

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
July 15, 2015 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Bradford, called the meeting to order at 3:05 P.M. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Bob Allen, Robert Brown, Kim Harden, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, II, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, and Jim Wagoner
Members Absent: Carolyn Hasser and Nick Holmes, III,
Staff Members Present: Cartledge W. Blackwell and Melissa Mutert.
2. Mr. Wagoner moved to approve the minutes for the July 1, 2015 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. Upon clarification of midmonth #12, Mr. Wagoner 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: Alec Glenn**
 - a. Property Address: 20 South Catherine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/12/15
 - c. Project: Retouch paint per the existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant: Rick Bonner**
 - a. Property Address: 54 South Julia Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/22/15
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork (when and where necessary) to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme. Reroof the house with shingles matching the existing. The aforementioned scope of work applies to the house and the garage.
3. **Applicant: Brad Debien**
 - a. Property Address: 103 Michael Donald Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/17/15
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with 30 year architectural shingle, charcoal gray.
4. **Applicant: Teague Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 108 South Conception Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/11/15
 - c. Project: Reroof the building with asphalt shingles.
5. **Applicant: Anna Kirby**
 - a. Property Address: 121 North Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/10/15
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with charcoal gray shingles
6. **Applicant: Thomas E. Harrison**
 - a. Property Address: 166 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/16/15
 - c. Project: Install a hanging blade sign. The double-faced metal sign will have sign faces measuring 30" x 36". The sign will feature the names and occupations of the tenants.
7. **Applicant: Melanie Bunting**
 - a. Property Address: 204 Tuttle Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/22/15

- c. Project: Remove cracked concrete paving. Install a new crushed gravel drive. Repair and repave a curbcut in coordination with Right of Way.
- 8. Applicant: Antonio Petite**
- a. Property Address: 358 Marine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/18/15
 - c. Project: Install a French door instead of solid door on a new newly constructed rear addition. Construct a wooden deck of said (approved) addition.
- 9. Applicant: Hon. Holmes Whiddon**
- a. Property Address: 357 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/12/15
 - c. Project: Clean and repaint the house (white per existing). Repaint lattice on carriage house Bellingrath Green.
- 10. Applicant: Violetta Simpson**
- a. Property Address: 1006 Elmira Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/10/15
 - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted Glidden color scheme: body, Soft Suede and trim, Natural Linen. Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile dimension and material. Install a three foot tall picket fence. Construct a rear deck. The deck's railing will be a simple picket. Resurface an existing driveway.
- 11. Applicant: Chris Wood**
- a. Property Address: 14 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/11/15
 - c. Project: Board windows and doors. Paint boards.
- 12. Applicant: Charlie Kelly**
- a. Property Address: 1562 Blair Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/12/15
 - c. Project: Install an eight foot tall interior lot privacy fencing.
- 13. Applicant: Big Moore**
- a. Property Address: 1605 Monterey Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/15/15
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with 30 year architectural shingle, weathered wood color.
- 14. Applicant: Signarama for Jim Jeffries**
- a. Property Address: 1706 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/16/15
 - c. Project: Relocate an existing monument sign (sign board made of wood).
- 15. Applicant: Philippe Lacoste**
- a. Property Address: 407 Dunham Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/22/15
 - c. Project: Reroof the building with 30 year architectural shingle, charcoal gray color. Replace rotten wood as needed to match.
- 16. Applicant: Philippe Lacoste**
- a. Property Address: 1209 Elmira Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/22/15
 - c. Project: Reroof with 30 year architectural shingle, charcoal gray color. Reroof porch. Replace rotten siding as necessary to match, repaint to match existing. Add metal gutters.
- 17. Applicant: John Watkins, Sr. for John Watkins, Jr.**
- a. Property Address: 1655 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/24/15

- c. Project: Reroof to match the existing. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated siding to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

18. Applicant: Allison Henry

- a. Property Address: 260 Dexter Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 6/26/15
- c. Project: Replace rotten siding and repaint to match.

19. Applicant: Adam Kingly

- a. Property Address: 1057 Texas Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/24/15
- c. Project: Build handrail out back.

