

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
June 19, 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, and Craig Roberts.
Members Absent: Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, Steve Stone, Jim Wagoner, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the June 5, 2013 meeting as posted. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: Fred Bauer**
 - a. Property Address: 9 South Julia Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/31/13
 - c. Project: Paint the house in the existing yellow color: Body: Lowe's A11-3 Butter; Trim: White; Porch Deck: Gray; Porch Ceiling: Blue. Replace front, cement steps with brick. Antipode's to remain. Replace side wood steps with brick. Repair roof replacing four roof jacks reattaching loose tiles.
2. **Applicant: Clark, Greer, Latham Associates**
 - a. Property Address: 61 South Conception Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/30/13
 - c. Project: Renewal for of a Certificate of Appropriateness issued on 2 May 2012. The CoA called for the construction of a parking lot and the installation of fencing.
3. **Applicant: Sheila McMahon**
 - a. Property Address: 102 Hannon Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/31/13
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
4. **Applicant: Patrick Tolbert**
 - a. Property Address: 201 Saint Joseph Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/31/13
 - c. Project: Install a new covering over a vehicular bay.
5. **Applicant: Joe Bradley**
 - a. Property Address: 359 Saint Francis Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/30/13
 - c. Project: Paint the building Benjamin Moore's Overcast.
6. **Applicant: Nik Shah**
 - a. Property Address: 555 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/3/13
 - c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.
7. **Applicant: Mark Keith**
 - a. Property Address: 553 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/29/13

- c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme: the body will be Svelte Sage; the lower-story fishscales will be Conti Street Grey Green; the upper-story fishscales will be Charles Street Brick; the main trim will be Dauphin Street Light Gold; the accent details will be Jorgenson Manor, Kendall Lodge, and Duxsberry Green.

8. Applicant: R & J Home Repair

- a. Property Address: 1626 Spring Hill Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 6/5/13
- c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repair and when necessary replace windows to match the existing in material, construction, and light configuration. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.

9. Applicant: Arthur B. Crooker, Jr.

- a. Property Address: 28 South Lafayette Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/5/13
- c. Project: Remove an existing vehicular gate and reconstruct a gate matching the existing that will be located further into the lot.

10. Applicant: Kimberly Hargrove

- a. Property Address: 1461 Brown Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/5/13
- c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

11. Applicant: Langan Construction

- a. Property Address: 15 Macy Place
- b. Date of Approval: 6/5/13
- c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.

12. Applicant: Bea Forniss

- a. Property Address: 308 Charles Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/6/13
- c. Project: Replace new non-matching wood with wood to match the original in profile, dimension, and material. Paint repairs as needed.

13. Applicant: Melanie Bunting

- a. Property Address: 1558 Bruister Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/7/13
- c. Project: Paint the house in the following paint scheme: Body – St. Anthony Street Gray (BLP); Trim – Light Sandstone (Behr); Accent – Cherry Bark (Behr); and Porch Floor – Fort Conde Gray Beige (BLP); Repair balusters to match existing in profile, dimension and material.

14. Applicant: Victoria D. Oetken

- a. Property Address: 26 South Lafayette Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/4/13
- c. Project: Replace a wooden gate to match that which existed.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2013-42-CA: 259 North Jackson Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Tim Lloyd and James Gilbert
- b. Project: New Construction and Fencing - Construct a rear wing and construct walls/fencing.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2013-43-CA: 1209 Elmira Street

- a. Applicant: Felipe Garcia with Felipe Garcia R and C for Robert Brooks
- b. Project: Alterations to a Rear Elevation – Infill the remainder of a partially enclosed two-tiered gallery.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2013-44-CA: 258 State Street

- a. Applicant: Don Williams for John Bridler
- b. Project: New Construction – Construct an elevator shaft off the Rear Elevation and extend a porch located off the old service wing.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2013-45-CA: 1700 Church Street

- a. Applicant: Randy Delchamps for the estate of Charles Harris, Jr.
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a residential building.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Foley Conference
- 2. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-42-CA: 259 North Jackson Street
Applicant: Douglas Burtu Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Tim Lloyd and James Gilbert
Received: 6/3/13
Meeting: 6/19/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction and Fencing – Construct a new rear wing and construct fencing.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to notes located within the MHDC property files, this side hall house was constructed in 1866. The Italianate style dwelling is a surviving example of scores of independent and attached row houses that once lined Mobile’s easternmost residential thoroughfares.

