

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
June 5, 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: Kim Harden, Nick Holmes III, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, and Jim Wagoner.
Members Absent: Robert Allen, Carolyn Hasser, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Stone moved to approve the minutes of the May 1, 2013 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. After making note of Mr. Karwinski's comments and corrections, Mr. Stone 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: Sign A Rama**
 - a. Property Address: 1614 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/30/13
 - c. Project: Replace existing sign with wood 48" x 42.5" on the existing post. Sign to have green logo and black lettering.
2. **Applicant: Chip Herrington**
 - a. Property Address: 1053 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/30/13
 - c. Project: Install 4x3 wood sign on current frame per photograph.
3. **Applicant: Case Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 1009 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/26/13
 - c. Project: Install a handicap access ramp off the side elevation. The wooden ramp will not be visible from the street.
4. **Applicant: Jean Lankford**
 - a. Property Address: 356 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/24/13
 - c. Project: Repaint the building per the submitted Benjamin Moore color scheme: the masonry will be repainted Bone White; portions of the woodwork will be Yosemite Sand; and the accent trim will be Raspberry Parfait.
5. **Applicant: Linda Cashman**
 - a. Property Address: 251 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/25/13
 - c. Project: Install a metal fencing around a generator. The generator is to be located behind the front plane of the house. Said fencing will be likewise.
6. **Applicant: Peach Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 150 South Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/29/13
 - c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.

7. **Applicant: City of Mobile**
 - a. Property Address: 111 South Royal Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/24/13
 - c. Project: Paint the Museum in the current scheme: body & trim white; ironwork black.
8. **Applicant: Chip Nolen**
 - a. Property Address: 56 LeMoyne
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/29/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork, detailing, and porch decking to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material (as consequence of leveling and repairing porch).
9. **Applicant: Stanley Fergusson**
 - a. Property Address: 33 South Reed Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/29/13
 - c. Project: Repair/replace rotten siding and wood to match in profile and dimension. Clean house and repaint, body Palmetto Street Green, porch deck Savannah Street Dark Brown, Trim De Tonti Square off White.
10. **Applicant: Patrick and Barbara Sims**
 - a. Property Address: 154 Macy Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/2/13
 - c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.
11. **Applicant: Ann N. Jarvis**
 - a. Property Address: 208 South Broad Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/3/13
 - c. Project: Remove wood covering tile. Board windows appropriately and paint it, doors and trim dark green. Paint fence to south dark green as well.
12. **Applicant: Ann N. Jarvis**
 - a. Property Address: 210 South Broad Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/3/13
 - c. Project: Paint building off white. Paint trim, doors and window boards dark green. Repair/replace rotten wood on rear to match the existing in profile, dimension and materials
13. **Applicant: R & J Home and Repair, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 558 Conti Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/4/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing. Repaint per the existing color scheme. Remove and reinstall an awning.
14. **Applicant: Debra T. Baumhauer with Debra Baumhauer Interiors**
 - a. Property Address: 958-960 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/6/13
 - c. Project: Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
15. **Applicant: Jimmy Bonner**
 - a. Property Address: 410 Charles Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/7/13
 - c. Project: Repair woodwork, siding porch decking, and details (when and where necessary) to match the existing. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.
16. **Applicant: American Homes Contracting**
 - a. Property Address: 551 Eslava Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/7/13
 - c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.

- 17. Applicant: Carla Sharrow**
 - a. Property Address: 1005 Augusta Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/9/13
 - c. Project: Erect four foot privacy fence with and an eight foot section toward the rear; or erect an eight foot privacy fence. In either instance the fence is to begin no farther forward than the front plane of the house (not inclusive of the porch) and extend to the rear privacy fence.
- 18. Applicant: Stanley Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 204 Lanier Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/7/13
 - c. Project: Repair roof of main house to match existing.
- 19. Applicant: Stefanie Toler**
 - a. Property Address: 57 South Catherine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/10/13
 - c. Project: Install an interior lot cast iron fence. The fence will be located behind the front plane of the house and will be five feet in height.
- 20. Applicant: Diversified Commercial Builders**
 - a. Property Address: 750 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/10/13
 - c. Project: Repaint the building per the existing color scheme.
- 21. Applicant: Suzanne Montgomery**
 - a. Property Address: 1411 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/13/13
 - c. Project: Repair portion of roof to match. Repair, replace any rotten wood to match.
- 22. Applicant: Graham Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 103 Etheridge Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/13/13
 - c. Project: Reroof with charcoal gray 30 year architectural shingle.
- 23. Applicant: Jim Alston with Alston Fence Company**
 - a. Property Address: 21 Houston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/14/13
 - c. Project: Install a six foot wooden privacy. The fence will not exceed beyond the front plane of the house.
- 24. Applicant: Do Right Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 1507 Monroe Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/15/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme. Replace several damaged window panes to match the existing.
- 25. Applicant: Linda Cashman**
 - a. Property Address: 251 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/16/13
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with architectural shingles.
- 26. Applicant: Historic Mobile Preservation Society for the Cook's House**
 - a. Property Address: 350 Oakleigh Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/17/13
 - c. Project: Revision of approved plans. Relocate an electrical enclosure from the side to the rear of the building. Reopen an enclosed doorway. The door will match the historic doors. Reconstruct a handicap access ramp. Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing.

