

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTS
July 17, 2013 – 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: Robert Allen, David Barr, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, and Jim Wagoner.
Members Absent: Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes III, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and John Lawler.
2. After noting a clarification regarding the dimensions on one a previous scope of work, Mr. Oswalt moved to approve the minutes of the June 19, 2013 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. After some discussion regarding mid month approvals #10 and #19 , Mr. Karwinski 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: Jason Comer**
 - a. Property Address: 10 North Reed
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/17/13
 - c. Project: Reroof with Atlas Pinnacle, 30 year shingle; Oyster (dark gray) in color; replace decking as needed; and vents as needed.
2. **Applicant: Damon Lett**
 - a. Property Address: 52 LeMoyne Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/17/13
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.
3. **Applicant: Prichett /Pack Construction for Thomas Rue**
 - a. Property Address: 124 Ryan Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/17/13
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated siding to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
4. **Applicant: Gary Lee**
 - a. Property Address: 202 Michigan Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/13/13
 - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted BLP color scheme. The body will Joachim Street Biege and the trim will be Spring Hill Brown. The decks will be Savannah Street Dark Brown.
5. **Applicant: Garden Design Solutions**
 - a. Property Address: 251 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/12/13
 - c. Project: Construct an 8' fence enclosing the rear lot (house is adjacent to multi-family housing). Brick piers will by rhythmically spaced between the expanses of fencing. Install brick and stone walks and patio in the backyard. Construct 6' x 9' garden shed in the backyard. The wooden building will be surmounted by gable-roof a will feature a bracketed overhang above the wooden glazed and paneled door. The building will feature a four light wooden window.
6. **Applicant: Timothy Hight**

- a. Property Address: 266 Stocking Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/12/13
 - c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.
- 7. Applicant: Margaret Rushing**
- a. Property Address: 1106 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/12/13
 - c. Project: Repair and where necessary replace porch decking to match the existing in type and material. The porch deck will be grey in color. Touch up paint on the house per the existing color scheme.
- 8. Applicant: Edward Adams of Adams Painting for Rebecca Taylor**
- a. Property Address: 1216 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/17/13
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
- 9. Applicant: Fred South**
- a. Property Address: 1518 Eslava Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/17/13
 - c. Project: Reroof with 30 year architectural shingle, repair/replace rotten wood and decking.
- 10. Applicant: Don Bowden with Bowden Architecture for Evan Maisel**
- a. Property Address: 1565 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/17/13
 - c. Project: Reinstall a door on the façade's secondary porch. Re-expose the rear elevation's lower gallery. Reinstall wooden columns matching the existing and install wooden railings matching existing. Install framed porch screening in the porch bays. Reconstruct a deteriorated outdoor staircase to match the existing in all respects. Remove concrete steps accessing the rear of the house. Install wooden steps with wooden railings matching the original railings on the house. Repaint the house per the house per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme: the body will be Rare Gray; the trim will be Nacre; the porch deck will be Thunderous; and porch ceilings will be Glimmer. Install interior lot wooden fencing (6' high privacy fencing along the West lot line) and an eight foot fence along the South lot line (rear lot line). Neither fence will be visible from the public view.
- 11. Applicant: Tom Karwinski**
- a. Property Address: 17 South Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/17/13
 - c. Project: Reroof with 30 year architectural shingle, repair, replace decking as necessary, minor chimney work.
- 12. Applicant: Buford Seawell**
- a. Property Address: 23 Hannon Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/17/13
 - c. Project: Repaint house in existing colors.
- 13. Applicant: Mike Chadwell**
- a. Property Address: 28 South Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/17/13
 - c. Project: Close-in 10x20 feet of existing deck with shed roof, shingles to match main roof, matching exposed rafters with beadboard soffit, redeck, screen, use existing handrails.
- 14. Applicant: Forrest Railey**
- a. Property Address: 1556 Blair Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/17/13

- c. Project: Retouch paint to match existing.

15. Applicant: Kiel Home Repairs

- a. Property Address: 1710-1716 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/17/13
- c. Project: Repair wood canopy matching existing in profile, dimension and materials. Paint white.

16. Applicant: Tuan Titlestad with Bay Town Builders

- a. Property Address: 63 Fearnway
- b. Date of Approval: 6/18/13
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.

17. Applicant: Hubert Parrish

- a. Property Address: 120 Garnett Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 6/18/13
- c. Project: Install a handicap ramp per the submitted photos and specifications. Ramp to be made of pressure treated wood.

18. Applicant: Joe Bradley

- a. Property Address: 359 Saint Francis Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/20/13
- c. Project: Repaint an existing bracket sign. The new sign face will feature the name of the occupying tenant.

19. Applicant: Brad Robertson

- a. Property Address: 312 Marine Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/20/13
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Replace the deteriorated glazed double doors to match. Repair and replace windows to match the existing in material and light configuration. Paint the building off white. Reroof the building with asphalt shingles. Remove the existing signage. Reopen a closed doorway. Reinstall a double door matching the aforementioned double door. Remove chain link fencing. Shadowbox the fencing extending along the northern lot line. Extend the aforementioned fencing along a section of the western lot line. Install wooden picket fencing matching that enclosing the adjacent property to the north to the north of the building.

