

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
June 17, 2015 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Robert Allen, David Barr, Kim Harden, Harris Oswalt, and Jim Wagoner.
Members Absent: Catarina Echols, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes II, Bradford Ladd, and Robert Brown, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone,
Staff Members Present: Cartledge W. Blackwell, III.
2. moved to approve the minutes for the June 17, 2015 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: David Gwatkin**
 - a. Property Address: 1751 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/20/15
 - c. Project: Reroof rear porch (flat), replace sill.
2. **Applicant: GDS Constructions, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 203 Michigan Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/20/15
 - c. Project: Reroof the house to match the existing.
3. **Applicant: Jennifer and Jake Roberts**
 - a. Property Address: 60 North Reed Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/21/15
 - c. Project: Construct a deck and ancillary building per submitted plans. The work will not visible from the public. The deck will feature a simple picketed railing. The ancillary building will be detailed to match the house.
4. **Applicant: Lou Ann Ingram**
 - a. Property Address: 1102 Savannah Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/22/15
 - c. Project: Pain the house in the following paint scheme: body, Benjamin Moore Sherwood Green; trim, Benjamin Moore Linen White; porch deck, Sherwin Williams Juniper Blue; accent, Sherwin Williams Dark Night.
5. **Applicant: Freedom Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 61 North Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/27/15
 - c. Project: Install roof: 30 year, Owens Corning, charcoal in color.
6. **Applicant: Stevi and Barry Gaston**
 - a. Property Address: 307 Chatham Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/28/15
 - c. Project: Reconstruct a flight of brick steps accessing the front steps reusing same salvaged bricks. The steps, which are not original to the house, will be reconstructed with deeper treads.
7. **Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architecture**
 - a. Property Address: 1204 Old Shell Road

- b. Date of Approval: 5/28/15
- c. Project: Construct previously approved dormers off of a rear elevation. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme is necessary.

8. Applicant: David Naman

- a. Property Address: 259 Michigan Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 5/28/15
- c. Project: Secure mothballing measure over exposed fenestrated units.

9. Applicant: Affordable Painting, Roofing, and Construction

- a. Property Address: 164 Roper Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/1/15
- c. Project: Repaint the house to match the existing color scheme. Repair and if necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.

10. Applicant: David Paton

- a. Property Address: 56 Semmes Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 6/3/15
- c. Project: Reroof with charcoal gray shingles, three tab.

11. Applicant: Coast Exterior Construction Company

- a. Property Address: 200 Catherine Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/3/15
- c. Project: Reroof with asphalt with asphalt shingles.

12. Applicant: Brew Port, LLC

- a. Property Address: 225 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/2/15
- c. Project: Hang wood business sign under balcony on Dauphin Street, four feet by two feet six inches. Install small sign on glass door.

13. Applicant: Daryl Manning

- a. Property Address: 266 Dexter Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 6/2/15
- c. Project: Replace rotten as necessary, replace six foot privacy fence boards as needed, repaint house sea foam blue, white trim, black doors.

14. Applicant: Jeffrey Goodman

- a. Property Address: 301 S. Georgia
- b. Date of Approval: 6/2/15
- c. Project: Reroof with black asphalt shingles.

15. Applicant: Shirley Jones

- a. Property Address: 354 Rapier Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/1/15
- c. Project: Construct three foot wood fence across front of lot facing Elmira, and wrapping south side to front porch of neighbor, then rise to six foot privacy fence along south side of lot. Construct six foot privacy fence down south side of 354. Erect wood storage shed in back yard, roof to match that of house.

16. Applicant: Taylor Atchison

- a. Property Address: 913 Augusta Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/3/15
- c. Project: Construct a deck of the side elevation. Install enclosures (wall, but not roofed) atop the deck. Repaint the building. The walls will be a muted gray. Repair and when necessary replaced deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.