20. Applicant: Steve Stone

- a. Property Address: 455 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/25/15
- c. Project: Paint the building per the following Sherwin Williams color scheme: Pearly White 7009 (body) and Thunder Clap 1492 (trim).

21. Applicant: South Alabama Property Services

- a. Property Address: 55 North Julia Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/30/15
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork (when and where necessary) to match the existing. Repaint the house per the existing color. Replace broken window panes to match.

22. Applicant: Home Depot

- a. Property Address: 1051 Old Shell Road
- b. Date of Approval: 7/1/15
- c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.

23. Applicant: Adam Kingry

- a. Property Address: 1057 Texas Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/1/15
- c. Project: Build a handicap ramp off rear deck and wrap west side of house.

24. Applicant: Bo Stacy

- a. Property Address: 56 South Catherine Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/2/15
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2012-4-CA: 104 South Georgia Avenue

- a. Applicant: Pete Vallas with Pete Vallas Architect for Joel Bullard, III
- b. Project: Addition and Ancillary Construction – Construct a rear porch addition and a carport.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2015-26-CA: 957 Selma Street

- a. Applicant: Mary Beth Harris with Restore Mobile
- b. Project: Partial Demolition – Demolish a fire-damaged later rear wing.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2015-27-CA: 23 South Reed Avenue

- a. Applicant: Kay Edmonson
- b. Project: Demolition and New Construction – Demolish a fire-damaged single-Family residence and construct a new residence atop the site.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-26-CA: 104 South Georgia Avenue
Applicant: Pete Vallas with Pete Vallas Architect for Mr. & Mrs. Joel Bullard, III
Received: 6/15/15
Meeting: 7/15/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Addition and Ancillary Related – Construct a rear porch addition and carport.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Aesthetics Movement inspired Queen Anne residence dates from 1903. The spacious dwelling features classical detailing and a prominent wrap-around gallery.

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 September 4, 2013. At that time, the Board denied an application calling for a change in the height of rear lot privacy fencing. The proposal up for consideration calls for the construction of a rear porch addition and an ancillary building.
- 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 characterized the property. 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.”
 - 2. “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 measured 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, elevations, etc...):

1. Remove later infill from the rear porch's lower-story. Said infill is located within the rear porch's terminal west-facing bay.
2. Install wood framed French doors within the aforementioned terminal bay.
3. Construct a rear porch addition.
 - a. The porch (including a stoop-like deck off of its northern face) will measure 30' in length and 15' 3" in depth (The deck will measure 7' 3" in length of the thereof.).
 - b. The porch will rest atop brick veneered foundation piers matching those supporting principle dwelling.
 - c. Boxed and recessed (wooden) lattice panels will extend between the foundation piers. Said panels will match those found between foundation piers supporting the body of the house.
 - d. A continuous wooden skirt board with molding will extend around the porch. Said skirting and detailing will match that employed on the body of the house.
 - e. Wooden tongue-groove decking will be employed on the porch floor
 - f. The porch will feature wooden posts with stepped and chamfered shafts. Said porch posts will match those found on the main house.
 - g. Wooden framing will extend between the porch supports and walls. Said framing will secure porch screening.
 - h. The porch will feature a blind frieze, cornice, and boxed rafter/fascia treatment that will match that found on the body of the house.
 - i. Standing seam metal roofing panels will sheath the porch's hipped roof.
 - j. The porch addition's South Elevation will feature four framed screens set within the single porch bay.
 - k. The enclosed portion of the addition's three bay West Elevation will be defined by four porch posts with intervening porch screening.
 - l. A flight of wooden steps with railings matching those found on the main house's porches will comprise the northernmost open bay of the addition.
 - m. The addition's three bay North Elevation will be centered on a brick chimney stack. Screened bays will be located to either side of the shaft. One of the bays will be a door bay. The open deck-like stoop with its railing matching that on the main house's railings will front the enclosed portions of the addition.
4. Construct a carport.
 - a. The carport will measure 22' in width and 30' in depth.
 - b. The foundation will be laid and surfaced in concrete.
 - c. The carport will be open and enclosed in nature/construction.
 - d. The carport will feature stepped and chamfered (wooden) posts matching those found on the main dwelling's and the addition's galleries.
 - e. The enclosed portion of the carport will be faced with board-and-batten siding.
 - f. The eave/fascia treatment will match that found on the principle dwelling.
 - g. The carport's hipped roof will be surmounted by standing seam metal roofing panels.
 - h. The East Elevation will feature posts fronting two parking bays located in advance of two door bays. Said door bays will access the enclosed portion of the carport.
 - i. The South Elevation will be comprised of two open bays and a single enclosed bay.
 - j. The board-and-batten faced West (rear) Elevation will not feature fenestration.
 - k. The North South Elevation will be comprised of two open bays and a single enclosed bay.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the construction of a rear addition and an ancillary building. The rear addition takes the form of screened porch with a stoop-like deck. The ancillary building, a carport, would afford covered vehicular parking and enclosed storage space.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that 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 (See B-1.). Located off of the rear elevation and behind advancing side bays, the proposed porch would be minimally visible from the public view. The impact to historic fabric is minimized on account of the location and height of said addition. The single-story massing would serve to differentiate the addition from the body of the two-story residence, while elements and constructions matching the existing would afford continuity between the new work and historic fabric.