20. Applicant: Devereaux Bemis

- a. Property Address: 167 State Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/21/13
- c. Project: Power wash the house to gently remove paint. Install a downspout on the front of the house. Said downspout will either be bronze or brown in color. Paint the fence to match the existing. Polyurethane the doors. Reputty windows and paint glazing as needed. Touch up trim paint as needed.

21. Applicant: David Sanders

- a. Property Address: 202 George Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/21/13
- c. Project: Repaint the house. The body of the house will be Platinum Gray in color.

22. Applicant: Philippe Lacoste

- a. Property Address: 1209 Elmira Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/21/13
- c. Project: Install a six foot tall interior lot privacy fence. The fence of this inner lot property will not extend beyond the front plane of the house. Install boxed and recessed lattice foundation screening between the house's foundation piers. Reinstall operable wooden louvered shutters.

- 23. Applicant: Christ Church Cathedral**
- a. Property Address: 109-111 South Conception Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/24/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated decking to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint of said decking per the existing color scheme. Repair deteriorated masonry to match the existing.
- 24. Applicant: Melissa Mutert**
- a. Property Address: 254 Dexter Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/20/13
 - c. Project: Underpin house with frame lattice.
- 25. Applicant: Capital Signs and Awning**
- a. Property Address: 750 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/25/13
 - c. Project: Replace a monument sign, a wall sign, and vehicular signage. The monument sign will be located within the existing sign armature. The sign will feature the name of the establishment and will be made of resin board material. The aluminum wall sign will feature reverse channel illumination. The directional signage will not feature illumination.
- 26. Applicant: Dennis Carlisle for the Boys and Girls Clubs of South Alabama**
- a. Property Address: 1102 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/25/13
 - c. Project: Revise a Certificate of Appropriateness issued on 6 February 2013. A porch and sign will be constructed on wood not aluminum.
- 27. Applicant: Pat Edington**
- a. Property Address: 551 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/25/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repair and when necessarily replace shutters to match the existing. Touch up the color scheme to match the existing.
- 28. Applicant: David and Ellen Alsobrook**
- a. Property Address: 300 Rapier Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/26/13
 - c. Project: Install a six foot interior lot wooden privacy fence.
- 29. Applicant: Douglas Kearley for Schley Rutherford, II**
- a. Property Address: 201 North Conception Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/26/13
 - c. Project: Reroof the body of the house with asphalt shingles. Reroof the former service wing with slate tiles.
- 30. Applicant: Conner Construction**
- a. Property Address: 1413 Monroe Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/26/13
 - c. Project: Reroof with asphalt shingles.
- 31. Applicant: Bessie Fairly**
- a. Property Address: 1008 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/26/13
 - c. Project: Install a prefabricated ancillary building in the rear lot. The building will be located in the rear of the lot and will be situated so as to meet setback requirements.

- 32. Applicant: Bessie Fairley**
a. Property Address: 1010 Selma Street
b. Date of Approval: 6/26/13
c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material on the principle dwelling. Repaint per the existing color scheme. Remove the remains of a collapsed ancillary building of contemporary construction.
- 33. Applicant: Melissa Wilson**
a. Property Address: 702 Saint Francis Street
b. Date of Approval: 6/26/13
c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
- 34. Applicant: Alec Glenn**
a. Property Address: 20 South Catherine Street
b. Date of Approval: 6/27/13
c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork. Paint the porch decking Valspar's Aged Pine. Install an 8' tall interior lot privacy fence (next to multi-family) in the rear of the lot.
- 35. Applicant: Alec Glenn**
a. Property Address: 202 South Catherine Street
b. Date of Approval: 6/27/13
c. Project: Paint the porch decking Valspar's Aged Pine and touch up the walls per the existing color scheme. Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
- 36. Applicant: Mac Lewis**
a. Property Address: 158 South Jefferson Street
b. Date of Approval: 6/27/13
c. Project: Replace rotten siding on the south side to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Remove later plate glass window with a wood, single pane, true divided light, 2/2 to match others on house.
- 37. Applicant: Kim Harden**
a. Property Address: 500 Church Street
b. Date of Approval: 6/28/13
c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint in the affected area to match the existing color scheme.
- 38. Applicant: J. A. Roofing**
a. Property Address: 100 Beverly Court
b. Date of Approval: 7/1/13
c. Project: Reroof with asphalt shingles
- 39. Applicant: Michelle J. M. Harbin**
a. Property Address: 312 North Jackson Street
b. Date of Approval: 7/2/13
c. Project: Replace fan ventilators on the rear elevation.
- 40. Applicant: D. E. Brutkiewicz, Jr.**
a. Property Address: 56 South Conception Street
b. Date of Approval: 7/2/13
c. Project: Repaint the woodwork and the ironwork per the existing color scheme.
- 41. Applicant: Wendy James**
a. Property Address: 1552 Monterey Place
b. Date of Approval: 6/19/13