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 June 5, 2013. At that time, the Board approved the reconstruction of a front gallery. With this application, the new owners/applicants propose the construction of a rear addition and the construction of fencing.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy 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. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
 - 3. Fencing “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.”

- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Remove a later stoop accessing the rear entrance.
 2. Infill with brick (to match the existing) the lower portions a later vertical strip window. The replacement window wood in material and single light in configuration.
 3. Construct a rear addition (per submitted plans).
 - a. The addition will measure 24' by 26' in plan.
 - b. The addition will take the form of a single-story enclosed space with and L-shaped porch.
 - c. The stucco-faced addition will be surmounted by a hipped roof. Asphalt shingles will sheath the roof.
 - d. Framed and recessed lattice skirting will extend between the porch's stuccoed foundation piers.
 - e. A flight of west-facing and north-facing splayed steps will access the porch.
 - f. Square section wooden porch posts will provide a rhythmic sequence on the porch.
 - g. Tongue-and-groove porch decking will top the porch's substructure.
 - h. The addition's South Elevation will feature a six-over-six wooden window.
 - i. The addition's West (Rear) Elevation will feature a double French door unit with flanking side lights and surmounting transom. Said fenestrated bay will access the porch and will be locate behind four square section posts.
 - j. The addition's North Elevation will feature a double French door unit with flanking side lights and surmounting transom. Said fenestrated bay will access the porch and will be located behind four square section posts.
 4. Demolish a later ancillary building.
 5. Install a brick walkway that will extend between the inner edge of the sidewalk and the reconstructed front porch (approved during the 5 June 2013 meeting).
 6. Remove a concrete block wall located behind the property's eastern brick wall.
 7. Construct a stuccoed CMU wall that will extend along the South and West lot lines. A portion of wall of the same design will extend between the house and the existing wall extending along the North lot line. An double iron gate will allow for ingress and egress. The wall fields will measure 6' in height. The wall piers with their surmounting caps will measure 6' 8" in height.
 8. Construct a 30" iron fence atop an 8" bring coping wall. Said wall and fencing will extend from the termination of the East lot line's existing brick wall to a point just beyond the front walkway. The wall-fence construction will tie-into the northeast corner of the house.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a rear addition and the construction of walls and fencing.

Meeting setback and lot coverage requirements, the proposed addition would be minimally visible from the public view. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the addition's single-story form and stuccoed walls differentiate it from two-story massing and brick walls of the main house (See B-1).

With regard to the proposed walls and fencing, the removal of the expanse of concrete blocks located behind the eastern section of wall would remove an unsympathetic alteration to the property. The proposed stuccoed wall meets the design and material standards (See B-3). The proposed iron fence a coping wall is a historical combination that the Board has approved on locations within the DeTonti Square Historic District (258 State Street for instance). Iron open-work fencing is allowed up to a height of four feet.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley 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. Kearley if he had any questions to ask, clarifications to address, or comments to make. Mr. Kearley responded by saying that the small section of the wall extending along the eastern lot line would be removed. He also noted that the site plan shown in the PowerPoint presentation was an earlier version. Mr. Roberts thanked Mr. Kearley for the clarifications.

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

Mr. Karwinski said that he had several questions to ask. He asked Mr. Kearley how parking would be accommodated. Mr. Kearley responded by saying that existing curbcut and parking pad would remain in place. Mr. Karwinski asked for clarification as to the height of the coping wall. Mr. Kearley said the coping wall would be 8' as stated in the Staff Report. No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd 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 as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/19/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-43-CA: 1209 Elmira Street
Applicant: Felipe Garcia with Felipe Garcia R and C for Robert Brooks
Received: 6/3/13
Meeting: 6/19/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Alterations to a Rear Elevation – Infill the remainder of a partially enclosed two-tiered gallery.

