

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

July 18, 2018 – 3:00 P.M.

Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

### A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. John Sledge, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:  
**Members Present:** Harris Oswalt, Bob Allen, John Ruzic, Craig Roberts, David Barr, Nick Holmes III and Kim Harden .  
**Members Absent:** Carolyn Hasser, Catarina Echols, Jim Wagoner, and Robert Brown.  
**Staff Members Present:** Flo Kessler, Marion McElroy, Bridget Daniel, and John Sledge.
2. Mr. Oswalt moved to hold over the minutes of the June 20, 2018 meeting to allow for more time to review.
3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the Midmonths. The motion received a second and was approved with one opposed, Mr. Allen.

### B. MIDMONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: A. Warren Jr.**
  - a. Property Address: 1714 C Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/13/2018
  - c. Project: Install one 36"x18" double faced, hanging blade, painted wood sign. Install two signs (one on either side of door), wall signs constructed of painted wood an 13" 48" to fit architectural features.
2. **Applicant: Terry Lawrence of Terry Lawrence Construction**
  - a. Property Address: 915 Palmetto Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/14/2018
  - c. Project: Replace wooden steps with brick. Widen stairs to 7' to fit architectural feature. Install iron handrails
3. **Applicant: Michael Spencer**
  - a. Property Address: 56 S. Lafayette Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/14/2018
  - c. Project: Reroof to match existing shingles.
4. **Applicant: Michael Imwalle**
  - a. Property Address: 306 Marine Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/14/2018
  - c. Project: Erect 6' fence and 42" inch picket fence per drawing.
5. **Applicant: Virginia Adkisson**
  - a. Property Address: 1151 Old Shell Road
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/15/2018
  - c. Project: Re-roof with gray architectural shingles, to match existing. Paint exterior with Behr - Anonymous (light gray color) on house with White trim.
6. **Applicant: Bo Wilder of Bo Wilder Contracting**
  - a. Property Address: 157 Davitt Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/20/2018
  - c. Project: Enclose landing space to make utility room at rear of house not visible from public view. New wall will align with existing wall planes. A rectangular wooden window will be installed on rear elevation in newly enclosed space. Relocate existing window will be relocated. New materials will match existing.

- 7. Applicant: Christopher Scott and Jodi White**
  - a. Property Address: 160 S. Dearborn Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/22/2018
  - c. Project: Repaint in the following color scheme: Body-Classic French Gray; Trim-White Hyacinth; Decking-Battleship Gray; and Porch Ceiling-Haint Blue. Install new wooden door to be stained to replace non-historic door. Remove later canvas awnings. Install metal picketed fence no more than 4' high in front of house.
- 8. Applicant: Deborah Pelt**
  - a. Property Address: 107 N. Pine Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/25/2018
  - c. Project: Replace rotten boards to match and repaint existing colors.
- 9. Applicant: Ryan Lewis**
  - a. Property Address: 161 Michigan Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/26/2018
  - c. Project: Add new sills under front porch, build two piers; kitchen area level; rework sills.
- 10. Applicant: Project 50, LLC**
  - a. Property Address: 111 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: Waterproof front and rear of building.
  - c. Project: 6/26/2018
- 11. Applicant: Amy Brown**
  - a. Property Address: 54 S. Lafayette Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/29/2018
  - c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in charcoal.
- 12. Applicant: Nancy Haralson of Entera Branding, LLC**
  - a. Property Address: 1550 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/27/2018
  - c. Project: Install 6'0"H by 4'2"W monument sign. Sign will be composed painted aluminum with two tenant panels. Sign will say "Weinacker's since 1882" and "Winn Dixie + pharmacy" and be no more than 54 sq. ft. each side.
- 13. Applicant: Jim Myers of Myers Architecture**
  - a. Property Address: 351 George Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/29/2018
  - c. Project: Install multi-lite wooden door on South elevation in existing opening for access to patio. Construct wooden deck on existing patio location. Deck will be skirted and have capped wooden railing and ADA ramp. Replace existing 6' feet wooden fence with 6' wooden fence topped with lattice for a total of 8'. Property is a commercial site, restaurant.
- 14. Applicant: Jim Myers of Meyers Architecture**
  - a. Property Address: 205 Congress Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/29/2018
  - c. Project: Install french door in existing opening on West elevation. Construct raised patio and ADA ramp on southwest corner of property. Patio will have a wooden deck and metal railings. Regravel existing lot. Construct one ADA accessible parking spot on existing gravel parking surface. Repair and replace lapsiding and deteriorated fascia when necessary in dimension, profile, and material and paint.
- 15. Applicant: Virginia Snider**
  - a. Property Address: 407 Church Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 7/2/2018
  - c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles.