27. **Applicant: Affordable Painting, Roofing, and Constructing for Mr. David Thomas**
 - a. Property Address: 263 South Cedar Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/17/13
 - c. Project: Reroof the house. The roofing shingles will match the existing.
28. **Applicant: William Appling**
 - a. Property Address: 9 South Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/20/13
 - c. Project: Replace a hanging sign. The double-faced metal sign will be framed in wood and feature the name of the establishment.
29. **Applicant: Mike Henderson Roofing and Repair Services**
 - a. Property Address: 154 Marine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/20/13
 - c. Project: Reroof the house to match the existing.
30. **Applicant: Lesley Rainosek**
 - a. Property Address: 153 Macy Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/20/13
 - c. Project: Reroof to match the existing. Replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing. Construct a pergola atop the rear deck. The pergola will be at best minimally visible from the public view.
31. **Applicant: Justin Merrick**
 - a. Property Address: 1703 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/20/13
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the submitted Benjamin Moore color scheme. The body will be Bennington Gray and the trim will be white. Repair and replace any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
32. **Applicant: Cheryl W. Zafiris**
 - a. Property Address: 1711 Hunter Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/20/13
 - c. Project: Repave the existing driveway and front walkway. Construct a carport and attached storage room behind the main house (to meet setback requirements). The storage shed will be faced with either hardiplank or wooden siding. The structure's hipped roof will be sheathed with asphalt shingles. The structure will be painted to match the house.
33. **Applicant: Michael Zanetti**
 - a. Property Address: 101 Bradford Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/20/13
 - c. Project: Retain a replacement (photographic documentation provided for the original installation) roof turbine installed a year ago. The wind turbine matches the previous one.
34. **Applicant: Dobson Sheet Metal and Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 1260 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/22/13
 - c. Project: Repair roof to match existing in profile, dimension and materials
35. **Applicant: L. Craig Roberts for Kay and Byron Cruthirds**
 - a. Property Address: 306 Charles Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/22/13
 - c. Project: Install iron handrails per submitted plans.
36. **Applicant: Ken Dempsey with the Lathan Company**
 - a. Property Address: 1453 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/22/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated stucco to match the existing. Repair and when necessary replace window sills to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.

Repair and when necessary replace roofing tiles to match the existing. Replace the guttering system to match the existing. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

37. Applicant: Eugene Caldwell

- a. Property Address: 957 Selma Street
- b. Date of Approval: 5/22/13
- c. Project: Mothball a building. Apply plyboard over burned out windows and openings. Mothballing interventions will not damage the historic fabric.

38. Applicant: Dick Whiting

- a. Property Address: 219 Dearborn Street
- b. Date of Approval: 5/22/13
- c. Project: Replace rotten portion of front porch balustrade to match existing, repaint porch deck and exterior as necessary.

39. Applicant: Home Improvement

- a. Property Address: 1751 Hunter Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 5/23/13
- c. Project: Replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

40. Applicant: Carolyn Sebastian

- a. Property Address: 70 Bradford Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 5/23/13
- c. Project: Reroof the house with architectural shingles.

41. Applicant: Carisa Anderson

- a. Property Address: 1456 Brown Street
- b. Date of Approval: 5/23/13
- c. Project: Remove water oak at front wing fence, replace damaged fence to match original in extent and design. Repair/replace porch decking as needed to match existing.

42. Applicant: Steve Stone

- a. Property Address: 457 Conti Street
- b. Date of Approval: 5/23/13
- c. Project: Install a temporary sign on the site for the duration of the construction of a rear addition. If necessary, the sign permit will be renewed in compliance with municipal signage requirements.