- c. Project: Relocate a later cast iron fence to location further into the lot (behind the front plane of the house in the side yard). Construct a small section of eight foot fence to the rear and side of the house (property is adjacent to multi-family). Replace an existing six foot high rear lot line fence.
- 42. Applicant: Oakleigh Garden District Society**
 - a. Property Address: various addresses
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/3/13
 - c. Project: Revise the wording on previously approved historic district signage.
- 43. Applicant: Nofio Pecoraro**
 - a. Property Address: 14 Kenneth Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/3/13
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten boards on roof and reroof with GAF architectural shingles – slate.
- 44. Applicant: Wendell Quimby**
 - a. Property Address: 266 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/9/13
 - c. Project: Repaint the building per the following Sherwin Williams’ color scheme: the body will be Ecru; the doors will be Cottage Red; and the shutters will be Raccoon Fur. The awning covering will be replaced. The new covering will be slate in color. Repair woodwork and trim to match the existing when and where necessary.
- 45. Applicant: Wendell Quimby**
 - a. Property Address: 705 Spring Hill Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/9/13
 - c. Project: Paint the body of the building Sherwin Williams’ Wheat Grass. The trim will be white. Replace siding to match the existing. Reroof to match the existing.
- 46. Applicant: Wendell Quimby**
 - a. Property Address: 714 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/9/13
 - c. Project: Paint the body of the building Sherwin Williams’ Functional Gray. The trim will be white.
- 47. Applicant: Jeff Alexander**
 - a. Property Address: 307 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/9/13
 - c. Project: Replace the six foot high privacy fence. The new interior lot fence will occupy the same location and be same height as the existing. Only the cap will change. Construct a vehicular gate instead of a pedestrian gate.

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 2013-46-CA: 957 Selma Street**
 - a. Applicant: Eugene Caldwell
 - b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a fire-damaged house and a later ancillary building.

DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
- 2. 2013-47-CA: 65 North Catherine Street**
 - a. Applicant: Wilbur Hill with Brown Studio Architecture for Dr. Philip Butera of Nephrology Associates of Mobile
 - b. Project: Lighting – Retain lighting fixtures and install light-shielding devices within the fixture’s globes.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. **2013-48-CA: 457 Chatham Street**
 - a. Applicant: Devereaux Bemis for Restore Mobile
 - b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a single family residence.
DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
4. **2013-49-CA: 311 Charles Street**
 - a. Applicant: Kevin Cross
 - b. Project: Renovation – Renovate a non-contributing residential building.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
5. **2013-50-CA: 1507 Government Street**
 - a. Applicant: Derek Peterson for Mike Catanese
 - b. Project: Demolition – Demolish an ancillary building.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
6. **2013-51-CA: 958 Dauphin Street**
 - a. Applicant: Jim Cummings for One Southern Way
 - b. Project: Demolition – Demolish an ancillary building.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
7. **2013-52-CA: 116-118 North Catherine Street**
 - a. Applicant: Hyun Soon and Charles G. Storrs
 - b. Project: Demolition and Fencing – Demolish a non-contributing residential building, remove fencing, and install fencing.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion – The Board discussed the issue of Board member attendance. Mr. Bemis was instructed to contact City Council members about Review Board members who are neglectful in their attendance.
2. The Board discussed Form-Based Code.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-46-CA: 957 Selma Street
Applicant: Eugene Caldwell
Received: 6/13/13
Meeting: 7/17/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition – Demolish a single family residence and a later ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This shotgun featuring a recessed side wing house dates circa 1904. The wooden dwelling features turn-of-the-century details.

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. Two arson-related fires gutted the interior and claimed portions of the roof of the vacant dwelling. The owner/applicant proposes the demolition of the building.
- B. The 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 contributing residential building and a later ancillary structure. The property is located within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. A fine example of the shotgun with recessed side wing typology, the principle residence is one of many such dwellings that once lined the streets of Mobile’s late 19th-Century western suburbs. The ancillary building is not of the same architectural caliber (with regard to construction and design) as the principle dwelling. The ancillary building is of recent construction (post 1970s).

- 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 property's principle dwelling contributes to built density, rhythmic spacing, and historical character of the streetscape and surrounding districts. The ancillary building is not visible from 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 demolition of scores of this house type, significant numbers survive in Church Street East, Oakleigh Garden, Old Dauphin Way, and Oakdale Historic Districts. Other examples can be found in areas not included within the historic districts. The principle building is unique in that it is one of pair of surviving butterfly-like twin houses. The ancillary building is one of many rear lot storage-related buildings found in backyards across the region.
- v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 - 1. If granted demolition approval, the buildings would be demolished, the debris would be removed, the lot would be leveled, and sod would be planted.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. The owner/applicant acquired the property on August 20, 1975 for a sum of \$15,000.00.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. After assessing damage incurred by the two arson-related fires, the applicant has not considered any alternatives other than the demolition of the house. The house has been mothballed in an effort to prevent further access. The roof remains exposed to the elements. The ancillary building would be demolished as well.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The property has not been listed for sale.
- 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. Not applicable.
- x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. Not given.
- 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; and
 - 1. Application submitted.
- xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.

1. See the submitted materials.
2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

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

1. Demolish the fire-damaged house and unused later ancillary building.
2. Remove the debris.
3. Level the site.
4. Plant sod.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a fire damaged house. Demolition applications entail the review of the following concerns: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the affect the demolition would have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

This building is a contributing residential structure located within the Oakleigh Garden District. The building is a fine example of the shotgun with wing typology. The ancillary building is of recent construction and not of the same architectural and design quality as the principle dwelling.

After years of being unoccupied, the principle dwelling has suffered from deterioration caused by neglect. Two successive fires gutted the interior and structure of the house. The location of the second fire, which occurred in the center of the original portion of the house, caused considerable damage.

The main residence contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and historic character of the streetscape and the surrounding district.

