

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
June 4, 2014 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Jim Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: David Barr, Robert Brown Catarina Echols, Kim Harden, Nick Holmes III, Bradford Ladd, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone.
Members Absent: Bob Allen, Carolyn Hasser, and Bradford Ladd, and Harris Oswalt.
Staff Members Present: Cart Blackwell, and Keri Coumanis.
2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes of the May 21, 2014 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Holmes moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: John Stimpson**
 - a. Property Address: 1000 Elmira Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/14/14
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per composition, profile, and material. Replace roofing shingles when and where required. Repaint to match the exiting color scheme. Remove chain link fencing. Install a three foot tall Gothic point wooden picket fences on the location of the aforementioned fencing.
2. **Applicant: 251 Properties**
 - a. Property Address: 363 Marine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/14/14
 - c. Project: Reroof with either metal roofing panels or switch to an asphalt roofing. Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per composition, profile, and material. Repaint to match the exiting color scheme. Remove chain link fencing. Install a three foot tall Gothic point wooden picket fences on the location of the aforementioned fencing.
3. **Applicant: Timothy Lloyd and James Gilbert**
 - a. Property Address: 259 North Jackson Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/15/14
 - c. Project: Make repairs to the house's chimneys (internal and external). Any repointing will be done with appropriate mortar. Install ventilating devices.
4. **Applicant: David Gwatkin**
 - a. Property Address: 203 Charles Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/19/14
 - c. Project: Repair (and when necessary replace) deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per proportion, dimension, and material.
5. **Applicant: Advanced Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 1312 Azeala Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/7/14
 - c. Project: Reroof with 25 year shingles, charcoal in color.
6. **Applicant: Sam and Hartley Winter**
 - a. Property Address: 22 South Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/19/14
 - c. Project: Install wooden (picket) fencing per the discussed location. Said fencing meets the height, design, and material requirements outlined in the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts.
7. **Applicant: Stacy Wellborn**
 - a. Property Address: 1054 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/19/14
 - c. Project: Replace existing privacy fence in kind (six foot dog eared), remove chainlink fence and add privacy fence in that sector.

8. **Applicant: Camilo Contracting**
 - a. Property Address: 63 Houston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/20/14
 - c. Project: Paint the house in the following BLP colors: Light Gray; white trim.
9. **Applicant: Finn and Tjaden Cox**
 - a. Property Address: 1015 Savannah Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/21/14
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme. The body will be Antique White and the shutters will be Courtyard. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Lay a concrete patio off the rear elevation of the fenced lot.
10. **Applicant: Robert Sturdivant**
 - a. Property Address: 161 South Warren Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/21/14
 - c. Project: Repair and replace porch decking to match the existing. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.
11. **Applicant: Arby's**
 - a. Property Address: 659 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/21/14
 - c. Project: Repair woodwork to match the existing.
12. **Applicant: Amy Prendergast**
 - a. Property Address: 1317 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/21/14
 - c. Project: Reroof the house to match the existing.
13. **Applicant: Glenda Snodgrass**
 - a. Property Address: 1408 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/23/14
 - c. Project: Reconstruct a deteriorated rear porch. The foundation piers will be faced to match intact examples supporting the main house. The decking, porch, and railings will match the existing as per design and material. The roof pitch and surfacing will be maintained. Install storm windows that will fit within the window casings.
14. **Applicant: Southeast Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 1402 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/27/14
 - c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2014-CA-26: 110 South Royal Street**
 - a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for the Society of 1842
 - b. Project: Construct an outdoor fireplace

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
2. **2014-CA-27: 1569 Dauphin Street**
 - a. Applicant: William A. and Susan M. Moseley
 - b. Project: Demolition – Demolish an ancillary building.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-26-CA: 110 South Claiborne Street
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for the Society of 1842
Received: 5/16/14
Meeting: 6/4/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-B
Project: Construct an outdoor fireplace.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to sources cited Nineteenth Century Mobile Architecture, this building, which is known as the Waring Texas, dates circa 1840. The building was constructed by J. Nugent on a lot that originally extended from Claiborne to Franklin Streets. In 1868, the property was acquired by Moses Waring, a prominent merchant, who owned the house formerly located at the southwest corner of Government and Claiborne Streets. 110 South Claiborne Street served as the *garconniere* or "Texas" for the younger men of the Waring household. Following the demolition of the Waring House in the 1940s, the Waring Texas and the Servants Quarters (108 South Claiborne Street) were sold as individual parcels and restored.

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 outdoor fireplace. The main building recently underwent an extensive and thoroughgoing restoration.
- 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 the historic materials that characterize a property."
 2. "New additions and alterations 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 site plan):**
 1. Construct an outdoor fireplace.
 - a. The three-part chimney piece will be comprised of a raised hearth, shaft and stack.
 - b. The construction will measure 16' 6" in height.
 - c. The chimney piece will be centered within a wall extending along the property's West lot line. Said wall (stucco-faced) dates from the latter half of the 20th Century.