43. Applicant: Todd and Karen Duren

- a. Property Address: 9 Macy Place
- b. Date of Approval: 5/24/13
- c. Project: Reconstruct a deck to match the existing in appearance and plan.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2013-34-CA: 210 Lanier Avenue

- a. Applicant: L. Craig Roberts of L. Craig Roberts, Architect for Dr. and Mrs. Boyette Hunter
- b. Project: New Construction – Construct a rear porch and a deck.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2013-35-CA: 2306 DeLeon Avenue

- a. Applicant: Douglas Burtu Kearley of Douglas Burtu Kearley, Architect for Jake and Melissa Epker
- b. Project: Restoration and New Construction – Make in kind repairs and replacements of deteriorated features; demolish a rear wing; construct a rear porch addition; and construct a garage.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. **2013-36-CA: 259 North Jackson Street**
 - a. Applicant: Douglas Burtu Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Tim Lloyd and James Gilbert
 - b. Project: Restoration and Renovation – Reconstruct a porch and modify an altered rear elevation.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
4. **2013-37-CA: 1711 Old Shell Road**
 - a. Applicant: Damon Lett with Damon Lett Roofing for Ken George
 - b. Project: Reroofing – Reroof a portion of a house with metal roofing.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
5. **2013-38-CA: 1565 Dauphin Street**
 - a. Applicant: Don Bowden with Bowden Architecture for Evan Maisel
 - b. Project: Demolition – Demolish later additions and infill.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
6. **2013-39-CA: 1558 Bruister Street**
 - a. Applicant: Melanie Bunting
 - b. Project: Enclose a portion of porch. Change the treatment of the remainder of the porch.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
7. **2013-40-CA: 255 McDonald Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: Michael Stricklin, Jr.
 - b. Project: Alterations to Previously Approved Planned – Change the fenestration on a side dormer and change the treatment of a rear addition.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
8. **2013-41-CA: 257 North Jackson Street**
 - a. Applicant: Lucy Barr with Lucy Barr Designs for Mr. and Mrs. Peter F. Burns
 - b. Project: New Construction – Construct a single family residence.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. **OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-34-CA: 210 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: L. Craig Roberts of L. Craig Roberts, Architect for Dr. and Mrs. Boyette Hunter
Received: 5/1/13
Meeting: 6/5/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a rear porch and a deck.

BUILDING HISTORY

This residence dates from 1923. With its double-pitched roof, story-and-a-half massing, wall dormers, and flared eaves, the house is one Mobile’s finest example of Dutch Colonial subset of the larger Colonial Revival movement.

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. With this application, the applicants propose the addition of a rear porch and a deck.

- 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. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture.”
 - 4. “Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions, and decorative details.”

- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**
 - 1. Construct a porch off of the East (Rear) Elevation.
 - a. The substructure of the porch and deck will be L-shaped in form and located off the southeast corner of the house.

- b. The covered porch will be connected to the South (side) Elevation's glazed porch by way of an elevated deck.
- c. The porch and the deck will rest atop brick foundation piers. Boxed and recessed lattice panels will extend between the foundation piers.
- d. A flight of brick steps with flanking cheeks will allow access to and from the porch. Simple iron railings will be located atop stair treads. The design of the stair structure will match the one accessing the front entrance.
- e. Tongue-and-groove decking will serve as flooring for the porch and deck.
- f. Either Tuscan columns matching those found elsewhere on the house or square section paneled piers based on the pilasters (formerly porch posts) will support the porch roof.
- g. The porch's entablature and trim will match those found on the main dwelling.
- h. A hipped roof will surmount the porch. Asphalt shingles matching those surmounting the body of the house will sheath the porch's roof.
- i. The work will be painted to match the existing color scheme.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a rear porch and deck. The proposed work is not visible from the public view. Setback and lot coverage requirements allow the construction of the porch.

In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, the proposed is designed to be differentiated from yet compatible with the existing historic fabric (See B-1). The porch's single-story massing provides a visual break from the story-and-a-half massing of the main house. Porch details and proportions match those found on the body of the house. The porch "reads" as a porch on a porch. All of the materials are in compliance with the Design Review Guidelines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-4), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural and historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Dr. and Mrs. Boyette Hunter were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicants. He asked them if they had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address. Mr. and Mrs. Hunter answered no.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicants. Mr. Karwinski said that he did not, but added that the minutes of the meeting should reflect that Mr. Roberts recused himself from the discussion and left the room.

Mr. Stone asked for clarification regarding a restored window. Mr. Karwinski addressed Mr. Stone's query.

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. 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: 6/5/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-35-CA: 2306 DeLeon Avenue
Applicant: Douglas Burtu Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley, Architect for Jake and Melissa Epker
Received: 5/7/13
Meeting: 6/5/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Restoration and New Construction – Make in kind repairs and replacements of deteriorated features; demolish a rear wing; construct a rear porch addition; and construct a garage.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house dates from 1921/22. With a façade featuring a monumental portico before a balcony topped single-story porch, this double-pile (a two room deep plan) house ranks among Mobile’s finest Southern Colonial Revival residences. The house remained in the hands of the same family for which it was built until the recent sale to the present owners.

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 new owners propose the restoration of the house, the construction of a rear porch addition, and the construction of a rear lot garage connected to the house by way of a hyphen-like connector.
- 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. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture.”
 - 4. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions, and decorative details.”