If granted demolition approval, the applicant would demolish the main house and an ancillary building, remove debris, level the site, and plant sod. The applicant has not posted the property for sale on account of the extent of the damage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes the demolition of the contributing dwelling would impair the architectural and historical character of the building and district. Due to the condition of the building, the number of buildings for sale or in foreclosure in the area, and the number of vacant/burned out buildings in the area, Staff recommends approval of the demolition of the house and the ancillary building.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Allan voiced concern over the number of demolitions on the agenda.

Mr. Blackwell explained that Staff reciprocated the concerns regarding the number of demolitions. Citing assistance provided by Staff to property owners and adjacent property owners, along with work of revolving funds, Mr. Blackwell said that they are doing what they can to revitalize the areas affected by the demolitions. Mr. Bemis stated that the number of burned out buildings and their conditions posed a threat to adjacent property owners.

The Board acknowledged the condition of the building, and their policies regarding demolitions. It was noted that in previous applications involving the demolition of a principle dwelling the Board had required the applicant to list the property for sale for a period of six months before bringing it back to the Board. It was noted that the property had not been listed for sale.

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.

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 impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued and that the property be placed on the market for a period of six months.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-47-CA: 65 North Catherine Street
Applicant: Wilbur Hill with Brown Studio Architecture for Dr. Philip Butera of Nephrology Associates of Mobile
Received: 6/14/13
Meeting: 7/17/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-1
Project: Lighting - Retain lighting fixtures and install light-shielding devices within the fixture's globes.

BUILDING HISTORY

This non-contributing building was constructed in 2012.

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 May 1, 2013 as a result of a 311 call. The application called for the retention of lighting fixtures. Staff recommended approval of the fixtures pending the installation of light diffusing shields to be located within the fixture's acorn-shaped globes. The Board denied the request to retain the fixtures as installed. The application reappears before Board with a request calling for the retention of the light fixtures and the installation of light-diffusing devices within the globes thereof.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "Proposed lighting should be designed to avoid invading surrounding areas."
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted materials):
 - 1. Retain lighting fixtures.
 - 2. Install light-shielding devices within the fixture's globes. Said devices will be located in the direction of the adjacent residential properties.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the retention lighting. The Design Review Guidelines state that proposed lighting should be designed to avoid invading surrounding areas (B-1).

Seven lighting fixtures were installed to the west (rear) and south (side) of this building. The total number of fixtures is seven. Four of the fixtures are of a more traditional design. Three of the fixtures are more

contemporary in appearance. The lighting fixtures were depicted in the plans, but were not discussed at the time of the approval of either the building or other site improvements.

In order to minimize light spill over, Urban Development recommends the use of light diffusing shields located within the four traditional conical globe lights as a means of mitigating the spread of light onto adjacent residential properties. The applicants are amenable to installing the light shielding devices.

It should be noted that the file contains the lighting plans as built but they were never reviewed by the Board and are not listed on the COA. Those plans did have the light shielding devices in them.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district and recommends approval based on the assurances that the light will be contained on the property. However, the applicants should be aware that if spill over continues, they will be required to come back before the Board with an alternative lighting solution.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Wilbur Hill and Don Brown both of Brown Studiowere present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representatives. He asked Mr. Hill and Mr. Brown if they had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address.

Mr. Hill addressed the Board. He thanked Mr. Bemis and Mr. Blackwell for their help and professionalism. Mr. Hill then clarified for the Board what a diffuser is and what it accomplishes. He said that in this instance, the proposed diffusers are light shielding devices that would be directed toward the houses located on adjacent properties, therefore blocking light from them. He stated that an electrical engineer had been engaged to survey the overflow of light from the lamp posts. The study showed that the light overflow was within the City's guidelines, but that the owner still wanted to work with the neighboring property owners. Mr. Hill further stated that while the lights were not specifically approved, he and his firm were under the understanding that they were working within the Guidelines when installing the lamp posts. The proposed shields would physically block light from directly invading the neighboring properties. Mr. Hill added that a photometric study showed that the light spill was immeasurable. He said that he could still understand the neighborhood's concerns about glare from the lights and that he believed the light shields will eliminate the glare.

Mr. Ladd asked if a sample diffuser had been installed. Mr. Hill answered no. Mr. Roberts asked if a sample drawing of the shields was available. Mr. Hill answered yes and Mr. Brown distributed copies of a drawing depicting diffusers installed in the acorn type lights. The Board examined the copies of the drawing, which depict a vertical metal shield located within the acorn-shaped globe.

Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Blackwell if the concern was over the design of the fixtures or the spread of light. Mr. Blackwell answered the latter. He reiterated the stance of the present and previous Staff recommendations, both of which addressed the light overflow. Mr. Hill again explained that the light shields would eliminate the light concerns. Mr. Ladd told the Board and the audience that one of his neighbors had installed a similar device and that it had had blocked out the light.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any further questions for the applicant's representatives. Mr. Karwinski stated that the light poles are too high and out of character with the historic district. He asked the applicant's representatives if they could be reduced in height. Mr. Hill answered no. He said that in cutting the lights the mechanizations would be separated from the base.

Mr. Allen asked if both types of lights would receive light-shielding devices. Mr. Hill answered yes.