BUILDING HISTORY

This classically proportioned foursquare dwelling dates from 1908. Both the house’s interior plan and fittings survive intact.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicant proposes the infill the remainder of a partially enclosed two-tiered gallery.
- 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. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Infill the upper-story and the lower-story galleries of a partially enclosed rear porch.
 - a. A double multi-light French door with surmounting transom and a four light wooden window matching that found on the body of the house will comprise the lower story’s south-facing fenestration. A single light window will comprise the west-facing fenestration. The framing of the windows will match that found on the body of the house.
 - b. A porch post will be removed.
 - c. A wooden stoop and flight of wooden steps will access the French door. Wooden picket rails and boxed pedestal-like newel posts will surmount the stoop. Matching picket railings will be located on either end of the stairs. A pergola-like device will extend over

the stoop. A second cantilevered device will be located to the west of the lower-story window.

- d. A framed transom and a framed single light window will comprise the upper story's south-facing fenestration. A single light window will comprise the upper-story's west-facing fenestration. The framing of the windows will match that found on the body of the house.
- e. Two intermediate posts will be removed from the upper gallery. The two terminating posts (one engaged to the wall and other free-standing) will remain.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the infill of a two-tiered rear gallery. This rear porch is already partially enclosed. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that alterations to historic structures should be differentiated from, yet compatible with the existing (See B-1). By retaining the corner posts, the infill will still "read" as a porch, only one that has been enclosed. Siding and windows will match those found on the main house and will provide continuity. The alterations are reversible (See B-2).

CLARIFICATIONS

1. Will the newel posts located on the stoop be employed at the termination of the steps?

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Philippe Lacoste and Robert Brooks were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant and his representative. He asked Mr. Brooks and Mr. Lacoste if they had any questions to ask, clarifications to address, or comments to make. Mr. Lacoste and Mr. Brooks stated that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application as proposed.

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

Mr. Roberts complimented the renderings.

Mr. Lacoste and Mr. Roberts distributed revised drawings.

Mr. Karwinski asked for clarification regarding the corner board depicted in the drawing of the West Elevation. Mr. Bemis noted that the corner board is an existing feature. Mr. Karwinski said that drawing was incorrectly rendered. He asked if the application called for changes to the front porch. Mr. Brooks responded no, but added that he did have a question regarding the façade that he would put before the Board following the ruling of the application up for review. Mr. Karwinski asked for clarification

regarding the cantilevered devices. Mr. Lacoste and Mr. Brooks addressed Mr. Karwinski's query. Mr. Karwinski asked for clarification as to the location of the plane of the infill's rear wall. The applicant and his representative explained that the addition would be in plane with the existing walls. Mr. Karwinski pointed out that the drawings did not accurately depict what was proposed.

Mr. Ladd asked if there were any further questions for the applicant or his representative. 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, Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts as 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: 6/19/14

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION

Following the approval of the application, Mr. Brooks and Mr. Lacoste submitted renderings of possible changes to the front elevation. They expressed their interrelated intentions of preserving the historical integrity of the house, improving the building's appearance, and obtaining a Banner and Shield. The Board examined possible alterations to the façade as depicted in imagery inserted into their PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Roberts opened the discussion. He stated that from an architectural perspective, he admired the rendering. After making several suggestions, he said architectural quality and historical integrity are not one and the same.

Mr. Blackwell and Mr. Bemis outlined the four principle changes depicted: the division of the existing columnar posts into lower pedestal and upper shaft; the addition of the lower gallery railing; the reinstallation of an upper-gallery railing; and the alteration to upper-story fenestration.

Discussion ensued as to whether a railing would be required. Mr. Blackwell explained that existing columns are replacement columns. According to photographs located in the property's MHDC file, the porch originally featured unfluted Doric columns. Mr. Blackwell told the Board that the same picture in found within the property file recorded portions of a gallery that extended around the upper gallery. Mr. Bemis initiated a discussion regarding the upper-story fenestration.