5. “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance.”
6. “The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch.”
7. “An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Make the following repairs to the main house.
 - a. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated windows (glazing and frames) to match the existing in profile, dimension, material, and light configuration.
 - b. Replace deteriorated siding, detailing, and other woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. As noted in the annotated drawings, the columns and railings will be repaired and when necessary replaced to match the existing. Repair and when necessary replace the façade’s single-story column’s composition capitals to match the existing.
 - c. Scrape and sand windows, doors, detailing, and siding.
 - d. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
 - e. Scrape and paint the front steps and continuous foundation.
 - f. Remove an existing crown molding located within the cornice and install an ogee profile gutter.
 - g. Repair an existing internal guttering system located on and within the front porch’s structure and eaves. Install a downspout that will connect the two sections of the guttering system.
 - h. Scrape, prime, and paint the foundation’s iron grilles.
 - i. Remove a later handicap access ramp.
 - j. Remove and replace roof flashing.
2. Demolish a single-story porch and service room located on the two-story house’s North (rear) Elevation.
3. Construct a rear addition taking the form of an enclosed space, porch, hyphen, and garage.
 - a. The porch and enclosed portion of the rear addition will be three parts in both plan and elevation. The enclosed portion will occupy the eastern portion of the aforementioned new construction. The porch will occupy the remainder of this portion of the addition.
 - b. The porch and enclosed space will rest atop brick foundation piers that will be interspersed with boxed and recessed lattice skirting.
 - c. Tongue-and-groove wooden porch decking will be employed.
 - d. Reconfigure the rear entrance by moving forward the recessed door and window bays thereby making them in plane with the main rear wall.
 - e. Square section wooden porch posts will feature bases and capital-like moldings. Picket railings matching those found on the front porch will extend between the porch posts.
 - f. The eastern enclosed portion of this section of the new construction will feature pilasters detailed to match the porch posts. The pilasters will be spaced in a manner that will maintain the symmetrical treatment of the addition.
 - g. Metal porch screening secured by wooden framing will extend between the porch posts.
 - h. The porch’s two west-facing (side) bays will feature serpentine lattice panels with oval inserts above the railings.

- i. The addition's fascia and moldings will match those of the main house.
 - j. A hipped roof will surmount the porch. A second hipped roof will project from the aforementioned so as to cover the advanced central portion of the porch.
 - k. Salvaged wooden windows will be employed on the enclosed eastern portion of the rear porch addition. A glazed and paneled wooden door with surmounting transom will provide access to the hyphen connecting the main house to the garage.
 - l. The hyphen will be L-shaped in form.
 - m. The hyphen will be raised atop a concrete walk.
 - n. The hyphen's supporting posts will match those supporting the rear porch.
 - o. The hyphen's fascia and moldings will match those found on the main house.
 - p. A hipped roof will surmount the hyphen.
 - q. The garage will measure 24' 4" by 25' in plan.
 - r. The garage will rest atop a concrete slab.
 - s. Wooden siding will face the garage.
 - t. A hipped roof will surmount the garage.
 - u. Asphalt roofing shingles will sheath the garage, hyphen, and rear addition.
 - v. The garage's West Elevation (facing Levert Avenue, the side street) will feature two six-over-six wooden windows.
 - w. The garage's South Elevation (facing the rear of the house) will feature a glazed and paneled door. The hyphen terminates at the doorway.
 - x. The garage's East Elevation will not feature fenestration.
 - y. The garage's North Elevation will feature two metal vehicular doors.
4. Remove concrete pavers from the rear portion of the lot.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the following: the in kind repair and replacement of existing features; the demolition of a rear wing; the construction of a three part rear addition. Lot coverage and setback requirements allow the construction of the addition.

In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, repairs should match the original and when necessary, replacement of existing features will match the existing in design, composition (where required) and material.

The proposed addition of a new porch, hyphen-like connector, and garage would be located off of this corner lot property's rear elevation. An existing one story porch occupies a portion of the location of the proposed porch. While the Design Review Guidelines state that form and shape of porch should be maintained, the Guidelines were written with reference to front and more monumental rear porches and the Board has prioritized front porches over rear porches (See B-5). Elements and proportions of the existing porch would be replicated in the proposed work. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that additions to historic buildings should be differentiated from yet compatible with the existing historic fabric (See B-1). The single-story massing of the proposed addition will serve as visual break that differentiates it from the two-story massing of the main residence. The three part nature of the addition avoids the pitfalls of a single massed addition composed of porch-cum-garage wing. The scale of the addition does not overwhelm the building. The scale and treatment of the ancillary portion of the new construction complements the design of the main house (See B-7). All of the materials are in compliance with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts.

