

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**January 3, 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:** Catarina Echols, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes II, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone,  
**Members Absent:** Robert Allen and Robert Brown.  
**Staff Members Present:** Cartledge W. Blackwell and Melissa Mutert.
2. Mr. Stone moved to approve the minutes for the December 3, 2014 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. Mr. Stone 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:      Ron Hoffman**
  - a. Property Address:    2 or 6 South Franklin Street
  - b. Date of Approval:    5/4/15
  - c. Project:    Install a four foot tall front cast iron fence enclosing the front lawn (per submitted design).
2. **Applicant:      Richard Inge with Inge & Associates**
  - a. Property Address:    3 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval:    5/6/15
  - c. Project:    Install a four foot tall front cast iron fence enclosing the front lawn (per submitted design).
3. **Applicant:      John Whitman**
  - a. Property Address:    20 South Ann Street
  - b. Date of Approval:    4/30/15
  - c. Project:    Add wooden screen to front.
4. **Applicant:      William and Jennifer Stallings**
  - a. Property Address:    38 Blacklawn Street
  - b. Date of Approval:    5/1/15
  - c. Project:    Construct an ancillary building in the rear lot per submitted plans. The storage building will be located to negotiate the roots of heritage tree and meet setback requirements.
5. **Applicant:      Andrea and Parks Moore**
  - a. Property Address:    102 Levert Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval:    5/4/15
  - c. Project:    Install an iron fence around an air-conditioning unit. Repaint doors.
6. **Applicant:      Dr. Charles Brown**
  - a. Property Address:    5/6/15
  - b. Project:    Repair windows to match the existing as per framing, material, and light configuration (several on side elevations). Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated wooden siding to match the exiting in profile and dimension. Install a skirt board around a later rear addition. Repaint the building per the existing color scheme. Reinstall a cast iron railing accessing the rear entrance.
7. **Applicant:      Bobby Gipson**

- a. Property Address: 200 South Washington
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/29/15
  - c. Project: Reroof rear shed roof addition with modified stick down roof, black granulated. Repair rotten wood as necessary to match original.
- 8. Applicant: Ron Diegan**
- a. Property Address: 206 Marine Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/6/15
  - c. Project: Reroof with lifetime Timberline, charcoal color.
- 9. Applicant: Edward Adams with Adams Painting**
- a. Property Address: 213 South Warren Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/6/15
  - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair and replace (when and where necessary) deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.
- 10. Applicant: Eric Young**
- a. Property Address: 278 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/30/15
  - c. Project: Repaint as existing.
- 11. Applicant: Emilija McNulty**
- a. Property Address: 1004 Savannah Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/30/15
  - c. Project: Reroof rear flat roof addition with 30 membrane, replacing corrugated metal . Repair/replace rotten wood as necessary and repaint, paint window sash white.
- 12. Applicant: Thetford and Thetford**
- a. Property Address: 1250 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/30/15
  - c. Project: Reroof the building to match the existing.
- 13. Applicant: Laura Cummings for Cummings Architecture**
- a. Property Address: 1413 Old Shell Road
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/5/15
  - c. Project: Construct a handicap access ramp in the inner courtyard. The ramp will feature a simple metal railing. The ramp will not be visible from the public view.
- 14. Applicant: City of Mobile/Keep Mobile Beautiful**
- a. Property Address: 1451 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/6/15
  - c. Project: Paint the building the same colors as presently on the structure.
- 15. Applicant: James Victory**
- a. Property Address: 1214 New Saint Francis Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/11/15
  - c. Project: Reroof with GAF Timberline, charcoal.
- 16. Applicant: Rashawn Figures**
- a. Property Address: 356 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/11/15
  - c. Project: Remove and replace shutters to match the existing and paint the shutters, as well as the door(s), Templeton Gray.
- 17. Applicant: Ping Investments LLC**
- a. Property Address: 61 South Lafayette Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/13/15
  - c. Project: Reroof the building with asphalt shingles matching the existing.