**16. Applicant: Sandy McQueen**

- a. Property Address: 350 Rapier Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 7/3/2018
- c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles charcoal. Repair wood siding and other deteriorated wood elements in dimension, profile, and material. Repair and replace windows to match existing in dimension, profile, and material. On later rear addition windows may be replaced with wood or aluminum clad windows. Repair doors and replace any deteriorated elements on door to match. Repaint to match existing.

**17. Applicant: Jim Wagoner**

- a. Property Address: 1805 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/2/2018
- c. Project: Paint columns and trim white.

**18. Applicant: William Graham**

- a. Property Address: 1760 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/5/2018
- c. Project: Repair/ replace rotten wood on porch and repaint to match existing.

**19. Applicant: Nick Colletti**

- a. Property Address: 1358 Old Shell Road
- b. Date of Approval: 7/6/2018
- c. Project: Repair rotten wood as needed to match original in dimension and profile, repaint to match; build deck in rear.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2018-20-CA: 800 Monroe Street**

- a. Applicant: Mr. Jeff Zeiders
- b. Project: Rehabilitation and Addition Related: Conduct to the body of a historic building; demolish later non-contributing rear addition and construct new addition in same footprint; install fenestration; and instate fencing.  
APPROVED IN CONCEPT. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

**2. 2018-21-CA: 1009 Texas Street**

- a. Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. Mike Rogers
- b. Project: Rehabilitation and Renovation Related: Conduct in kind repairs; Replace windows with wooden windows; Install lapsiding; Construct rear porch addition.  
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

**3. 2018-22-CA: 458 George Street**

- a. Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Restore Mobile, Inc.
- b. Project: Rehabilitation and Rear Addition Related: Conduct in-kind repairs; Replace deteriorated elements; Alter later fenestration; Remove later addition; construct new rear addition.  
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

**4. 2018-17-CA: 1654 Government Street**

- a. Applicant: Pamela and Jeffrey Kent
- b. Project: PREVIOUSLY HELDOVER: Porch Related: Retain porch railing, planters, and gate installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness.  
HELDOVER AT THE REQUEST OF THE APPLICANT. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. **OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Our next meeting will be held August 1<sup>st</sup> 2018.

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

**2018-20-CA: 800 Monroe Street**  
**Applicant: Mr. Jeff Zeiders**  
**Received: 6/21/2018**  
**Meeting: 7/18/2018**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Church Street East  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: T5.1  
Project: Rehabilitation and Addition Related: Conduct to the body of a historic building; demolish later non-contributing rear addition and construct new addition in same footprint; install fenestration; and instate fencing.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This building is adjacent to the Crystal Ice building which was designed by C.L. Hutchisson Sr. in 1926 with alterations in 1946.

**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 15, 1993 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time approval was granted for a metal addition. The proposed scope of work includes in-kind repairs, alteration of fenestration, partial demolition of later rear addition, and new rear addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Alterations to non-historic commercial buildings must be compatible with the historic district.”
  - 2. “Design an alteration to retain a placement and orientation that is compatible with the district.”
  - 3. “Design an alteration to appear similar in massing and scale with historic commercial buildings in the district.”
  - 4. “Use building elements that are of a similar profile and durability to those seen on historic buildings in the district.”
  - 5. “Maintain a solid-to-void ratio on building walls that is similar to those seen on historic buildings in the district.”
  - 6. “Design building massing to reflect massing of nearby historic structures.”
  - 7. “Reference traditional articulation patterns on the façade of a new commercial structure.”