Mr. Stone asked Mr. Bemis how the approval would work. Mr. Bemis explained that in approving the proposal, the diffusers would be approved as presented. He cited the Staff Report. Mr. Karwinski said that light-related concerns might still remain. He said test would be simple.

Mr. Brown addressed the Board. He said that he and Mr. Hill had redone the math found in the municipal inspection's paperwork and had taken measures in addition to those conducted by professionals. After discussing the different types of light, he said that the proposed diffusers would cover up the light.

Mr. Roberts said that while he appreciates the efforts and the insight, the neighbors had some issues that need to be addressed. He said that if the diffusers work then the problem would be solved, but if not the issue would still have to be addressed. Mr. Ladd said that the Board is working in that respect, to reach a working solution that satisfies all parties. He stated that the Board is here to allow the concern to be solved as a team. After thanking the applicant's representatives, Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application.

Mr. George Swann said that based on the discussion, a possible resolution of the matter could be at hand. Ms. Megan Jorns stated that while she appreciated all the efforts made, she still had two points of concern, the light produced by and the overall height of the light fixtures. Mr. Ladd addressed Ms. Jorns' concerns. He said that why they were valid, she and her neighbors now had a chance to see if the proposal solved issues on both sides. Ms. Jorns said that she was appreciative and hoped for the best. Mr. Swann asked for clarification as to the reason for the lights. Mr. Brown answered that reasons of security and safety called for their presence.

The Board discussion came to a conclusion. Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak either for or against the application. No further comments ensued from the audience. 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. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/17/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-48-CA: 457 Chatham Street
Applicant: Devereaux Bemis for Restore Mobile
Received: 6/21/13
Meeting: 7/17/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition – Demolish a single family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This paired-door workman’s cottage dates from 1878. The house was remodeled in the 1920s.

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 interior of the house is gutted and fire-damaged. The applicants, the Restore Mobile Revolving Fund, propose the demolition of the building.
- B. The 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 building is a contributing residential structure located within the Oakleigh Garden District. A paired-door workman’s cottage, this building is substantially proportioned.
 - 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 dwelling contributes to built density, rhythmic spacing, and historical character of the streetscape and surrounding districts.
 - 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 demolition of scores of this house type, significant numbers of paired-door workman's cottages survive.
 - v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 1. If granted demolition approval, the house would be demolished, the debris would be removed, and the lot would be leveled, and sod would be planted.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. Restore Mobile acquired the property in 2012 for \$7,211.65.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. After purchasing the house and taking into consideration the scope of the damage (what amounted to demolition by neglect), the property was listed for sale. No offers have ensued. The cost of a restoration/renovation is more the Restore Mobile can afford and is thought too high for any potential buyer.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. The property has been listed for sale, but received no offers.
 - 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. Not applicable.
 - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 1. Not given.
 - 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; and
 1. Application submitted.
 - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
 1. See the submitted materials.
2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

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

1. Demolish the house.
2. Demolish an ancillary building.
3. Remove the debris.
4. Level the site.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a principle residence. When reviewing demolition applications, the followings concerns are taken into account: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the effect the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

The building in question is a contributing residential structure located within the Oakleigh Garden District. The building is one of many paired-door, double pile (two rooms deep) workman's cottages surviving in and around Mobile's historic districts. This example is substantially proportioned.

A previous owner did little to care for the property. Extensive deterioration from neglected maintenance has resulted in extensive structural decay. A recent fire caused more damage. As it now stands, the building is unsound structural shell.

The building contributes to the building density, rhythmic spacing, and historic character of the streetscape and the surrounding district.

If granted demolition approval, the applicant would demolish the house, remove debris, level the site, and plant sod.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes the demolition of the contributing dwelling will impair the architectural and historical character of the building and the district. That said taking into consideration the condition of the building, Staff recommends approval of the demolition.¹

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Keri Coumanis 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 Ms. Coumanis, a board member of the Restore Mobile Revolving Fund, if she had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address.

Ms. Coumanis addressed the Board. She stated that after assessing the situation (namely repair bids exceeding \$80,000 for the exterior alone) Restore Mobile found that demolishing the building constituted the best way which to begin revitalizing the property. Ms. Coumanis said that she hoped to have ready by the upcoming deadline plans for a new building to be constructed on the lot. She stated that Restore Mobile had acquired the property one year earlier. The original intent had been to restore the exterior and list the property. While stabilizing the house, the extent of the damage was discovered. The bids for restoring the house were found to be infeasible. Ms. Coumanis stated that Restore Mobile purchases properties in order to stabilize and restore exterior volumes and that demolitions had never previously been part of their interventions.

¹ On account his being a board member of the Restore Mobile Revolving Fund, MHDC executive director Devereaux Bemis was not involved in the review of this application.

Mr. Karwinski asked who would give an \$80,000 demolition bid. Ms. Coumanis stated that three contractors had quoted figures at or exceeding the aforementioned amount. Mr. Karwinski asked if Restore Mobile had looked into demolishing the rear portion of the building and restoring the house's original four rooms. He stated that they could be reconditioned.

Mr. Ladd addressed Ms. Coumanis by saying that his concern was precedent related. Citing other applications in which applicants had been required to place the property on the open market, Mr. Ladd said that he not did want the Architectural Review Board to receive an unwarranted reputation for partiality.