CLARIFICATIONS/REQUESTS

1. Provide a rendering of the proposed West Elevation in its entirety.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-7), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Pending review of the aforementioned clarification, 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 told Mr. Kearley that as a nearby resident, he was glad the house is being restored. Mr. Ladd stated that it was feared that if allowed to deteriorate further, many believed the house could not be saved. He asked Mr. Kearley if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address. Mr. Kearley answered no.

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

Mr. Karwinski said he had one comment and one question. He told Mr. Kearley that the garage's setback was close to the lot line. Mr. Kearley responded by saying that backyard was not large. Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Kearley if it would be possible to increase the setback to five feet. Mr. Kearley answered yes.

Mr. Ladd asked if any other Board members had any questions to ask the applicant's 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. Holmes moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that the setback would be five feet.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski 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: 6/5/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-36-CA: 259 North Jackson Street

Applicant: Douglas Burtu Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Tim Lloyd and James Gilbert

Received: 5/6/13

Meeting: 6/5/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: R-1

Project: Restoration and Renovation – Reconstruct a porch and modify an altered rear elevation.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to notes located within the MHDC property files, this side hall house was constructed in 1866. The house Italianate side hall originally featured a front gallery. The gallery was removed during a 20th-Century “restoration.”

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.
- 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. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
 - 4. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture.”
 - 5. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions, and decorative details.”
 - 6. “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance.”
 - 7. “The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Remove a later front stoop with associated steps and awning.
2. Reconstruct a front porch with surmounting gallery.
 - a. The front porch will be 8' in depth and will be set 8" in from the side plane's of the body of the house.
 - b. The porch will rest atop a continuous brick foundation featuring recessed brick panels.
 - c. A flight of brick steps measuring 6' in depth will access the porch. Iron railings will flank the front steps.
 - d. The porch floor will be laid with stone tiles and will feature a concrete border.
 - e. The three bay porch will be defined by four cast iron supports. Foliate and vegetal in form, the supports will feature splayed spandrels and connecting valences.
 - f. Sections of a foliate/vegetal railing will extend between the cast iron supports.
 - g. Sections of a foliate railing will extend around the upper-level gallery.
 - h. The gallery's deck will feature a downward slope to dispense with rainwater.
 - i. The porch's roof/gallery's deck will feature concave and convex cornice moldings.
2. Install operable wooden shutters. The shutters will be louvered in construction.
3. Repair existing flashing atop the roof where required.
4. Reconfigure the West (Rear) Elevation's altered fenestration.
 - a. Remove the center portion of a later vertical window.
 - b. Reconfigure the aforementioned window as two one-over-one wooden windows and infill area with brick as needed. The first-story window will be surmounted by a splayed lintel.
 - c. Remove an existing brick stoop with associated steps and awning.
 - d. Construct a wooden porch off of the rear entrance.
 - e. The porch will rest atop brick foundation piers.
 - f. The porch will be accessed by wooden steps extending along its North and West Elevations.
 - g. The porch will feature square section wooden posts and wooden tongue-and-groove decking.
 - h. The porch's hipped roof will be sheathed in asphalt shingles.
5. Install new guttering.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the reconstruction of a front porch and modifications to altered Rear Elevation.

This house once featured a single-story gallery. The existing stoop is not in keeping with the design and proportions of the house. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, the railings, supports, pavers, and proportions appropriate to the period and style of the house, a Postbellum Italianate side hall residence (See B-5). Sanborn Maps and physical evidence record the existence of the porch (See B-3). Full-length windows located on both first-story and the second-story determined the proportions of the proposed reconstruction. While the Design Review Guidelines state that porch and stair railings should match, the proposed railings differ, which is common practice with iron porches (See B-7).

The Rear Elevation of this house has been extensively altered. A rear service wing was demolished. Rear galleries were removed and fenestration altered. The proposed alteration of fenestration involves the conversion of a tall vertical window into two windows per story. Shutters would be added on the Rear Elevation, as well as the other four elevations. In compliance with the Guidelines, said shutters would be

operable. The proposed work for the Rear Elevation also calls for the removal of a later porch and the construction of a new porch.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-7), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historic character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. 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. After noting that the proposed rear porch had been withdrawn from review, he asked Mr. Kearley if he had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address. Mr. Kearley stated that cast iron stair railings often feature designs that are different from those on the house.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant. Mr. Karwinski stated that he too had consulted the Sanborn Maps. He said that while the house did have a porch, it was unknown if it was iron or wooden in construction. Mr. Karwinski stated that it was a well-known fact that iron galleries replaced many earlier wooden porches. He asked Mr. Kearley if he any evidence substantiating the use of an iron gallery. Mr. Kearley answered no. He added that there was no evidence that porch was not iron. Mr. Kearley stated the applicants want an iron gallery. Mr. Bemis stated that substantial townhouses of the 1860s featured iron galleries from the onset. Mr. Blackwell noted that the color coding on the Sanborn maps do not accurately record the materials of porches and galleries.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had other questions to ask the applicant's representative. No further Board discussion ensued. Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd closed the period of the 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, amending facts to note that rear porch and fenestration changes had been withdrawn.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski 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: 6/5/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-37-CA: 1711 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Damon Lett with Damon Lett Roofing for Ken George
Received: 5/16/13
Meeting: 6/5/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Reroofing – Reroof a rear portion of the house with a metal roof.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Arts and Crafts inspired bungalow dates circa 1925.