- 18. Applicant: Sandra Stewart**  
a. Property Address: 1001 Church Street  
b. Date of Approval: 5/13/15  
c. Project: Repaint the roof.
- 19. Applicant: John Watkins**  
a. Property Address: 1655 Dauphin Street  
b. Date of Approval: 5/13/15  
c. Project: Reroof with charcoal gray, three tap shingle.
- 20. Applicant: Thad Hartman with Commercial Diving Services**  
a. Property Address: 450 Charles Street  
b. Date of Approval: 5/13/15  
c. Project: Stabilize, re-deck, repair, and reroof the building to match the existing
- 21. Applicant: MH3**  
a. Property Address: 156 St. Anthony Street  
b. Date of Approval: 5/13/15  
c. Project: Replace a yard blade sign. The individual faces of the two-sided metal sign will measure 2.5' x 2' for a total of 10 square feet. The sign faces will feature the name of the occupying concern.
- 22. Applicant: Ben Murphy**  
a. Property Address: 160 South Georgia Avenue  
b. Date of Approval: 5/14/15  
c. Project: Repair rot on fascia and repaint to match.
- 23. Applicant: Will Mastin with GDSI**  
a. Property Address: 204 Levert Avenue  
b. Date of Approval: 5/14/15  
c. Project: Build 48 inch high picket fence between driveway and backyard.
- 24. Applicant: Chris McGough**  
a. Property Address: 959 Palmetto Street  
b. Date of Approval: 5/15/15  
c. Project: Repair and replace woodwork to match the existing. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.
- 25. Applicant: Redd Roofing**  
a. Property Address: 251 Rapier Avenue  
b. Date of Approval: 5/18/15  
c. Project: Repair roofing and flashing to match the existing.
- 26. Applicant: Sydney & Jaime Betbeze**  
a. Property Address: 1210 Selma Street  
b. Date of Approval: 5/19/15  
c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted color scheme: body - SW 6205, Comfort Gray; trim - white; the porch floor & shutters, black; porch ceilings "haint blue," or SW 6791 Lauren's Surprise.

## C. APPLICATIONS

### 1. 2015-23-CA: 1453 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Thomas F. Karwinski of Thomas F. Karwinski Architect for Michael and Michelle Shine
- b. Project: Addition and Fenestration – Construct an addition off of the rear elevation and repair/replace fenestration on the side elevations.  
**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

### 2. 2015-24-CA: 464 George Street

- a. Applicant: Mary Beth Harris with Restore Mobile
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish two buildings located behind the principle dwelling.  
**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

## D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Guidelines

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

**2015-23-CA:** 1453 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Thomas F. Karwinski of Thomas F. Karwinski Architect for Michael and Michelle Shine  
**Received:** 5/11/15  
**Meeting:** 6/3/15

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Addition and Fenestration – Construct an addition off of the rear elevation and repair/replace fenestration on side elevations

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This Arts and Crafts Movement informed “bungalow” exhibits the influence of building catalogs and popular magazines such as *The Craftsman*. The house’s prominent porch, all encompassing roof, simple lines, and rectilinear forms are salient features of the bungalow concept/typology.

**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 the construction of an addition off of the rear elevation and the repair/replacement of fenestration on the side elevations.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction 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 type, size, and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Where historic windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible with existing.”
  - 3. Storm windows “should be as unobtrusive as possible and may be single pane or match the sash pattern of the window.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan, floor plan, elevations, photographs, and other supplemental material):**
  - 1. Construct an addition off of the Rear (South) Elevation.