8. "Use building materials that are compatible with the surrounding context."
9. "Maintain significant historic façades in their original form."
10. "Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material."
11. "Repair and maintain original roof materials rather than replace them, wherever possible."
12. "Pertaining to roof: Use materials that are consistent with the architectural style of the structure."
13. "Pertaining to roofs: Materials that are the same as the original or that appear similar in texture, pattern, finish and color range to the original are acceptable. These often include: Metal when consistent with the period and style of the building."
14. "Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material."
15. "Materials that do not appear similar to the original in texture, pattern, finish and color range to the original are unacceptable. These often include: Corrugated fiberglass; Asphalt roll roofing (unless obscured by parapet walls); Built-up membrane roof on steep sloping roofs (greater than 3:12); Panel and batten; Brightly colored metal"
16. "A new fence, wall or gate should be compatible with the architectural style of the primary building and these same elements on other properties in the district."

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

1. Renovate a commercial building.
  - a. Clean with the gentlest means possible any brick, and prime.
  - b. Clean with the gentlest means as possible any concrete, stone or metal and then prime.
  - c. Paint colors will be approved by staff at a later date.
  - d. Repair and repaint existing windows.
  - e. Repair existing corrugated roof and panels or replace with new corrugated roof and panels to match existing in profile, dimension, and material.
  - f. South (façade) Elevation.
    - i. Remove existing masonry and create openings located at the westernmost portion of elevation.
    - ii. Install equidistant aluminum clad windows to match the configuration of those windows found on the East (side) elevation.
    - iii. Install glazing in existing openings on two garage doors located in the outermost automobile bays.
    - iv. Install glazing in central automobile bay on garage door to match the aforementioned.
    - v. Install four gooseneck lamps.
  - g. West (a side) Elevation.
    - i. Remove existing door and frame located on the southern portion of the West elevation.
      - a) Install new glazed and panel door.
      - b) Construct new loading platform. A shed roof will be supported by wooden post with painted steel tube railings.
      - c) Deck and posts will be painted.
    - ii. Remove existing gooseneck lamp.
    - iii. Install new gooseneck lamp.

- iv. On easternmost portion, repair loading platform to match existing.
      - a) Install new painted steel tube handrail.
  - h. North (rear) Elevation
    - i. Remove existing handicap ramp located on the western portion of the North elevation.
    - ii. Construct new wood ramp and steps in the same place as the aforementioned.
      - a) Ramp will be constructed of wood and painted steel tube hand railings.
      - b) Ramp and steps will access existing loading platform.
    - iii. On eastern portion of existing loading platform, create opening install metal door with sidelight.
    - iv. Install glazing in existing opening on garage doors in automobile bays.
- 2. Demolish later addition located between automobile bays on North elevation.
- 3. Construct a new addition on the rear elevation.
  - a. The addition will be slab on grade.
  - b. Hardiplank lapsiding will clad the addition.
  - c. A shed roof will surmount the addition.
  - d. The roof will be corrugated metal to match the existing in profile, dimension and material.
  - e. A new aluminum and glass overhead will be installed centrally on the North elevation.
  - f. On eastern portion of the North elevation, a new glazed storefront will be installed. Storefront will feature a mitered corner.
- 4. Conduct landscape improvements.
  - a. Install new curbcut to access parking lot.
  - b. Stripe concrete pad for parking stalls and install wheelstops.
  - c. Construct sidewalk at new curbcut site.
  - d. Construct new concrete pad for ramp access on Northwest corner of building.
  - e. On Northeast corner of rear elevation install concrete or composite pavers with gravel between and wooden pergola.
    - i. Pergola will be 11' 7-1/2" deep by 11' 7-1/2' wide.
    - ii. Pergola will be 10'0" in height.
  - f. Construct 3'8" metal panel between wooden posts privacy fence to match previously approved fence.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the restoration of the body of a non-contributing commercial building, changes to fenestration, removal of a later addition, and construction of a new addition.