Mr. Karwinski suggested that the applicants hire a good restoration architect.

Mr. Allen asked how similar window units were treated on other area windows as to type, style, and period. Mr. Blackwell told the Board of other examples. He said that the interior casing and surrounds of the windows evidenced no signs of alterations. Mr. Blackwell added that sizes and locations of units were similar to other examples. Mr. Brooks and Mr. Lacoste thanked the Board and said that they would follow up with the Staff.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-44-CA: 258 State Street
Applicant: Don Williams for John Bridler
Received: 6/5/13
Meeting: 6/19/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a Rear Addition – Construct an elevator shaft and extend a porch located off the old service wing.

BUILDING HISTORY

William K. Thurber constructed this side hall with wing house in 1851. A cast iron gallery originally graced the façade's three western bays.

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 house has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicant proposes the construction an elevator shaft and a connector between elevator shaft and the balcony located off the Rear (North) Elevation.
- 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. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
 - 3. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions, and decorative details.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Construct a rear addition (an elevator shaft).
 - a. The addition will measure 8’ x 9’ in plan.
 - b. The addition will be constructed of either “Old Mobile” or weathered modern brick.
 - c. The water table will be continued around the addition.

- d. Brick-veneered and recessed faux windows will be employed on the upper and lower-stories of the addition's West and North Elevations. The dimensions of the windows will match those found on the body of the house. Stuccoed window sills matching those employed on the body of the house will be employed.
 - e. The addition will feature flounder-like parapets.
 - f. The addition will be surmounted by a shed roof that will continue the roof pitch of the main roof.
 - g. The roofing shingles will match the existing.
2. Extend a porch roof.
- a. Connect the service wing's reconstructed side gallery to the main house.
 - b. The roof pitch and sheathing off the extended roof will match the existing.
 - c. Crickets will be employed.
 - d. The entablature will match the existing in profile and materials.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. What is the height of the proposed addition?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a rear addition and the continuation of a porch. Both interventions would be located the rear of this corner lot property.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that additions should be differentiated from, yet compatible with the historic building (See B-1). The use of brick walls will serve to differentiate the addition from the stuccoed walls of the main house. The use of an articulated water table and the dimensions of faux windows will allow for continuity proportions and features.

With regard to the continuation of the service wing's side gallery, the gallery already has features a upper porch deck. The entablature and pitch of the roofed portions of the gallery will be continued over the subject area and tie into the house as was originally to the dwelling (as documented by Sanborn Maps depicting the porch in its original configuration). In accord with Design Review Guidelines, the proportions would be in keeping with the existing (See B-3).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

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

Mr. Roberts complimented Mr. Williams on all the notations in the plans submitted for review.

Mr. Karwinski stated that he was concerned about how the addition would abut the building. He asked Mr. Williams if it could be constructed with a reveal or some other device/element that would provide a break between the old and the new. Mr. Roberts said that while he appreciated Mr. Karwinski's concern, he thought that the location, materials, and height of the addition would serve to adequately differentiate from the main house. Mr. Williams explained how the use of reveal or some similar device would not allow deter access and installation of the proposed elevator.

No further Board discussion ensued. Mr. Ladd asked there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, 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 Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/19/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-45-CA: 1700 Church Street
Applicant: Randy Delchamps for the Estate of Charles Harris, Jr.
Received: 6/3/13
Meeting: 6/19/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition – Demolish a residential building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This contributing residence dates from 1945. The single story residence features a gabled stoop entrance and large side porch.

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 August 1, 2012. The application called for the demolition of the property’s contributing residence. The property had previously appeared before the Board on November 2, 2011 with the same request. The Board encouraged the applicant to investigate alternative courses of action such as listing the property for sale. The property was listed for sale, but received no offers. The applicant’s representative reappears before the Board application calling for the demolition of the house.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
 - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
 - 1. “Minimal Traditional” in style, this contributing residence is one many single story houses featuring stoop accessed front entrances and screened side porches found across the region. This wood frame example is situated on a corner lot amid buildings of similar date and style.