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. With this application, the applicant proposes the installation of metal roofing panels over a small rear addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “A roof is one of the most dominate features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form, pitch, and color.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted materials):
 - 1. Reroof a small rear addition with 5-V crimp metal panels.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of a metal roof. Applications for metal roofs are reviewed on a case by case basis. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s state that a roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Materials should be appropriate to the form, pitch, and color of the roof (See B-1).

The body of this Arts and Crafts informed bungalow is surmounted by a hipped roof. The hipped roof will remain the same. The area proposed for reroofing constitutes a later rear addition and is surmounted by a gable roof. The subject area is not visible from the public view.

While a gable in type and construction, the rear addition’s roof pitch is very low, almost flat.

The color of the proposed roofing panels is historically appropriate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff ordinarily encourages applicants to employ matching roofs. On account of the location, pitch, and type of roofing proposed, along with the later construction of the rear wing, Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or historical character of the building and the district.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Damon Lett, Sr. and Damon Lett, Jr. with Damon Lett Roofing were 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. Lett if he had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address. Mr. Lett, Sr. responded by saying the project was a simple reroofing.

Mr. Wagoner said that he had one question to ask Staff. He asked what would happen if in the coming years a metal roof was proposed for the rest of the house. Mr. Wagoner articulated himself further by saying that he did not want to make the approval of the metal roof for the addition as a precedent for the remainder of the house.

Mr. Karwinski asked for clarification regarding the color of the roof. Mr. Lett addressed Mr. Karwinski's concern.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any other questions to ask the applicant's representative. No further Board discussion ensued. Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd closed the period of the 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, amending facts to note that approval of a metal roof for the addition would not be precedent setting for the remainder of the house.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski 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: 6/5/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-38-CA: 1565 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Don Bowden with Bowden Architecture for Evan Maisel
Received: 5/20/13
Meeting: 6/5/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition – Demolish later additions and infill.

BUILDING HISTORY

This grand residence dates circa 1900. Featuring one of the grandest surviving Aesthetics Movement interiors, the interior rivals the exterior in its proportions and detail.

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 .
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standard’s 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. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
 - 4. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture.”
 - 5. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions, and decorative details.”
 - 6. “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted plans):**
 - 1. Demolish later additions and infill.
 - a. Remove infill from a secondary front porch (North Elevation). The demolitions and removals will restore the house to its original configuration.
 - i. The porch’s deck, pedestals and columns, and entablature remain intact.
 - ii. The original front wall remains in place.

- iii. Replace and “feather” siding to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material where necessary.
- iv. Reinstall a doorway.
- b. Demolish a single-story commercial addition that wraps around the East (side) and South (Rear) Elevations.
 - i. The fenestration of the affected elevations will appear before the Board in the second phase of this multi-part application.
- c. Remove infill from the Rear Elevation’s upper and lower galleries.
 - i. The exact treatment of restored galleries (location of fenestration, spacing of porch posts, etc...) will appear before the Board in the next phase of this multi-part application. It is hoped that exploratory demolition will reveal the construction (columnar supported or cantilevered) and appearance (columnar in full or in part) of the rear porch.
- d. Demolish a later addition located off the Rear Service Wing.
 - i. The fenestration of the affected portion of the Rear Elevation will appear before the Board in the second phase of this multi-part application.
- e. Repair and replace deteriorated siding, woodwork, and detailing to match the existing.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the first phase of the restoration of a highly significant late 19th-Century residence. The exterior features and interior treatment survive largely intact. Later additions were made to the side and rear of the house. A secondary front porch and the rear galleries were infilled. In this first phase of the restoration, the applicant proposes the demolition of the later additions and removal of the infill.

When reviewing demolition requests, the following criteria are taken into account; the architectural significance of the building or portion of a building slated for demolition; the condition of the aforementioned; the effect the demolition will have on the streetscape and historic district; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment/construction. The two additions date from the middle third of the 20th Century. While non-obtrusive, the additions do not contribute to either the architectural or the historical character of the house. The addition located off the southeast corner of the house, is minimally visible from the public view and the rear addition cannot be seen from the public access. The demolition of the two additions would allow for the restoration of the original house’s original footprint. With regard to proposed redevelopment, the fenestration of the re-exposed expanses of wall affected by the demolition will appear before the Board in the next phase of this multi-part application.