With regard to restoration of existing features, materials will be cleaned and repaired to match existing in dimension, profile and material (See B-10.) Metal windows, brick, corrugated metal roof will all be repaired to match the materials found on a neighboring commercial building in the district or to match existing (See B-4 and B-14.). The buildings automobile bay garage doors will have glazing inserting in existing openings. On one of the aforementioned doors where an opening does not exist, one will be created to match the location of the others. On the façade, two new windows will punctuate the western portion. These windows will match the existing metal windows in configuration. All fenestration changes maintain a solid-to-void ratio and rhythm well suited to the commercial building (See B-5 and B-7). The proposed changes would respect the historic fabric on the building while being in character with other commercial warehouse buildings in the downtown area (See B-8).

A later rear addition will be demolished. The addition is not architecturally significant nor is it visible from public view (See B-2). Another addition located in a similar footprint to the aforementioned will be constructed. A change in wall planes will differentiate the old from the new portions of the building. The new addition components (lapsiding, corrugated metal roof, and storefront windows) are in keeping with the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts* for commercial buildings.

With regard to site improvements such as the installation of fencing, pergola, terrace and parking improvements, when designed well the oftentimes complementary elements respond to the site. A new curb cut will access parking located in the rear. A new terrace and pergola will be constructed out of public view on the rear of the lot. A fence constructed of corrugated panels between posts responds to the building elements on the structure (See B-16.)

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Gavin O'Connell, owner was present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. O'Conner if this property was party of the Crystal Ice buildings. Mr. O'Connell said, yes it is part of storage. Mr. Roberts commented he thought the property was to be used as offices. Mr. O'Conner commented it is an open concept.

Mr. Roberts mentioned application notes an existing chain link fence and is unsure if the Board can allow this type of fence. He noted the City requires 13% of landscaping to provide a buffer. The owner confirmed for Mr. Roberts that he was unaware of the landscaping requirements.

Mr. Oswalt asked about the fence. Mr. O'Lowell said it was a 6' tall privacy fence.

Mr. Roberts mentioned night lights can be controversial and he did not see a lighting plan. He stted he did not know why staff recommended approval without all the information.

Mr. Holmes commented we can approve building in concept and request to finish landscape plan with requirements before final approval by staff. Mr. Roberts agreed. Mr. Oswalt mentioned we can have conditional approval. Mr. Roberts agreed and stated staff could not approve until the lighting and fence were addressed.

Mr. O'Lowell said he would discuss with his architect.

Mr. Allen commented that the sidewalks and curb cuts noted does not address the landscaping. Mr. O'Lowell again stated he will discuss with his architect. Mr. Roberts commented the City zoning staff enforces restrictions on curbcuts.



Mr. Holmes requested a site plan be submitted.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

#### **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Holmes 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, with the exception of being incomplete due to the lack of landscaping and lighting plans.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

#### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Holmes moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and that the application be conceptually approved, contingent on landscaping and lighting plans being submitted and approved by staff as proposed. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

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

**2018-21-CA: 1009 Texas Street**  
**Applicant:** Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. Mike Rogers  
**Received:** 6/14/2018  
**Meeting:** 7/18/2018

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Rehabilitation and Renovation Related: Conduct in kind repairs; Alter fenestration;  
Install lapsiding; Construct rear porch addition.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This Creole cottage residence was included as a part of the latest Oakleigh Garden local expansion.