- 17. Applicant: Darryl Manning**
a. Property Address: 1504 Eslava Street
b. Date of Approval: 6/2/15
c. Project: Replace fence per existing, replace rot as needed, repaint body sea foam blue, white trim, black door.
- 18. Applicant: Katrina Norris**
a. Property Address: 20 South Reed Street
b. Date of Approval: 6/5/15
c. Project: Repaint house white with gray trim.
- 19. Applicant: Kevin Shaw**
a. Property Address: 61 North Ann Street
b. Date of Approval: 6/5/15
c. Project: This COA amends that of May 27, 2015. Reroof house and garage with charcoal gray roof.
- 20. Applicant: John Dendy for Rennie Brabner**
a. Property Address: 303 North Conception Street
b. Date of Approval: 6/4/15
c. Project: This COA amends that of 16 March 2015. Due to level of deterioration in the non historic 1985 addition, demolish addition, and reconstruct per plans by John Dendy.
- 21. Applicant: Allyson Knight**
a. Property Address: 1555 Monterey Pl.
b. Date of Approval: 6/5/15
c. Project: Repaint house per existing colors.
- 22. Applicant: Mobile Carnival Museum**
a. Property Address: 355 Government Street
b. Date of Approval: 6/9/15
c. Project: Construct a six foot interior lot privacy enclosure around a dumpster area for reasons of enclosure.
- 23. Applicant: Southern Property Hounds, LLC**
a. Property Address: 1111 Elmira Street
b. Date of Approval: 6/9/15
c. Project: Remove later aluminum windows. Install period wooden windows (three-over-one in configuration). Touch up the paint. Install a period appropriate door. Lengthen a window and install a salvaged door-window and wooden shutters. Install wooden moldings atop the aforementioned fenestrated unit.
- 24. Applicant: Southern Property Hounds, LLC**
a. Property Address: 1109 Elmira Street
b. Date of Approval: 6/9/15
c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles. Touch up paint. Replace glazing on windows to match the existing.
- 25. Applicant: Thomas Beleale**
a. Property Address: 65 South Julia Street
b. Date of Approval: 6/8/15
c. Project: Jack and level out porch with new footings, repair cracks in brick.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2015-25-CA: 2301 DeLeon Avenue

- a. Applicant: James Carter of James F. Carter, Inc., Architect for Bradford and Francie Ladd
- b. Project: Additions - Construct two additions off of the rear elevation and porch addition.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Guidelines Update
- 2. Neighborhood Updates

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-25-CA: 2301 DeLeon Avenue
Applicant: James Carter of James F. Carter, Inc., Architect for Bradford and Francie Ladd
Received: 6/1/15
Meeting: 6/17/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Additions - Construct two additions off of the rear elevation and a side porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Colonial Revival house dates from 1913. Designed by noted Mobile architect C. L. Hutchisson, Sr, the dwelling is informed by two popular currents of the Colonial Revival expression. A Georgian informed ethos is observed in façade’s classically detailed main entrance and the house’s overall symmetry. Spanish Colonial Revival flavor is seen in the peddledash stucco work and overhanging eaves. This combination of Anglo and Latin informed variants of the Colonial Revival was employed in several other houses of the same period. Other examples by C. L. Hutchison include 207 Lanier Avenue, 1800 Dauphin Street, and 1202 Government Street. George Rogers, another Mobile architect of the era, designed two lost houses on Government Street in the idiom. 211 Lanier Avenue is third example within Ashland Place

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 application up for review calls for construction of two rear wings. The wings would extend from existing wings.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
 - 2. “The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan, floor plans, elevations, and other submitted materials):