- d. The brick-face hearth will measure 1' 6" in height. The hearth will feature courses of horizontally and vertically oriented brick.
 - e. The brick chimney shaft will measure 6' 6" in height.
 - f. The shaft will feature a flat arched firebox and sawtooth molded shelf.
 - g. The chimney stack will measure 9' in height.
 - h. The Chimney stack will take either one of two forms:
 - i. Alternative "A" - The battered chimney stack will be faced in stucco. The stucco will be scored to simulate masonry cut ashlar blocks. A bronze emblem of the Mardi Society will be attached onto the face of the chimney stack and a pair of terracotta flues will surmount the same.
 - ii. Alternative "B" - The battered chimney shaft will feature a stepped base and a sawtooth cornice.
2. Level brick, concrete, ballast, granite, and other pavers located within the property's rear courtyard.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of an outside fireplace.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts do not specifically address outdoor fireplaces. The proposed fireplace would be located behind the building and engaged within an existing wall. Said wall dates from the latter half of the 20th Century and is not historic in construction or material. In accord with Secretary of the Interior's Standards, original historic features and elements that characterize the property would not be impacted (See B-1.).

Similar outdoor features have been approved on other properties in the historic districts, most recently at 254 Saint Anthony Street (20 June 2012). Precedent for engaged examples approved for additions to and alterations of residential construction are more numerous. Set back deep within the lot, the proposed freestanding chimney stack would be minimally from the public view.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Kearley if he had any clarifications to address, comments to make, or questions to ask.

Mr. Kearley answered no saying that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Kearley if the applicants had settled on one of the two designs. Mr. Kearley answered no.

Ms. Harden noted that the applicants were likely awaiting quotes before making a final decision.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Wagoner asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Wagoner 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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/4/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-27-CA: 1569 Dauphin Street
Applicant: W. A. and Susan M. Moseley
Received: 5/17/14
Meeting: 6/4/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing (main house not ancillary building in question)
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolish an ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Gothic Revival dwelling dates from 1867. The board-and-batten walls, scroll sawn bargeboard carvings, and varied roof structure are key ingredients of wooden or “carpenter” Gothic style/construction. Mobile possessed relatively few examples of Gothic Revival influenced residential construction. Notable exceptions included the Smith and Goldsby Houses, both which stood on Government Street (205 and 452 Government Street respectively). Located just outside the city limits on expansive property, this picturesquely styled dwelling constitutes one of Mobile’s finest *cottage orne* compounds, one in an Gothic informed vein.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board in 1995. At that time, the Board approved the construction a garage. Said garage was located on the site of an earlier garage. With this application, the applicants propose the demolition of a garage apartment.
- B. The regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the board shall consider:
 - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure:
 - 1. This two-story garage apartment located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District stands behind a contributing residential building. The garage apartment was constructed during the middle third of the 20th

Century. The building is set back within the lot. Minimally visible, the building is not of same stylistic, material, and historical caliber as other period structures.

- ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 1. From the 1930s through the 1950s many garage apartments were constructed in the area between downtown and Spring Hill. These buildings provided shelter for a rapidly expanding war time and then baby boom populations.
 - iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced.
 - iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 1. Garage apartments of this period and style are found across the United States. Several examples are located on the subject property's block.
 - 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 site, remove debris, and landscape the site in manner in keeping with the rest of the property
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The owner/applicants acquired the property in 1986.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. After examining the costs of renovating the building and considering possible reuses thereof, the applicants decided to demolish the building.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. The larger property has not been listed for sale.
 - ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 1. Not applicable.
 - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 1. Not given.
 - xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and
 1. Application submitted.
 - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
 1. See 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 correspondence):
1. Demolish a non-contributing ancillary building.
 2. Remove debris.
 3. Level the site.
 4. Landscape the subject area.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of an ancillary building. The ancillary building is a non-contributing structure located on a property distinguished by notable and contributing residential building. When reviewing demolition applications, the following criteria are taken into account: the architectural significance of the subject building; the physical condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the historic district; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

The building proposed for demolition is a garage apartment. The two-story structure dates from the middle third of the 20th Century. With regard to style, materials, and construction, the building is representative of many similar ancillary structures located across the country. Several examples can be found in the blocks immediately surrounding the property.

While the main residence, other ancillary construction, and grounds of the subject property are in an excellent state of maintenance, the garage apartment has not been renovated following storm-related damage caused by Hurricane Ivan in 2004. It should be noted that the building had preexisting issues.

This property constitutes one of the largest residential lots in Mobile's historic districts. While the garage apartment is minimally visible from the street, the structure does not contribute to the experiential and historical character of the streetscape. Though constructed over fifty years ago, the building is not of the same construction quality and architectural distinction as the property's contributing residential building.

If granted demolition approval, the applicants would demolish the subject building, remove any debris, level the site, and plant sod.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe the demolition of the property's garage apartment would impair the architectural or the historical character of the property or the district. While Staff regrets the loss of the built density and historical expression, Staff recommends approval of the application on account of the building's construction, style, and period (in relation to the principle building).

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

William A. Moseley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Moseley if he had any clarifications to address, comments to make, or questions to ask.

Mr. Moseley answered no, but added that he was present to answer any question which the Board might entertain.

No Board discussion ensued.

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/7/15