Located at the end of an existing vehicular drive and set well into the deep lot, the proposed carport would likewise be minimally visible from the public view. The Design Review Guidelines state that ancillary construction should complement the design and scale of the main building (See B-2.). The proposed carport adopts the materials and detailing of the main residence. The wooden structure would feature columnar posts matching those employed on the main building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application would impair the architectural or the historical character of the house/property or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Pete Vallas of Pete Vallas Architect 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. Vallas if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Vallas responded by saying no. He allowed that any Board members had any questions he would be happy to answer them.

Mr. Ladd complimented the proposal.

Mr. Vallas explained that roof pitches of both the addition and carport would match those found on the main house's front gallery.

Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Vallas for clarification as per the location of the outdoor fireplace. He complimented the design, but mentioned to the applicant's representative that discussion of previous applications for similar constructions had involved discussion of the height of the chimney stack in relation to building code. Discussion ensued as to municipal code and chimney performance.

Mr. Blackwell volunteered to assist as per the code related concerns.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no comment, he 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 the coordination of staff with the applicant and code officials.

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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/15/16

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2015-27-CA: 957 Selma Street
Applicant: Mary Beth Harris with Restore Mobile
Received: 6/12/15
Meeting: 7/15/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Partial Demolition – Demolish a fire-damaged later rear wing.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to materials located within MHDC property files, this shotgun with recessed side wing, a vernacular pairing largely restricted to Mobile, dates circa 1904. The house was the onetime home of the sister of famous ballplayer Satchel Paige. A rear addition was added in the 1970s.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on November 5, 2014. At that time, the Board denied a request to demolish of the fire damaged residence. The application up for review calls for the demolition of the house’s later rear wing. The demolition of the aforementioned rear addition would represent phase one in a multi-phased restoration.
- 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 features a single-family residence dating circa 1904. The house is listed as contributing dwelling within the Oakleigh Garden National Register Historic District. A fine example of the shotgun with recessed side wing typology, the main dwelling is one a pair of surviving butterfly-like pairings of a largely Mobile defined housing option. Only the later rear wing, a post WW II addition not possessing the architectural or historical character

- of the principle dwelling, is proposed for demolition. The main house would be restored.
- ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 1. The original portion of this inner lot property's residential structure contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and historical character of the streetscape and surrounding district. On account of the narrowness of the lot, the location of the recessed side wing, and the proximity to the dwellings situated upon adjacent lots, the rear addition only marginally impacts the public view.
 - 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.
 - 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. Despite the unfortunate demolition of scores of this house type, significant numbers survive in the Church Street East, Oakleigh Garden, Old Dauphin Way, and Oakdale National Historic Districts. The subject example is one of three extant butterfly-like pairings of the genre. The historic core would be restored. Later rear additions such as that proposed for demolition are encountered throughout and beyond the surrounding historic district.
 - 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. Only the later rear addition is proposed for demolition. The main body of the dwelling will be restored.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. Restore Mobile acquired the property in June of the calendar year for a purchase price of \$1.00.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. After assessing the fire damage impacting the whole of the dwelling, taking into account the plan of the original portions of the house, and considering the resale of the property, Restore Mobile decided to propose the demolition of the later rear portion of the dwelling.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. The property has been purchased with the intention of restoring the historic portions of the principle residence.
 - 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. N.A.
 - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 1. Plans for the restoration of the principle dwelling are being executed.
 - 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. N.A.