1. Remove fencing.
2. Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.
3. Construct two new rear wings off the South Elevation.
 - a. The additions will be open and enclosed in form.
 - b. Said additions will be two-story in height.
 - c. The additions will rest atop a foundation treatment matching that found on the body of the house.
 - d. The stucco wall facings will match the treatment of those found on the main dwelling.
 - e. Wooden siding (where employed) will match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.
 - f. The roofs will be of the same hipped roof form, continue the same roof pitch, feature the same eave treatment (in overhang and articulation), and employ the same roofing shingles as those to surmount the main house.
4. The East Wing will extend from an existing porch and sun porch.
 - a. The east wing's first floor will be an extension of an existing porch.
 - b. Stuccoed porch piers will be replicated on first floor porch extension.
 - c. The east wing's second floor will be an extension of a previously enclosed sun porch.
 - d. The siding of the porch will match the existing.
 - e. A sill rail will be altered in height so align with that extending around the whole of the main house's upper story. Said sill rail will extend around the east wing.
 - f. Remove a later six-over-six wooden window from the enclosed porch's East Elevation.
 - g. East Elevation
 - i. The first floor will feature two lattice bays located on either side of a chimney. Said chimney will be stucco-faced to match the main house's stuccoed surfaces.
 - ii. The latticed bays will be framed and fitted into the reveals.
 - iii. The second floor will feature two six wooden light windows with casings matching those employed on the body of the house.
 - h. South Elevation
 - i. The first floor will be defined by stuccoed pier matching existing stuccoed piers.
 - ii. Wood framed screening of a three bay sequence will be located between the aforementioned piers. Said screening will be feature and intermediate post and continuous dado-like rail.
 - iii. The second floor will feature a twelve-over one wooden window/
 - i. West Elevation
 - i. The first floor will feature a latticed bay and an open bay. The latter will communicate to a low pitched metal roofed gallery extending between the two wings.
 - ii. The second floor will feature two six light wooden windows.
5. Construct a connector between the two additions.
 - a. The connecting gallery's roof will be so pitched to preserve the windows lighting an original staircase.
 - b. The gallery will feature defined by framed screening of a tripartite design. A door with transom like space above will occupy the center bay. Dado-like rails will be located in and divide the flanking bays.

6. The West Wing will extend from, enlarge, and reface (wood to stucco) an existing wing (glazed above and below).
 - a. A sill rail will be altered in height so align with that extending around the whole of the main house's upper story. Said sill rail will extend around the east wing.
 - b. The additions will be open and enclosed in form.
 - c. Said additions will be two-story in height.
 - d. The additions will rest atop a foundation treatment matching that found on the body of the house.
 - e. The stucco wall facings will match the treatment of those found on the main dwelling.
 - f. East Elevation
 - i. The first floor will feature four double French doors with surmounting transoms.
 - ii. The aforementioned transoms will be comprised of paired four light windows.
 - iii. The second floor will feature four twelve-over-one wooden windows.
 - a. South Elevation
 - i. The South Elevation will be defined by a single story shed roofed western section and two story hipped roof eastern section.
 - ii. The two-story portion will feature a chimney flanked by six-light windows on both its upper and lower stories.
 - iii. A wood frame arbor will extend between the one-story portion of the and the existing garage.
 - iv. A glazed wood frame door with surmounting transom will access the arbor.
 - b. West Elevation
 - i. A single-story hipped roof shed will extend from the West Elevation.
 - ii. The first-story fenestration will be as follows (from North to South): a twelve-over-one window; a multi-light tripartite window unit; and a twelve light window. The two latter fenestrated components will distinguish the ones-story portion of the addition.
 - iii. The upper-story will feature three twelve-over-one wooden windows.
7. Construct side entrance.
 - a. The entrance will be located within the lower portion of an advanced bay occupied by two windows.
 - b. The entrance will take the form of a distyle portico patterned after the front entrance.
 - c. A flight of cascading steps of the same material as the front steps will access the porch.
 - d. The Tuscan columns will match those on front porch.
 - e. The entablature will match that on front porch
 - f. The porch's end bays will feature wooden settles.
8. Repair an existing driveway.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the construction of rear additions and a side entrance. While visible from the public view (on account of the property being a corner lot), the additions would not impact the façade or alter the character of the property. The two rear additions would take the form of expansions to and the refacing of previously altered galleries/sun porches and the porch would extend from a minimally visible side elevation.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that new additions shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment (See B-1.). The two proposed wings, which would be connected by a gallery, are designed so to retain the rear elevation's court-like configuration and feel. The East Wing would take the form on open first-floor and an enclosed upper story. The openness of the first-story and differentiation in light pattern on the second-story will serve to differentiate the historic from the new fabric. The West Wing would be wholly enclosed. The advanced single-story shed-roofed space on the West Elevation and the full-length fenestration on East Elevation would allow the addition to "read" as a later, albeit sensitive, intervention within an existing built context. Matching wall treatments (stucco work and siding), roof overhangs, rafter treatments, fenestration types, and foundation treatments afford continuity to the overall whole.

