board with estimated figures. He said that it could be used to strengthen the corners, on the foundations, and/or breaking the wall expanses. Mr. Stricklin said he was open to recommendation from the Board.

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

Mr. Karwinski said that he had a comment to make with regard to the second floor bath room addition. He said that as proposed it appeared that the wall of that dormer addition would be flush thereby breaking the curve of the roof. Mr. Karwinski said that the design would be improved if the dormer was placed further back from the edge of roof. He noted that it would allow the continuation of an uninterrupted roof curve.

Mr. Stricklin said that the ceiling height might be affected.

Mr. Ladd told Mr. Stricklin that Mr. Karwinski was making a suggestion.

Ms. Harden noted the flared eave is a defining feature.

Discussion ensued as to the placement of the dormer addition.

Mr. Holmes redirected the discussion to the rear addition. He said that he had concerns regarding the wide expanses of stucco and lack of break in plane between the existing and the proposed. He said that there was little continuity or connection between the old and new.

Mr. Karwinski reflected this application raised the same concern as the first application, the issue of differentiation.

Mr. Ladd and Mr. Holmes suggested the convention of a Design Review Committee. Mr. Holmes said that the fenestration, stonework, and other facings could then be worked out more successfully.

Mr. Stricklin stated that when designing the rear addition the matching treatment of the second floor was seen as providing continuity while the stuccoed treatment of the lower floor was viewed as allowing for differentiation.

Mr. Ladd explained to Mr. Stricklin that by agreeing to partake in a Design Review Committee the application would be improved and the project would move forward.

Mr. Stricklin asked if work could begin on the project before the finer details were fully decided upon.

Mr. Karwinski said that such a step would be inadvisable. He stated that one of the main problems of the proposal was the design. He said that the overall design was not good and that a not well considered plan affected the elevations. Mr. Karwinski suggested to Mr. Stricklin that he rethink the plan.

A discussion of the plan ensued.

Mr. Stricklin explained to the Board that in developing the plan, he and his wife had taken into consideration the square footage and usage they needed as well as the location and impact they would have on their historic home.

He mentioned a similarly planned addition that he had constructed on Church Street.

Mr. Karwinski mentioned another issue, one not noted in the scope of work. He asked for clarification regarding the North Elevation's easternmost door, door canopy, and window. Mr. Stricklin said that the door and canopy would be removed, but the window would remain.

Mr. Ladd reiterated the usefulness of a Design Review Committee.

Mr. Ladd, Mr. Oswalt, and Mr. Karwinski volunteered to serve on the Design Review Committee.

The Board denied the application for lack of information and moved to convene a Design Review Committee.