**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 not appeared before Architectural Review Board according to the MHDC vertical files. The proposed scope of work includes rehabilitating the existing structure and a rear porch addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 2. “Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.”
  - 3. “Consider removing later covering materials that have not achieved historic significance.”
  - 4. “Repair and maintain original roof materials rather than replace them, wherever possible.”
  - 5. “Use new roof materials that convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally.”
  - 6. “Repair or replace a damaged historic door to maintain its general historic appearance.”
  - 7. “Repair a porch (existing) in a way that maintains the original character.”
  - 8. “For most contributing window properties in historic districts, the windows on the front elevation and those on the sidewalls that are most visible from the street will be the most important to preserve.”
  - 9. “When a historic window is missing on a key character-defining wall, use a historically accurate replacement.”
  - 10. “Design an addition so that that the overall character of the site are retained.”

11. "Design an addition to be compatible with the material and character of the property, neighborhood, and environment."
12. "Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color, and/or wall plane."
13. "Place an addition so that it is subordinate to the historic residence."
14. "Design an addition to be compatible with in massing and scale with the original historic structure."
15. "Design the building components (roof, foundations, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible the historic architecture."
16. "Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure."
17. "Design a porch addition roofline to be compatible with the existing historic structure. However, a porch addition roofline need not match exactly that of the existing historic building. For example, a porch addition may have a shed roof."
18. "Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building."
19. "Do not use a contemporary deck railing for a porch addition placed at a location visible from the public street."

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

5. Restore a house.
  - i. Repoint foundation piers with the appropriate mortar.
  - j. Install picketed skirting between piers.
  - k. Remove shingle siding and repair and replace wooden siding.
  - l. Repaint the house (color scheme to be submitted at a later date).
  - m. Repoint chimney.
  - n. Reroof the house with architectural shingles in "Sienna".
  - o. North (façade) Elevation.
    - vi. Remove existing wood balustrade.
    - vii. Construct wooden balustrade appropriate to period of the house.
    - viii. Encase and box existing wood columns.
    - ix. Repair porch decking and stairs.
    - x. Remove the later front door from the main entrance.
    - xi. Restore two doorways and install four-paneled wooden doors.
    - xii. Install new six-over-six windows.
  - p. East (a side) Elevation.
    - v. Install six-over-six window on Northern portion of elevation.
    - vi. Remove window and feather in wood siding on southern portion of elevation.
  - q. West (a side) Elevation.
    - i. Install one wooden six-over-six window on northern portion of elevation.
    - ii. Install six-over-six wooden window in place of a pair of one-over-one windows.
  - r. South (rear) Elevation
    - i. Relocate door to center of elevation.
    - ii. Install a diamond window equidistant on either side of door.
    - iii. Install a new six-over-six wood window.
6. Construct a new rear porch addition on the rear elevation.
  - g. The addition will rest atop brick-faced foundation piers so as to match the rest of the house.
  - h. Picketed lattice skirting will extend between the foundation piers.
  - i. Wooden siding be employed on gable.
  - j. A gable roof will surmount the addition and truncate into existing roof.

- k. The fascia and eave detail will match that found on the body of the house.
  - l. Architectural shingles comprise the roofing sheathing.
  - m. The roof will be supported by chamfered posts.
  - n. A wooden railing composed of horizontal 2x4's will extend around the porch.
  - o. A wooden deck and steps will provide access to the porch.
  - p. The North (the side) Elevation will feature one salvaged.
- 7. Corner boards will be retained/employed.
  - 8. Conduct landscape improvements.
    - a. Install driveway from existing curb cut.
    - b. Install sidewalk from right of way to existing entrance.
    - c. Construct 6' wooden privacy fence behind front plane of house.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the restoration of the body of a contributing residence, changes to fenestration, and construction of a new rear porch addition.

With regard to restoration of existing features found on the main residence, the pertinent portions of the scope of work either involve exacting in-kind repair/replacement of existing features or the replacement of features with historically appropriate ones documenting known or period examples. Windows, sidings, porch posts, and decorative details would be period appropriate and consolidated or replaced to match the existing as per profile, dimension, light configuration, and material (See B 1-3.). The façade's existing main entrance was complimented by another entrance. The proposed changes would restore original features such as dual entrances and six-over-six windows (See B-5 and B-6.). Existing windows on the original body of the house will be replaced to match that of original windows in profile, dimension, and material (See B-8.).