In a manner similar to the rear additions, the proposed side porch is designed to work in harmony with historic fabric. Two windows would be removed, but in accord with Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the new fenestration would be compatible with the general character of the building (See B-2.). The single-story of said entrance serves as a differential between it and the body of the house. Elements and details are drawn from and based on those of the front entrance (See B-1.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Bill Cherry, Bradford Ladd, and Francie Ladd were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicants and their representative. He asked Mrs. Ladd, Mr. Ladd and Mr. Cherry if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Ladd explained to the Board that instead employing wooden siding on the upper-story of the proposed East Wing he and Mrs. Ladd would prefer to employ stucco wall facings matching those on the main house (as much as possible) and the addition. He explained that wooden treatment depicted in the plans and infilling the old sleeping porch was akin to plyboard in composition. The Board referenced photographs showing the appearance and commented on the nature of wooden infill under discussion.

Mr. Cherry introduced a brief discussion regarding stucco types. Mr. Blackwell and Mr. Allen took part in the discussion.

Discussion ensued as to the roof sheathing. Mr. Cherry recommended the use of terracotta or terracotta-like roofing tiles on the ridges of the roofs. Mr. Blackwell asked Mr. Ladd to clarify that roof was a latter roof. He showed pictures to that effect. Mr. Ladd verified the same. He allowed that the original wooden shingles still survive under the present roof. Ms. Harden asked what type of roofing treatment was proposed. Mrs. Ladd explained that while she, Mr. Ladd, and their contractor had not selected a roof cladding, the tile selected would be of dimensions similar to the existing tiles asbestos tiles and complementary to the house. Mr. Ladd volunteered to come back before the Board for approval of the roofing treatment if it could not be approved on Staff level. The assembled Board members agreed to defer the approval of the roofing shingles to staff. Ms. Harden noted that Staff approves roofing solutions as a general roof in most situations.

Ms. Harden inquired as to the two proposed chimney stacks. A discussion of the graduation and proportion of chimneys ensued. Mrs. Ladd assured the Board that the chimneys would respect the proportioning of house. She pointed out the proportion of the chimney on the West Wing was reflective of the internal volume it would serve. Ms. Harden referenced the proportion and graduation of the house's historic end chimney located on the East Elevation. She noted that similarities between the existing and proposed chimneys.

Mr. Ladd informed the Board that he and Mrs. Ladd wanted to remove a chimney located within the existing house. He added that it was neither a working chimney nor a distinctive feature of the house. Mr. Ladd stated that said chimney posed both safety and mechanical concerns. Ms. Harden and Mr. Allen asked for clarification as to the location of the chimney. After realizing the location of the chimney, Ms. Harden and Mr. noted that it was an internal not an external end or projecting chimney.

Mr. Ladd and Mr. Cherry mentioned that the possible of employing columnar supports on the side porch that would differ from those proposed, ones which match those on the main entrance. Discussion ensued as to design and composition. It was agreed to allow staff to review and approve the aforementioned columnar treatment.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Other than the applicants and their contractor, there was no one else in the audience.

Upon Mr. Oswalt's closing of the period of public comment, Mr. Ladd left the room for the Board deliberation.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Wagoner moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that the material facing of the East Wing would be stucco instead of wood and an internal chimney would be removed, as well as the staff review and approval of columnar supports for side entrance and roofing shingles.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/17/16