- 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 is located in the westernmost block of Church Street. Extending through three historic districts, the final block of Church Street, upon which this house is situated, is located within the Leinkauf Historic District. This house and others of comparable date and similar treatment comprise an intact streetscape which extends from Breamwood to Houston Streets. The house contributes to the built density, architectural significance, and historic integrity of the surrounding district.
- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 - 1. A portion of the west elevation has collapsed due to deferred maintenance. The interior has been trespassed upon on numerous occasions. Since last appearing before the Board in November of 2012, the deterioration has escalated despite the lawn being cleared and the building mothballed.
- 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. Single story houses of this design can be found across the Southeast and Northeast.
- 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 applicants would level the lot and plant grass on the site. The lot would function as a green space.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. The property is being gifted to St. John’s Episcopal Church.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. After assessing the condition of the house and receiving no offers purchase from an outside party, the owner and Church have decided to reapply for demolition of the house.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The property has been listed for sale. The asking price is \$31,500. No offers were made.
- ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 - 1. N.A.
- x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. N.A.
- xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
 - 1. Application submitted.
- xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
 - 1. See submitted materials.

2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):
1. Demolish a contributing residential building.
 2. Level the lot.
 3. Plant grass.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. Will any trees be removed?
2. Will fencing remain in place?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a single family residence. Demolition applications entail the review of the following concerns: the architectural significance of the building; the effect of the demolition on the streetscape and surrounding district; the condition of the building; and the nature of the proposed development.

This house is a contributing residence in the Leinkauf Historic District. The single story wooden residence, like many of the same date and style, is distinguished by a stoop accessed front entrance and a screened side porch.

The house is located in the westernmost block of Church Street. Church Street extends through three of Mobile’s historic districts. All the buildings on this final block of Church Street are extant. Several other buildings facing this stretch of Church Street are of the same period and similar design. This house and the neighboring dwellings contribute not only to the built density, but also to the architectural and the historical character of the Leinkauf Historic District.

This house suffers from years of deferred maintenance and its current state amounts to demolition by neglect. At the request of ht Board, the yard has cleared and the building mothballed continued deterioration has ensued. The property has been listed for sale, but no offers were made. The applicant has provided an estimate showing that the cost of restoration/renovation. Said estimate exceeds the estimated value of the house.

If granted demolition approval the applicant’s would level the lot and plant grass on the site.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The demolition of a contributing building results in the impairment of the property and the district. The condition of the building and the applicant compliance with all of the Board’s requests (mothballing, site clearance, and property listing) should be noted. Staff defers to Board with regard to this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Randy Delchamps was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He thanked Mr. Delchamps for cooperating with the Board. Mr. Ladd noted that the property had been listed for sale longer than had been required. He asked Mr. Delchamps if he had any questions to ask, clarifications to address, or comments to make.

Mr. Delchamps informed the Board that the appraisal of the property had been officially changed to reflect the physical conditions of the building. He said that he executed additional mothballing measures to deter vagrants from accessing the building. Mr. Delchamps stated that while he had received many calls regarding the possible purchase of the property, no one had followed up with any offers. He reminded the Board that St. John's owns the property to the west and the church campus occupies the northern side of the block.

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

Mr. Karwinski reminded Mr. Delchamps that at the previous meeting he had suggested demolishing the rear portion of the building and retaining the more intact front part of the structure. He asked Mr. Delchamps if this solution was still possible. Mr. Delchamps said on account of the deterioration and structure, no.

Mr. Allen asked what the lot would be used for if the house was demolished. Mr. Delchamps stated that any heritage trees would remain and that site would be employed as open greenspace by the Church. He added that if further development ensued that development would have to go before the Board.

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, Mr. Ladd 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 as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as written by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building, but that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued on account of the circumstances and physical conditions (exterior and structural).

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/19/14