A porch addition, subordinate to the intact portions of the house, is proposed (See B-12). The new addition components (lapsiding, eave details, foundation treatment) will match that of the intact portion of the house (See B-14). A contemporary railing is proposed for the porch addition. The railing is simplistic in design with its spaced horizontal slats. According to the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*, contemporary railings may be used on porch additions not visible from public view. Given the rear location of the porch addition, the railing is in keeping with the Guidelines (See B-18).

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-13), Staff does not believe this application would impair either the architectural or the historical significance of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Douglas Kearley, representative, was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

John Ruzic recused himself from the meeting.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Oswalt welcomed the owner's representative and asked if there were any comments, clarifications or questions he would like to make. Mr. Kearley mentioned there were additional doors at a location.

Mr. Oswalt asked, if he considered covering existing siding. Mr. Kearley stated Covering the existing siding would make it shatter.

Mr. Allen asked about the East Elevation where one window is shown on the plans. Ms. Harden stated the window is in the kitchen. Mr. Kearley replied the window was left off the elevation but exists.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and that the application be approved as proposed.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

**APPLICATION EXPIRES:** July 24, 2019.

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

**2018-22-CA: 458 George Street**  
**Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Restore Mobile**  
**Received: 7/2/2018**  
**Meeting: 7/18/2018**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Rehabilitation and Rear Addition Related: Conduct in-kind repairs; Replace deteriorated elements; Alter later fenestration; Remove later addition; construct new rear addition.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This two bay shotgun dates to circa 1905.

**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 not appeared before the Architectural Review Board according to the MHDC the proposed scope of work includes the rehabilitation of a residence with in-kind repairs, new roof, and new rear addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.”
  - 2. “Consider removing later covering materials that have not achieved historic significance.”
  - 3. “Repair and maintain original roof materials rather than replace them, wherever possible.”
  - 4. “Use new roof materials that convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally.”
  - 5. “Repair or replace a damaged historic door to maintain its general historic appearance.”
  - 6. “Repair a porch (existing) in a way that maintains the original character.”
  - 7. “For most contributing window properties in historic districts, the windows on the front elevation and those on the sidewalls that are most visible from the street will be the most important to preserve.”
  - 8. “When a historic window is missing on a key character-defining wall, use a historically accurate replacement.”
  - 9. “Design an addition so that that the overall character of the site are retained.”

10. "Design an addition to be compatible with the material and character of the property, neighborhood, and environment."
11. "Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color, and/or wall plane."
12. "Place an addition so that it is subordinate to the historic residence."
13. "Design an addition to be compatible with in massing and scale with the original historic structure."
14. "Design the building components (roof, foundations, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible the historic architecture."
15. "When reviewing applications for partial demolition, the following criteria are taken into account: "historical significance; physical condition; impact on the streetscape; and nature of any proposed redevelopment."

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

9. Restore a house.
  - s. Repoint foundation piers with the appropriate mortar.
  - t. Repair and when necessary replace wooden siding to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.
  - u. Repaint the house (color scheme to be submitted at a later date).
  - v. Repoint chimney
  - w. Reroof the house with architectural shingles or metal panels in 5V crimp or standing seam.
  - x. East (façade) Elevation.
    - xiii. Remove existing wood steps accessing the front porch.
    - xiv. Construct wooden steps and railing in the location of the previous steps.
    - xv. Remove the later front door from the main entrance.
    - xvi. Restore doorway and transom and install period appropriate wooden glazed and panel door aforementioned doorway.
    - xvii. Repair and when necessary replace components of an existing window as per light configuration, profile, dimension, and material.
    - xviii. Restore front porch posts and balustrade with turned posts and balustrade.
    - xix. Repair porch decking.
  - y. South (a side) Elevation.
    - vii. Repair wooden windows to match the existing as per light configuration, profile, dimension, and material.
  - z. North (a side) Elevation.
    - iii. Repair wooden windows to match the existing as per light configuration, profile, dimension, and material.
    - iv. Install three-over-three wooden windows salvaged from the removal of a later addition.
  - aa. West (rear) Elevation
    - i. Remove the current door and a later window from southern portion of the West Elevation.
    - ii. Install a new doorway.
    - iii. A wooden stop and steps will provide access to the aforementioned door.
    - iv. Boxed and recessed lattice skirting panels will extend between the foundations of the steps and stoop.
    - v. Wooden picketed railings will be employed on both the steps and the stoop.
    - vi. A wooden awning will extend over the stoop.