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.”
*This project is a partial demolition. The historic portions of the building will be retained and restored.

C. Scope of Work (per submitted application and photographs):

1. Demolish a later rear addition as the first phase in the restoration of a fire-damaged contributing residence.
2. Frame the South (rear) Elevation’s wall.
3. The location and height of the wall will conform to original.
4. Mothball and secure the exposed Rear (South) Elevation with plyboard.
5. Repair and reconstruct the roof structure to match the original in terms of location and pitch.
6. Reroof the building with asphalt shingles.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a later rear addition off of a fire-damaged residence. The historic portions of the contributing building will remain in place and will be restored. A first phase of multiphase intervention intended to save the building, this application will entail demolition and mothballing measures. 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 streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

The portion of the house proposed for demolition constitutes a later rear addition to a contributing residential structure located with the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The later rear addition does not possess the architectural and historical significance as the main dwelling.

Both historic and later portions of the house were impacted by several disastrous fires. The worst damage occurred at the juncture of original and later fabric. Far more than cosmetic, the damage impacted the whole structure of the building. The later addition also suffers from deferred maintenance, exposure to the elements, and damage by vagrants.

On account of the location of the addition, the frontages of lots occupying the subject block, and the proximity of adjacent dwellings, the addition is minimally visible from the public view.

If granted demolition approval, the applicant would remove the addition, frame a rear wall (and roof structure), and secure the dwelling. Plans are being developed for full exterior restoration of the dwelling.

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 first phase of multiphase restoration campaign.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mary Beth Harris with Restore Mobile was present to discuss the application.

Mr. Harris answered no allowing that Mr. Blackwell had covered the application in full.

Mr. Ladd complimented Ms. Harris and Restore Mobile.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no comment, he closed the period of public comment.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed Restore Mobile's representative. He asked Ms. Harris if she had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Wagoner 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.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no comment, he closed the period of public comment.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Wagoner 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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/15/16

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2015-28-CA: 23 South Reed Avenue
Applicant: Vera Edmonson
Received: 6/22/15
Meeting: 7/15/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition and New Construction – Demolish a fire-damaged contributing residence and construct a new single family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to materials located within the MHDC’s property files, this contributing residence dates from 1903. The dwelling is a fine example of Mobile’s single-story side hall with typology. Additionally, the house is one of the oldest houses on South Reed Avenue. The building featured simple classical detailing and gracious proportions.

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 house was damaged by a recent fire. The two part application up for review calls for the demolition of fire-residence and the construction of new dwelling atop the site.
- B-1. 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:
 - 2. *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:
 - v. The historic or architectural significance of the structure:
 - 1. This property features a single-family residence dating circa 1903. The house is listed as contributing dwelling within the Old Dauphin Way National Register Historic District. Representative of Mobile’s distinctive single-story side hall with wing typology, the dwelling is expressive of a unique housing solution largely restricted to Mobile. First appearing in the 1850s, these one-