- a. The addition will rest atop brick foundation piers matching those supporting the body of the house.
- b. Boxed and recessed wooden lattice foundation screening matching that found on the main residence will extend between the foundation piers.
- c. Wooden siding will match that found on the body of the house as per profile, dimension, and material.
- d. Window casings will match those on the body of the house.
- e. The addition will be painted in same color scheme as the existing.
- f. Aluminum clad wooden windows will be employed on the addition.
- g. Windows salvaged from the existing Rear Elevation will be reused on the addition.
- h. The eave and rafter treatments will match those found on the body of the house.
- i. Hipped roofs will surmount the addition.
- j. Roofing shingles will match those surmounting the principle roof.
- k. East Elevation
  - i. The East Elevation will be constructed in plane with the body of the house.
  - ii. A corner board will distinguish the transition between the addition and the body of the house.
  - iii. Two six-over-one aluminum clad sash windows will be employed on East Elevation.
- l. South Elevation
  - i. A series of advanced and recessed bays will inform the South Elevation.
  - ii. From East to West the sequence will be as follows: a single-paned door, a blind bay, a recessed porch with a glazed and paneled wooden doors, and six-over-one wooden window.
  - iii. A flight of wooden steps with a simple wooden railing will access the rear entrance.
- m. West Elevation
  - i. The East Elevation will be constructed in plane with the body of the house.
  - ii. A corner board will distinguish the transition between the addition and the body of the house.
  - iii. One four-over-one aluminum clad sash windows will be employed on East Elevation.
- 2. Replace two windows on the East Elevation to match the existing and install storm windows matching those found elsewhere on the building over the same.
- 3. Replace a window on the West Elevation to match the existing.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a rear addition and the repair/replacement of fenestration on side elevations.

With regard to the proposed addition, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction 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 proposed addition would be constructed behind the body of the house. It would be minimally visible from the public view on account of elevation of the lot, the setbacks between houses, and setback within the lot. While in plane with the side elevations, corner boards would serve to demarcate the transition from the historic core and the later addition. Additionally, the lower height of the addition's roof structure would allow the rear portion "to read" as a distinct, albeit complementary part of a larger whole. The foundation treatment, siding, fenestration, and roof treatment would match those found on the body of the houses.

Three windows are proposed for repair and/or replacement. The Design Review Guidelines state that where historic windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible with existing (See B-2.). The repair and replacement work would match the existing as per location, light configuration, material, and construction. The installation of proposed storm windows would of an unobtrusive design already approved and installed on rest of the main body of the house (See B-3.).

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Thomas Karwinski was present to discuss the application.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Karwinski if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Karwinski answered no.

Addressing his fellow Board members, Mr. Oswalt asked if anyone had any questions to ask the applicant's representative.

Mr. Stone asked Mr. Blackwell for clarification regarding the application submittal. Mr. Blackwell addressed Mr. Stone's query.

No further discussion ensued among the assembled Board members.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, 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 district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/3/16**

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

2015-24-CA: 464 George Street/1102 Texas Street  
Applicant: Mary Beth Harris of Restore Mobile  
Received: 5/8/15  
Meeting: 6/3/15

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Contributing and Non-Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Demolition – Demolish two ancillary buildings located behind the principle dwelling.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This property features three buildings. The principle dwelling, which faces George Street, dates prior to 1900. The main house and the one on the adjacent lot to the North were built as speculative development. An overlay in 1904 Sanborn Maps for Mobile indicates that rearmost building, a structure facing Texas Street and having the address of 1102 Texas Street, was either enlarged, constructed, or moved to site prior to the publication of the 1925 Sanborn Maps. The middle building, a single stall garage, dates from after 1955.

**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. Restore Mobile proposes the demolition of the two ancillary building located to the rear of the principle dwelling.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
  - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
    - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
      - 1. This property features a single-family residence dating prior to 1900. Two ancillary buildings are located behind the main building. The main house will



be restored and is not the subject of the application up for review. One of the ancillary buildings, which has a separate street address of 1102 Texas Street, appears as an overlay in 1904 Sanborn Maps of Mobile. The overlay might obscure an earlier core of the building dating from 1895. The building was enlarged, constructed, or moved to the site between 1905 and 1925. It is listed as a contributing structure. Said building is one room wide and skirted by an inner lot facing gallery. A rear wing is no longer extant. As evidence by the Sanborn Maps, the whole footprint has changed. The second building proposed for demolition is a single stall garage dating from after 1955. The latter building is a non-contributing structure.

- ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
  1. Both of the ancillary buildings proposed for demolition add to the built density and speak to the historical evolution of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The building faces Texas Street. Of the two, the contributing building with the street address of 1102 Texas Street is located closest to the street. The building is an advanced state of decay and stands as a nuisance to the neighborhood. The garage building is setback deeper into the lot (possibly intruding into the adjoining lot to the north), but its vehicular stall is oriented to face the street. The height and width of the building make it impossible to serve present day vehicles. Constructed on grade and without a foundation, the building is not of the same construction quality as the principle building informing the larger property.
- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
  1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced or acquired.
- iv. Whether the structures are 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. With regard to the contributing building listed as 1102 Texas Street, several houses of similar plan and massing are located on Texas Street. Two examples of this typology are situated on same block and to the west of the property. As per the garage building, vehicular structures of this type are found across and beyond Mobile's historic districts. The single stall formula is represents a building typology encountered on a national level.
- 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 applicant would demolish the two buildings, salvage materials (if possible), carefully remove debris, level the lot, and plant sod.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
  1. Restore Mobile acquired the property on October 4, 2014 for \$10,500.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
  1. The owner investigated the repair of 1102 Texas Street, but the condition of the structure made restoration extremely cost prohibitive
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
  1. The property has been acquired for restoration.

- 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. See submitted materials.
- 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. Not provided.
- 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 application submitted).**

- 1. Demolish two buildings to the rear of the main structure.
- 2. Remove debris.
- 3. Level the site.
- 4. Plant grass.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the demolition of two ancillary buildings on a corner lot in the Oakleigh Garden District. When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into account the following: the architectural significance of a building; the condition of a building; the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

One of the two buildings is listed as a contributing building. The building is likely not original to the lot. Examination of early 20<sup>th</sup>-Century Sanborn Maps of Mobile reveal that the building was moved to the site sometime between 1904 and 1925. The building bears a formal resemblance to Charleston Freedman houses. Several buildings of similar plan and elevation are located within the surrounding area of Southern Oakleigh. The other building is a vehicular storage structure. The garage is not of the quality design and construction as the main house. Countless ancillary buildings of comparable nature are located across the country.

Both buildings are in bad state of repair. The building with the address of 1102 Texas Street is plagued by structural, material, and cosmetic issues. Lack of basic maintenance and insect infestation caused extensive damage. While constructed atop piers, the building raised only a few inches above the ground. Portions of the building have collapsed. The other building, the garage, is constructed on grade. Rising damp has caused the earthfast construction to deteriorate.

Both buildings engage the Elmira Street. 1102 Texas Street is located close to the rear property line. While buildings are oriented to the street, neither is original to the lot. The garage, which is located between the house and 1102 Texas Street, encroaches onto the lot to north of property.

If granted demolition approval, the buildings would be demolished, the site would be leveled, debris would be removed, and grass would be planted.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Tilmon Brown was present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Restore Mobile's representative. He asked Mr. Karwinski if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Brown explained that he was a member of Restore Mobile's construction committee and was representing the application.

Addressing his fellow Board members, Mr. Oswalt asked if anyone had any questions to ask the applicant's representative.

Ms. Harden asked for clarification as per materials. Mr. Brown addressed Ms. Harden's query.

No further discussion ensued among the assembled Board members.

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

### **FINDING OF FACT**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, that while the demolition of the building with an address of 1202 Texas Street does impair the architectural and historical integrity of the district, on account of the building's condition and later placement of the lot, a Certificate of Appropriateness can be issued.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/3/16**

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or historical character of the contributing building. Based on the physical condition and their later presence on the lot, Staff recommends approval of the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Karwinski if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Karwinski answered no.

Addressing his fellow Board members, Mr. Oswalt asked if anyone had any questions to ask the applicant's representative.

Mr. Stone asked Mr. Blackwell for clarification regarding the application submittal. Mr. Blackwell addressed Mr. Stone's query.

No further discussion ensued among the assembled Board members.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, 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 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: 6/3/16**