Mr. Allen said that he had noticed a for sale sign on property for some time. He asked if it had been seriously marketed. Ms. Coumanis stated that in addition to placing the sign on the property, she is in contact with all the individuals who have previously purchased and restored homes within the Oakleigh Garden District and that no one was interested in restoring the house. Mr. Allen asked if the property had been placed on MLS. Ms. Coumanis answered no, not to date. She said that the City had issued several citations on the property and that decision needs to be made as to other alternatives that would revitalize the lot and the surrounding area.

A discussion ensued as the structural integrity of the building.

Ms. Coumanis told the Board that Restore Mobile is a not for profit entity. Speaking of previous properties which Restore Mobile had saved, Ms. Coumanis said that restoring the subject property did not fair well either architecturally or fiscally by comparison

Mr. Allan said that he understood the condition of the building and the area, but a broader audience might not be aware that the building is for sale. Kevin Cross from the audience voiced an interest in the property.

Mr. Karwinski said that he had a question. He asked the MHDC Staff how could a preservation board honesty condone demolitions. Mr. Bemis cited the condition of the building and the area. Mr. Blackwell referenced several decades of actions made the MDHC and its revolving funds. He then cited the Staff Report which notes that while the demolition would impair the architectural and the historical character of the building and the district, taking into account the condition of the building and the nature of the market, Staff had recommended approval of the application. Mr. Blackwell noted that he was only Staff member involved in this review. Mentioning the fire damage and other fire-related demolitions, Mr. Blackwell said that while he comprehended the concerns of the Board the damage is extensive. Ms. Coumanis referenced earlier comparisons she had made between this property and other properties which Restore Mobile had saved. Citing 457 Chatham Street as an example, Ms. Coumanis stated that the subject building possessed far less architectural significance and lacked structural integrity. Mr. Ladd stated that based on the pictures and the report, he concurred, but by reason of precedent he recommended that the property be put in MLS and marketed until February. If, it had not sold the application could reappear before the Board with a better standing.

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 impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued. The property is to be placed on MLS and marketed for six months.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-49-CA: 311 Charles Street
Applicant: Kevin Cross
Received: 6/26/13
Meeting: 7/17/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Renovation – Renovate a non-contributing residential building.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to materials found within the MHDC property files, this non-contributing residential building dates from circa 1945.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicants propose the removal asbestos siding and the construction of a porch, the installation of lap siding, and the alteration to fenestration.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture.”
 - 2. “The exterior of a building helps to define its style, quality, and period. The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
 - 3. “Some historic have buildings from the recent past, e.g. the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s. Some materials such as asbestos shingle siding are appropriate providing that is the original building material.”
 - 4. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Construct a front porch.
 - a. The two bay porch will rest atop brick-veneered foundation piers.
 - b. Boxed and recessed lattice foundation screening will extend between the porch’s foundation piers. Said porch screening will also be installed between the foundation piers of the body of the house.

- c. Square section wooden porch posts (featuring both base and capital moldings) will support the porch's gable roof.
 - d. The porch will feature tongue-and-groove decking.
 - e. A picket railing will extend between the porch posts.
 - f. A flight of brick steps featuring picket railings matching those on the porch deck will allow for access to and from the porch. Newel posts will secure and anchor the picketed stair railings.
 - g. The porch's gabled roof will feature a louvered vent.
2. Reconfigure the Façade's (West Elevation) fenestration.
 - a. Remove the front door.
 - b. Install a glazed and paneled front door.
 - c. Remove a three-over-one window.
 - d. Relocate the aforementioned to North Elevation (See C-3-1).
 3. Reconfigure the North (Side) Elevation's fenestration.
 - a. Remove a small three-over-one window.
 - b. Install the three-over-one windows relocated from the faced (See C-2-c and d) on the location of the aforementioned window
 4. Reconfigure fenestration on the East (Rear) Elevation's Fenestration.
 - a. Relocate a door.
 5. Remove asbestos tile wall sheathing install hardiboard lap siding.
 6. Install hardiboard window & door casings and corner boards.

Clarifications/Clarifications

1. Provide a rendering of the Rear Elevation.
2. Provide a site plan.
3. Will the lintel of the relocated side window align with the heights of the adjacent windows?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the renovation of a non-contributing residential building. The renovation can be divided into three parts: the construction of front porch; the alteration of fenestration; and the replacement of siding.

With regard to the construction of the new porch, Staff believes that this feature would tie the building to its historic context thereby adopting something of the traditional regional character of the surrounding district and streetscape (See B-1).

While the Guidelines state that windows should be retained in their original locations, this concern is generally directed toward contributing buildings (See B-4). The relocation of the fenestration on this non-contributing building would allow for the porch to better engage the house (window to be removed from the façade) and meet code requirements (the relocation of the aforementioned window on the side elevation and the relocation of a rear door).

The Design Review Guidelines state that original siding should be retained (See B-2). The walls of this house are sheathed in asbestos tiles. Originally the house was faced with wooden siding (See B-3). Only portions of the earlier wall surfaces survive. The proposed hardiboard siding would not be approved on a contributing building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-4), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district. Staff would ordinarily not recommend approval of alterations to the siding, but taking into account previous alterations, the building has lost much of its architectural integrity. Staff recommends approval of the application. That said Staff notes that if executed the changes would require the building would have to wait an additional fifty years before it would be considered for contributing status.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Kevin Cross was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Allen recused himself from the discussion and left the room.

Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Cross if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address. Mr. Cross answered no.

Mr. Karwinski said that he had two comments to make. He stated that the middle column of the three bay porch looked awkward. He said that in discussing the project with the owner, he recommended that the middle column either be centered or the porch converted from a two to a three bay composition.

Speaking to Mr. Cross, Mr. Ladd stated that Mr. Karwinski's remarks were suggestions and not requirements.

Mr. Karwinski said that he still had one comment to address. He said that as constructed the foundation piers would not be able to accommodate the proposed brick veneers.

Mr. Oswalt asked Mr. Cross why he was removing the asbestos tiles. Mr. Cross stated that upon inspection, the tiles were found to be made of concrete not asbestos. He said that the tiles were damaged and that a unique siding would allow the building to fit better within its historic surroundings.

Mr. Bemis suggested to the Board that if they were amenable to approving the application, they could approve the porch as either two or a three bay construction.

Mr. Karwinski recommended the centering of the middle column.

Mr. Cross said that he was amenable to centering the said column.

Board discussion came to a close. Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. No comments ensued from the audience. Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that foundation piers will

be faced with stucco or cement and that the center column of the porch will be centered between the outer columns.

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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/17/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-50-CA: 1507 Government Street
Applicant: Mike Catanese
Received: 7/2/13
Meeting: 7/17/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing (the main house)
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition – Demolish an ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

The main house situated on this property dates from the 1920s. The ancillary building, a two-story garage apartment, appears on the 1955 Sanborn Maps.

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

- B. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicant proposes the demolition of an ancillary building.
- B. The 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. The principle dwelling is not proposed for demolition. The property’s two-story garage apartment is one of many multi-story vehicular-residential ancillary buildings constructed during the first half of the 20th Century. These building are found both within and without Mobile’s historic districts.
 - ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. While a built manifestation of the ascendancy of the automobile and the decline of Government Street as a residential thoroughfare, the building

- is not visible from Government Street. Located in the center of the large block-deep lot, the building is minimally visible from Church Street.
- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced.
 - 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. Many examples of two-story vehicular-cum-rental/service residential construction from the period can be found throughout Mobile's westernmost historic districts.
 - v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 1. If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, the site would be leveled, and sod would be planted. The demolition would not affect the public view from Government Street. The effect would be minimal from Church Street. The archaeological record has already been disturbed.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The present owner acquired this property, along with the adjacent property to the East, during the present calendar year.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. After assessing the condition of the main dwelling, the subject building, and the main building on the adjacent property, the new owner decided to start work on the property's principle dwelling and demolish the subject building as his first step in revitalizing the complex.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. The property has recently been acquired by the current owner.
 - 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. NA.
 - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 1. Not provided.
 - 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; and
 1. Application submitted.
 - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
 1. See the submitted materials.
2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

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

1. Demolish the house.
2. Remove the debris.
3. Level the site.
4. Plant Sod.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of an ancillary building. When reviewing demolition applications, the followings concerns are taken into account: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the effect the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

The building proposed for demolition is a two-story ancillary structure. Featuring ground floor vehicular accommodation and upper-story living quarters, the building is one of many surviving service-cum-residential buildings located in Mobile’s early 20th-Century suburbs.

The ancillary building evidences signs of structural deterioration and insect infestation.

This building faces the rear elevation of a residence facing Government Street. It is not visible from that thoroughfare. As a consequence of being located on block deep lot, the building’s rear elevation is visible from Church Street though. That said the building does not engage Church Street in either elevation or placement.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes the demolition of the ancillary building will impair the architectural and the historical character of the property and the district, but upon taking into account the applicant’s cooperation in retaining the principle buildings on both subject and the adjacent properties, along with the condition of the subject building and its location on the lot, Staff recommends approval of the demolition.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Derek Peterson 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. Peterson if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address. Mr. Peterson answered no.

Mr. Bemis noted that the application would need to be amended to reflect that only the ancillary building was to be torn down.

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

No Board discussion ensued.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that only the ancillary building would be demolished.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/17/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-51-CA: 958 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Jim Cummings for One Southern Way
Received: 6/20/13
Meeting: 7/17/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing (the main house)
Zoning: B-1
Project: Demolition – Demolish an ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

The principle building on this property dates from the second half of the 20th Century. The ancillary building in question is not recorded on the site until after 1925.

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 May of 1989. At that time, the Old Dauphin Way Review Board granted demolition approval of the ancillary building in question.
- B. The 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. The principle building is not proposed for demolition. The ancillary building proposed for demolition is listed as a non-contributing structure. The structure does not appear on Sanborn Maps until after 1925.
 - ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. Though the ancillary building stands as a vestige of the property’s former residential use, the building is listed as non-contributing and does not engage the streetscape.

- 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. Other ancillary buildings, and even principle buildings of similar construction and date, survive both in and outside of Mobile's historic districts.
 - v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 - 1. If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, the site would be leveled, and sod would be planted.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. The present owner acquired this property in 2000 as part of a larger multiple property acquisition.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. After receiving citations and assessing the conditions of the building, the current owner makes a request to renew the demolition approval.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. NA.
 - 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. NA.
 - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. Not provided.
 - 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; and
 - 1. Application submitted.
 - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
 - 1. See the submitted materials.
2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

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

- 1. Demolish the building
- 2. Remove the debris.
- 3. Level the site.
- 4. Plant sod.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of an ancillary building. When reviewing demolition applications, the followings concerns are taken into account: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the effect the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

The building proposed for demolition is a single-story ancillary building. First recorded on the site after 1925, the building is representative of many surviving structures of its period and construction.