- story and predominantly frame versions of the masonry townhouses that once lined downtown thoroughfares, were constructed in large numbers in Mobile's Postbellum southern and western suburbs.
- vi. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 1. When intact, the house contributed to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and historical integrity of South Reed Avenue, as well as the surrounding Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
 - vii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 1. The majority building materials are capable of being reproduced.
 - viii. 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. Despite the unfortunate demolition of scores of this house type, significant numbers survive in the Oakleigh Garden, Old Dauphin Way, and Oakdale Historic Districts. Down By the Bay possesses some nice examples as well. Prior to the fire, the intact house was one of westernmost examples of the typology.
 - vi. 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 owner/applicant would demolish the house and construct a new single-family residence upon the site. The proposed new residential construction is informed by both the single-story side hall with wing typology and the architecture of the streetscape.
 - vii. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The owner/applicant acquired the property in June of 2006 for a purchase price of \$120,000.
 - viii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. The owner/applicant initially intended to restore the house. After assessing the fire damage, meeting contractors, and realizing the financial commitment involved, the owner/applicant made the decision to demolish the house and design a new house based on old, but one more informed by the prevailing architectural currents animating the streetscape.
 - ix. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. The property has not been listed for sale. The owner/applicant desires to remain on her property and within her neighborhood.
 - x. 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. N.A.
 - xi. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 1. See submitted materials.

xiii. 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.

2. Commitment given by financial and insurance companies.

xiv. 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.”

B-2. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:

1. “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples. The choice of materials and ornamentation for new construction is a good way for a new building to exert its own identity. By using historic examples as a point of departure, it is possible for new construction to use new materials and ornamentation and still fit into the historic district.”
2. “Historic buildings feature the use of a variety of materials for roofs, foundations, wall cladding and architectural details. In new buildings, exterior materials – both traditional and modern - should closely resemble surrounding historic examples. Buildings in Mobile’s historic districts vary in age and architectural styles, dictating the materials to be used for new construction. Traditional building materials which are not present on nearby historic buildings or buildings in the area that contains only Victorian-era frame houses, a brick ranch-style house would be conspicuous and disrupt the area’s visual continuity. Modern materials which have the same textural qualities and character as materials of nearby historic buildings may be acceptable.”
3. “PLACEMENT: Placement has two components: setback, the distance between the street and a building; and spacing, the distance between its property lines and adjacent structures. New construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings. New buildings should not be placed too far forward or behind the traditional “facade line”, a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the facade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape. Current setback requirements of the City of Mobile Zoning Ordinance may not allow the building to be placed as close to the street as the majority of existing buildings. If the traditional facade line or “average” setback is considerably less than allowed under the Zoning Ordinance, the Review Boards will support an application for a Variance from the Board of Adjustment to allow for new construction closer to the street and more in character with the surrounding historic buildings.”
4. “MASS: Building mass is established by the arrangement and proportion of its basic geometric components - the main building, wings and porches, the roof and the foundation. Similarity of massing helps create a rhythm along a street, which is one of the appealing aspects of historic districts. Therefore, new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.”
5. “FOUNDATIONS: The foundation, the platform upon which a building rests, is a massing component of a building. Since diminished foundation proportions have a negative effect on massing and visual character, new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings. In most historic residential areas, buildings are usually elevated above a crawl space on a pier foundation. 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. For this reason, slab-on-grade foundations are not allowed for single family residences. For multi-family, where slab-on-grade is most practical, other design elements such as water tables and exaggerated bases can be effective in creating the visual appearance of a raised foundation.”