A secondary front porch was infilled at a later date. The porch’s second story gallery still features the original deck, pedestals and columns, balustrades, and entablature survive intact. The original walls remain in place. If siding has been removed, replacement wooden siding feathered and proportioned to match the surrounding siding will be installed. The original fenestrated bay will re-exposed will be recreated.

The rear porch featured a two-tiered gallery. Later infill encloses the galleries. Exploratory demolition of the infill will allow greater understanding regarding the construction of the upper gallery. At this point, it is undetermined if the whole of the gallery was supported by piers or cantilevered in portions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-6), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Don Bowden was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Roberts complimented Mr. Bowden on the project.

Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Bowden if he had any questions to ask, clarifications to address, or comments to make.

Mr. Bowden added only that the original side and rear fenestration survives intact. Mr. Karwinski recommended the tidying up of the grounds and trees. Mr. Bowden spoke of the proposed improvements to the grounds.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant's representative. No further Board discussion ensued. Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd closed the period of the 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: 6/5/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-39-CA: 1558 Bruister Street
Applicant: Melanie Bunting
Received: 5/20/13
Meeting: 6/5/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Alterations to a Rear Elevation – Enclose a portion of porch. Change the treatment of the remainder of the porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Arts and Crafts informed bungalow dates from first third of the 20th-Century.

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 alteration to the Rear Elevation. A portion of the porch would be enclosed and the remainder would receive new railings and posts.
- 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. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile Architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions, and decorative details.”
 - 2. “The form and shape of the porch should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with the style of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work (Per Submitted Plans):
 - 1. Remove later enclosures to rear porch.
 - 2. Enclose the western portion of the North Elevation’s (Rear) Porch.
 - a. The western portion of the porch will be faced with wooden siding that will match that employed on the body of the house.
 - b. The porch’s corner board will remain in place.
 - c. A north-facing transom window will be installed.
 - 3. Alter the porch’s supports and balustrade.

- a. Remove the existing porch screening-like supports.
- b. Installed square section posts employing base and cap-like upper motifs.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves alteration to a Rear Elevation. A portion of a rear porch would be enclosed. The porch post and railing treatments of the remainder of the porch would be altered.

The proposed infill would not be visible from the public view. The corner board demarcating the end wall of the body of the house would remain in place. Said corner board would allow the infill to read as a later alteration. The wooden siding will match that employed on the body of the house and the fenestration (a transom window) will employ casing matching that found on elsewhere on the dwelling.

With regard to the proposed alteration to the front porch railings and posts, the siding-faced railing is not original to the house and the porch posts are not character defining features. The proposed posts and railings are in keeping with the style, period, and proportions of the house (See B 1-2).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based 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.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Melanie Bunting was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Ms. Bunting if she had any questions to ask, clarifications to address, or comments to make. Ms. Bunting answered no.

Mr. Karwinski addressed his fellow Board members. He told those assembled that the applicant is one of his neighbors and that he would not be voting on the application. Mr. Karwinski then said that he did have one comment and one question for the applicant. He stated that the house's vinyl siding extends over the corner board. Mr. Karwinski asked Ms. Bunting if the corner board depicted in the planes would be wooden or vinyl. Ms. Bunting answered that that it would be the former. Mr. Karwinski said that he found it difficult to evaluate the project since no plan was provided and it was not drawn to proper scale.

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/5/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-40-CA: 255 McDonald Avenue
Applicant: Michael Stricklin, Jr.
Received: 5/17/20
Meeting: 5/20/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Alterations to Previously Approved Planned – Change the fenestration on a side dormer and change the treatment of a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Tudor style residence exemplifies the 1920s/early 1930s penchant for picturesque evocations of medieval architecture. The half-timbered and stone-faced dwelling was constructed for Harry Toulmin. The rough cut granite blocks likely came from the 1839 Mobile County Jail.

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, 2013. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a rear addition and the addition of a side dormer. The applicant returns before the Board with an application calling for the after-the-fact approval of altered plans.
- 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 the property. The new 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:
 - 1. Retain a transom window instead of the approved double hung sash window and altered half-timbering.
 - 2. Alter the treatment of the rear wing.

- a. North Elevation
 - i. No windows on the first-story of the addition will be installed.
- b. East Elevation
 - i. No beltcourse-like intermediate entablature will be installed.
 - ii. Diagonal half-timbering will not be employed.
 - iii. Instead of a single multi-light window, two six-over-six wooden windows comprise the upper-story fenestration.
 - iv. The louvered vent will not be employed.
- c. South Elevation.
 - i. Retain refaced wall expanses on the original portion of the rear wing. The treatment has changed from a broken granite rock treatment to a half-timbered treatment.
 - ii. Employ two double French door units without transoms instead of single French door units with transoms on the ground floor.
 - iii. A recessed wall dormer featuring an interrupted treatment was employed instead of a wall dormer featuring a continuous treatment.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the approval of altered plans. A window on a dormer was changed from a sash to transom in type and the siding treatment of an addition was altered.