- vii. Asphalt shingles matching those on the house and will be employed on the awning.
- 10. Install a new six-over-six wood window.
- 11. Demolish a later rear addition.
- 12. Construct a new rear addition on the location of the aforementioned location.
  - q. The addition will rest atop brick-faced foundation piers so as to match the rest of the house.
  - r. Boxed, framed, and recessed lattice skirting will extend between the foundation piers.
  - s. Wooden board and batten siding be employed.
  - t. Salvaged windows and door will be employed.
  - u. A gable roof will surmount the addition, extending from the existing roof.
  - v. The fascia and eave detail will match that found on the body of the house.
  - w. Metal panels or architectural shingles comprise the roofing sheathing.
  - x. The West (rear) Elevation will feature one six over- six-over six wooden window and a glazed and panel door
  - y. A wooden deck and steps will provide access to the aforementioned door.
  - z. The door will be covered by a canopy.
  - aa. The North (the side) Elevation will feature one salvaged window.
- 13. Corner boards will be retained/employed.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the restoration of the body of a contributing residence, changes to fenestration, the demolition of a later rear addition, and construction of a new rear addition

With regard to restoration of existing features found on the main residence, the pertinent portions of the scope of work either involve exacting in-kind repair/replacement of existing features or the replacement of features with historically appropriate ones documenting known or period examples. Windows, sidings, porch posts, and decorative details would be period appropriate and consolidated or replaced to match the existing as per profile, dimension, light configuration, and material (See B 1-3.). The façade's existing main entrance is not original. The proposed replacement matches that found those found in the neighborhood (See B-10.). Existing windows on the original body of the house will be repaired to match that which surrounding as per profile, dimension, and material (See B-1.).

The demolition of a later rear addition is proposed. When reviewing applications for partial demolition, the following criteria are taken into account: historical significance; physical condition; impact on the streetscape; and nature of any proposed redevelopment (See B-15.). With regard to the historical significance, the portion of the house proposed for demolition is not original to the building. Sanborn Maps, physical fabric, and stylistic evidence corroborate to show these parts of the larger whole are of a later date. The addition suffers from deferred maintenance. Viewed at angles from the primary street, both the additions do not directly engage the public view. As per the nature of interventions impacting the redevelopment of the pertinent portions of the building, a small addition with porch deck that compliment and would not jeopardize the house are proposed (See B-10.).

Pertaining to the addition, it would be subordinate to the intact portions of the house (See B-12). Individual fenestrated units would be employed and would match the existing in terms of appearance and placement (See B 11, 13, & 14.).



## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-10), Staff does not believe this application would impair either the architectural or the historical significance of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Douglas Kearley, representative, and Sydney Betbeze, representative, were present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

John Ruzic returned to the meeting.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Oswalt welcomed the owner's representatives and asked if there were any comments, clarifications or questions he would like to make.