6. “MAIN BODY AND WINGS: Although roofs and foundations reinforce massing, the main body and wings are the most significant components. A building’s form or shape can be simple (a box) or complex (a combination of many boxes or projections and indentations). The main body of a building may be one or two stories. 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.”
7. “ROOFS: A building’s roof contributes significantly to its massing and to the character of the surrounding area. New construction may consider, where appropriate, roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings. Additionally roof designs of new residential buildings may incorporate eave overhang and trim details such as exposed rafters, soffits, cornice, fascia, frieze board, molding, etc. as those of nearby buildings.”
8. “SCALE: The size of a building is determined by its dimensions - height, width, and depth - which also dictate the building’s square footage. SCALE refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings - large, medium, and small. Buildings which are similar in massing may be very different in scale. To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.”
9. “FAÇADE ELEMENTS: Facade elements such as porches, entrances, and windows make up the “face” or facade of a building. New construction should reflect the use of facade elements of nearby historic buildings.”
10. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. In order to coexist in harmony with adjacent structures in the historic districts, porches are strongly encouraged. Porches often create a visual cadence along the street. Designs for new porches should also reference historic porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, rails and ornamentation. Porches of new buildings should also be similar in height and width to porches of nearby historic buildings. Proper care should be taken in the detailing of new porches. Scale, proportion and character of elements such as porch columns, corner brackets, railings, pickets, etc. should be compatible with adjacent historic structures. Wood or a suitable substitute material should be used. In addition, 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.”
11. “Some architectural styles, such as those dating from the Victorian period, featured decorative elements in gables like barge boards and louvered vents. Later styles such as bungalows used decorative cornice brackets or show rafters as design elements. Depending on the character and style of new construction and its relation to surrounding historic structures, similar gable elements should be used.”
12. “The number and proportion of openings - windows and entrances - within the facade of a building creates a solid-to-void ratio (wall-to-opening). New buildings should use windows and entrances that approximate the placement and solid-to-void ratio of nearby historic buildings. In addition, designs for new construction should incorporate the traditional use of window casements and door surrounds. Where a side elevation is clearly visible from the street, proportion and placement of their elements will have an impact upon the visual character of the neighborhood and must be addressed in the design.”

13. “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 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 examples in the district.”
14. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows, and their location and configuration (rhythm) help establish the character of a building and compatibility with adjacent structures. Traditionally designed window openings generally are recessed on masonry buildings and have a raised surround on frame buildings.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Demolish a fire-damaged residence
2. Construct a new residence.
 - a. The house will adopt the front and side setbacks established by the original residence.
 - b. The T-shaped dwelling will rest atop brick-veneered foundation piers.
 - c. Boxed lattice foundation panels (wooden) will extend between the foundation piers.
 - d. A continuous skirt board will extend around the dwelling
 - e. The exterior walls will be sheathed with hardiboard siding.
 - f. The house will feature three-over-one wooden or aluminum clad wooden windows.
 - g. An entablature will extend around the dwelling.
 - h. The gabled roofs will feature corner returns.
 - i. Asphalt roofing shingles will sheath the gable roofs.
 - j. West Elevation (Façade)
 1. The two part façade will be comprised of an advanced main block and a recessed wing.
 2. Four fenestrated bays will define the façade.
 3. A prostyle gabled porch will front the main block.
 4. A louvered lunette will punctuate the aforementioned gable.
 5. A main gable set parallel with South Reed Avenue will surmount recessed wing and the rear portion of the house.
 6. Four square section wooden porch posts with bases, necking, and capitals will define the three bay gabled porch.
 7. A simple picketed railing of the MHDC stock design will extend between the porch posts, as well as the posts and pilaster-like wall corner posts.
 8. A flight of wooden steps will access the porch.
 9. Railings matching the front porch railings will be located atop the steps.
 10. The steps will terminate in square section capped newel posts.
 11. A glazed (nine-light) window and two three-over-one windows will open onto the porch.
 12. A single three-over-one window will distinguish the recessed wing.

- k. South Elevation (a side)
 - 1. Two roof forms will define the five bay (fenestrated units) South Elevation.
 - 2. The main block with the gable set perpendicular to the street will feature three three-over-one windows.
 - 3. The rear portion with a gable set parallel to the street will feature two three-over-one windows.
 - 4. A louvered lunette will punctuate the aforementioned gable.
- l. East Elevation (the rear)
 - 1. Two pairs of multi-light French doors (either wood or aluminum clad wood) will open onto a rear deck.
 - 2. The aforementioned deck will rest atop brick foundation piers matching those of the house.
 - 3. A simple picketed railing of the MHDC stock design will enclose the deck. Intermediate newels will be employed.
 - 4. A flight of wooden steps featuring the same railing as the deck (with matching newels as well) will be employed.
 - 5. A shed roofed dormer featuring two pairs of three-over-one windows will punctuate the gable roof.
- m. North Elevation (a side)
 - 5. Two roof forms will define the six bay (fenestrated) South Elevation.
 - 6. The main block with the gable set perpendicular to the street will feature four three-over-one windows and a brick chimney stack.
 - 7. The rear portion with a gable set parallel to the street will feature two three-over-one windows.
 - 8. A louvered lunette will punctuate the aforementioned gable.
- n. Install paving.
 - 1. Install a concrete walkway accessing the front porch.
 - 2. Make repairs to a concrete driveway.
- o. Install fencing.
 - 1. Construct a small section of 6' tall brick wall between the North Elevation (from rear portion thereof) to the North lot line.
 - 2. Install interior lot wooden privacy fencing in the rear of the lot.
 - i. The fencing will be six feet in height.
 - ii. The palings will be either flat top or dog eared in design.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This two part application involves the demolition of a fire-devastated main residence and the construction of a new residence.