The ancillary building evidences signs cosmetic and structural deterioration.

Located behind the property's principle building, this structure does not engage the public view.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff does not believe it would be economically feasible or structurally possible to move the building as one unit. Based on B (1-2), Staff believes the demolition of building would impair the architectural or the historical character of the district and encourages the owners to investigate an adaptive reuse of the property on its present site. Staff recommends a three month stay of demolition. If after that period no alternative use is determined, the application could reappear before the Board.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Jim Cummings 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. Cummings if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address.

Mr. Cummings explained that the building had been approved for demolition in 1989 and it had continued to deteriorate. He said that the current owner had acquired the property as part of larger multi-lot purchase in 2000. The electricity and water had been disconnected. Fencing encloses the area surrounding the building. He stated that the owner would like to move forward with the demolition.

Mr. Wagoner asked for clarification regarding the fencing. A discussion ensued. Mr. Cummings was informed that additional inner lot fencing would be required to be either wood or aluminum in construction. Mr. Cummings stated that the applicant might like to remove two metal storage installations from the property.

Mr. Karwinski said that given the lack of significance of the ancillary building in question, granting demolition today or three months from now mattered little.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that the two metal ancillary installations could be removed from the property as well.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/17/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-52-CA: 116-118 North Catherine Street
Applicant: Hyun Soon and Charles G. Storrs
Received: 6/28/13
Meeting: 7/13/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition and Fencing – Demolish a non-contributing residential building, remove fencing, and install fencing.

BUILDING HISTORY

This non-contributing dwelling dates from the middle third of the 20th Century.

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 May of 1989. At that time, the Old Dauphin Way Review Board granted demolition approval of the ancillary building in question.
- B-1. The 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 residential building dates from the middle third of the 20th Century. In terms of materials, design, and construction, the building is typical of its period.
 - ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. This building contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and architectural character of the streetscape.

- 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. Numerous contemporaneous examples of houses of similar design, construction, and materials survive from the period of the house's construction.
 - v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 - 1. If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, the site would be leveled, sod would be planted, fencing would be removed, and fencing would be installed.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. The applicant is in the process of acquiring the property.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. After taking into account the condition of the property and the costs of restoring the building, the applicant, who owns the residence to the east of the house, decided to demolish the vacant structure.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The property has been listed for sale through the Neighborhood Renewal Project.
 - ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 - 1. The applicants are in the process of purchasing the property.
 - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. Not provided.
 - 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; and
 - 1. Application submitted.
 - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
 - 1. See the 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 Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:

1. Fencing “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and material should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fencing is generally restricted to six feet, however, if commercial or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.”

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

1. Demolish the building
2. Remove the debris.
3. Level the site.
4. Plant sod.
5. Remove interior fencing.
6. Install a six foot high aluminum fence along the West lot line.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a non-contributing residential building. When reviewing demolition applications, the followings concerns are taken into account: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the effect the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

The subject building is a non-contributing residential building located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. Dating from the middle third of the 20th Century, the building is one of many extant houses of its period and style.

This building is an extreme instance of demolition by neglect. The roof has collapsed, walls have bowed, and floors have collapsed.

While this building contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and architectural character of the streetscape, this section of North Catherine Street has undergone extensive changes in recent decades.

If granted demolition approval, the applicants would demolish the house, clear the debris, level the site, plant sod, remove interior lot fencing, and install a six foot high aluminum fence.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B-1 (1-2), Staff believes this demolition application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the district, but taking into account the condition of the building, Staff recommends approval of the demolition. With regard to fencing, Staff recommends approval of the proposed aluminum fencing and recommends that the four high section of wooden fencing extending along the northern lot line be removed and replaced with the proposed fencing. The extension of the proposed fencing would give cohesiveness to the fencing and augment security measures.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Hyun Soon and Paul Storrs were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicants. He asked Mr. Storrs and Ms. Soon if they had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address.

Ms. Coumanis addressed the Board on the applicant's behalf. She explained that the City of Mobile currently owns the property. Ms. Coumanis stated that the Neighborhood Renewal Project had acquired a quick title to the property and that the property had been on the nuisance list since 2002 for an amount exceeding \$200,000. She said that she and Mr. Bemis had halted a City ordered demolition of the property in 2008, but it had taken over four years to obtain title to the property. In that time, the deterioration had escalated. Ms. Coumanis stated that the applicants were in the process of acquiring the property from the City. The property would be required to be re-subdivided and rezoned. The lot would become the rear lot of their home (which faces Providence Street). The larger lot would all be R-1. The re-subdivided property would halt further commercial intrusions into this section of the historic district.

Mr. Roberts raised concerns as to setback requirements.

Discussion ensued as to the type and location of fencing.

Mr. Storrs stated that the three foot section of fencing that currently extends along the northern lot line would be removed and replaced with six foot high wooden fencing.

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 response, 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 facts to note that the three foot section of wooden fencing that currently extends along a portion of the northern lot line would be replaced with a six foot high section of fencing.

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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/17/14