Ms. Harden asked, it looks like a bracket wall line is there. Mr. Kearley commented yes it is a stock design.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and that the application be approved as proposed.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

**APPLICATION EXPIRES:** July 24, 2019.

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

**2018-17-CA: 1654 Government Street**  
**Applicant: Pamela and Jeffrey Kent**  
**Received: 5/21/2018**  
**Meeting: PREVIOUSLY HELDOVER at 6/6/18**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: HELDOVER: Porch Related: Retain wooden porch railing, planters, and gate constructed without Certificate of Appropriateness.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This bungalow was designed by notable local architect C.L. Hutchisson, Sr. and constructed in 1924. Mr. Hutchisson was responsible for over 233 residence designs in Mobile; 37 in Old Dauphin Way.

**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 October 24<sup>th</sup>, 1995 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time the repair of a roof was approved. The proposed scope of work includes retaining wooden railings and planters.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  1. “Preserving a front porch is a high priority. A rear or side porch also may be important to preserve, especially for a building located on a corner lot, and their preservation is encouraged.”
  2. “Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character.”
  3. “If replacement is required, design it to reflect the time period of the historic structure.”
  4. “Where an original porch is missing entirely, base a replacement porch on physical or photographic evidence. If no evidence exists, draw from similar structures in the neighborhood.”
  5. “When reconstructing a porch, pay particular attention to matching the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details”
  6. “The removal or alteration of any historic landscaping features, materials, or distinctive architectural features should be avoided.”
  7. “Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible.”
  8. “Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure or site should be treated with sensitivity with particular emphasis on preservation of the features.”
  9. “Preserve an original porch or gallery on a house.”

10. "Replace a historic porch element to match the original."
11. "Use replacement materials and elements that are appropriate to the style, texture, finish, composition and proportion of the historic structure."
12. "When reconstructing a porch, pay particular attention to matching the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details."
13. "Do not use a railing that is too elaborate for the building (of a different style)."
14. "(Pertaining to porch additions) "Do not use a contemporary deck railing for a porch addition placed at a location visible from the public street."

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

1. Retain the following porch components:
  - a. Wooden slats will stack to form a wooden railing.
  - b. The railing will be placed between existing brick plinths and planters.
  - c. The wooden planters will be constructed on top of brick plinths.
  - d. A wooden stair with gate will be located on the east elevation and access the side yard.
  - e. Wood will be stained.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the retention of porch railing, planters and wooden stairs with gate installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness. The application had been held over at the June 6<sup>th</sup>, 2018 ARB meeting. At that time, a Design Review Committee had been set in place for an onsite visit for further review. On June 14<sup>th</sup> Ms. Catarina Echols and Mr. Robert Allen visited the site with the owner.

The house had featured a Chippendale style pattern appropriate for the period of the building. Photographic evidence unsurfaced after the June 6<sup>th</sup> meeting shows a different traditional railing in place circa 1977. The latest images on file shows this Craftsman influenced Bungalow with Chippendalesque railing was in place until 2017. When replacing a porch detail, the *Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts* state that if replacement of a porch element is necessary, the replacement "the time period of the historic structure"(See B-3). The guidelines further address replacement of porch elements are to be appropriate to the style, finish and texture, composition and proportion of the historic building (See B-11). While the wood material of railings, planters, and gate is acceptable, the composition and profile of the boards is not period appropriate.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-3), Staff does believe the application as is will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the property or district. Staff recommends denial of the application as proposed.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

The owner requested the application be heldover until the August 1<sup>st</sup> meeting.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Oswalt asked for legal guidance on the rules and ordinance regarding the holdovers of applications, and what the motion needs to state. Ms. Kessler replied someone would need to make to make a motion

to hold over the request and waive the application deadline so it will not be automatically approved in 45 days.

Mr. Sledge noted the application was received on May 21<sup>st</sup> and heard by the Board on June 6<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Harden commented action was taken at the June 6<sup>th</sup> meeting for a Design Review Committee to visit the site. Ms. Kessler commented the rule is to not personalize the Board.

Mr. Oswalt commented the Board needed to make a motion.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Holmes made a motion to hold over at the request of the owner with the understanding to waive restrictions on action taken on an application. .

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.