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 streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

The building currently occupying the lot is listed as contributing residence in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. Prior to the fire, the dwelling was a representative example of a fully developed single-story Mobile side hall with wing dwelling. The house is one of the oldest dwellings on Reed Avenue.

The house was devastated by the fire. The location of the blaze (the front and most significant portion of the dwelling being impacted) and the extent of the damage (both structural and cosmetic), reduced a well maintained home to a burned out shell. While the rear portion of the house could be partially salvaged, that area does not possess either the architectural or the historical significance of the main portion in terms of construction, period, and finish.

Though the demolition of the fire-gutted dwelling will create a void within the block, impact the built density, and disrupt the streetscape, the situation would be temporary for the applicant proposes the construction of a new residence on the lot. The proposed dwelling is based upon the style and type of the original building.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobiles' Historic Districts state that the goal of new residential construction is to blend within the historic fabric without creating a false sense of historical integrity (See B-1.). The proposed dwelling constitutes an architectural shell informed by a locally specific historical typology, albeit one taking advantage of modern advances in materials and nuanced by architectural currents of the streetscape.

The proposed dwelling would adopt the same front setback as the original dwelling. The traditional "façade line" will be retained. Built density and rhythmic spacing along the streetscape would be recaptured (See B-3). Side setbacks are conditioned by the original and appropriate to the area.

In keeping with the original dwelling and the rest of the streetscape, the proposed house would be faced with siding (See B-2.). Hardiplank, an acceptable facing for additions and new construction, would be the subject material. Hardi materials have benefitted from improved manufacture in recent years. Milling, finishing, and molding can be tailored to the job at hand.

As with the original dwelling, the house would rest atop a raised pier foundation (See B-5.). Adoption of a raised elevation will serve to cultivate the massing of the dwelling. With its 11' ceilings and pitched roof, both the massing and the scale of the building would be reflective of the historical context of the surrounding streetscape and district (See B-4).

The façade would perpetuate the form and elements of the original (See B-9). The prominent gallery and recessed wing will define the dwelling. Porches typify the streetscape (See B-10.). The porch depth is both traditional and usable. Sash windows are proposed. Said window construction typifies the streetscape (See B-14.). Though the three-over-one light configuration differs from those found on original dwelling, said pattern observes an Arts and Crafts aesthetic that informs a number of dwellings on nearby lots. Building type to lot and elements to context are then combined to suit the site. The fenestration is spaced in a traditional manner that is reflective of and conditioned by the architectural proportions and structural systems of the building (See B-12.). The level of ornamentation is in keeping with the streetscape and design (See B-13.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

With regard to the demolition of the contributing residence, Staff recommends approval of that first portion of the application. While the demolition of the contributing building will impair the property and the surrounding district, the fire damage was to such an extent that the dwelling cannot be restored.

Based on B (1-14), Staff does not believe the proposed new residence would impair the architectural or the historical character of the historic district and streetscape. Staff recommends approval of the second portion of the application, the construction of a proposed residence.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Kay Edmonson was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Ms. Edmonson if she had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Ms. Edmonson answered no. She stated that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Ladd thanked Ms. Edmonson for her application.

She explained that the house burned in January of the calendar year and that she was ready to move forward with the project.

Mr. Roberts instigated a discussion regarding the chimney and the renderings.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no comment, he 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 fact

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, that while the demolition of the contributing residence does impair the architectural and historical character of the property and the district, a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued on account of the extent of the fire damage to the house.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/15/16