With regard to the altered window treatment, the scale and placement of the dormer followed the approved plans. The transom window is compatible with the house and the dormer. The detailing of the window is in keeping with the fenestration found on the body of the house.

During the construction of the addition to the Rear Wing, the granite veneer of the existing wing and portions of the body of the house collapsed. The latter was repaired to match the existing, while the original Rear Wing’s small expanse of stone veneer was not reconstructed. The reconstructed and extended Rear Wing will both employ a half-timbered treatment and altered fenestration. The first-story’s half timbering was altered to be more in keeping with that of the upper with regard to spacing and treatment. The fenestration and dormers were altered. The half-timbered treatment allows the addition to still “read” as later alteration to a historic building. The work is compatible with, yet differentiated from the existing (See B 1-2).

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.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Michael Stricklin was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Stricklin if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address. Mr. Stricklin showed the Board a selection of pictures documenting the project. He explained that when removing sections of the granite veneer to construct the addition sections of the rear and parts of the side elevation collapsed. Mr. Stricklin stated that almost the whole of the rear elevation was lost. Pieces of granite were engaged to brick and it proved to separate the two. Mr. Stricklin stated that as

much as possible of the stone had been salvaged and reused on the main house and the foundation of the addition.

Mr. Ladd complimented Mr. Stricklin on the project. He asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant. Mr. Karwinski said that he had several questions to ask and comments to make. He said that it should have been noted that the north-facing doorway had not been removed. Mr. Stricklin explained that he feared altering the subject area on account of the possibility of disturbing the wall structure.

Mr. Karwinski stated that the fenestration on the South Elevation had been altered. Mr. Stricklin explained the alterations. Mr. Karwinski then redirected the discussion to the South Elevation's altered dormer. He said that the unit was not proportional to the space. Mr. Ladd interjected. He stated that the applicant should be shown more respect on account of the structural problems he had encountered. Mr. Ladd said the majority of the work is not visible from street. He complimented Mr. Stricklin on the quality of the work and his efforts. Mr. Ladd said there was no reason to drag an applicant through the dirt. Mr. Karwinski explained that he wanted the public record to reflect the changes.

Mr. Ladd asked if any other Board members had any questions to ask the applicant's representative. No further Board discussion ensued. Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd closed the period of the 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 reports to reflect the discussion.

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.

The motion received a second. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/5/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-41-CA: 257 North Jackson Street
Applicant: Lucy Barr with Lucy Barr Designs for Mr. and Mrs. Peter F. Burns
Received: 5/20/13
Meeting: 6/5/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a single family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to early 20th-Century Sanborn Maps, a frame house occupied this vacant lot. The house was demolished some 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 vacant lot has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicants propose the construction of a single family residence
- B. The Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Placement has two components: setback, the distance between the street and a building; and spacing, the distance between its property lines and adjacent structures. New construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings. New buildings should not be placed too far forward or behind the traditional “façade line”, a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the façade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape.”
 - 2. “Building mass is established by the arrangement and proportion of its basic geometric components – the main building, wings and porches, the roof and the foundation. Similarity of massing helps create a rhythm along a street, which is one of the appealing aspects of historic districts. Therefore, new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.”
 - 3. “The foundation, the platform upon which a building rests, is a massing component of a building. Since diminished foundation proportions have a negative effect on massing and visual character, new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings. Pier foundations are encouraged for new residential

- construction. When raised slab foundations are constructed, it is important that the height of the foundation relate to that of nearby historic buildings.”
4. “Although roofs and foundations reinforce massing, the main body and wings are the most significant components. A building’s form or shape (a box) or a complex (a combination of many boxes or projections and indentations). The main body of a building may be one or two stories. Secondary elements, usually porches or wings extend from the main building. These elements create the massing of a building. Interior floor and ceiling heights are reflected on the exterior of a building and should be compatible with nearby historic buildings.”
 5. “A building’s roof contributes significantly to its massing and to the character of the surrounding area. New construction may consider, where appropriate, roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings. Additionally roof designs of new residential construction may incorporate eave overhang or trim details such as exposed rafters, cornice, fascia, frieze board, mouldings, etc. as those of nearby buildings.”
 6. “The size of a building is determined by its dimensions which also dictate square footage. SCALE refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings – large, medium, small. To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.”
 7. “Façade elements such as porches, entrances, and windows make up the “face” or façade of a building. New construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.”
 8. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. In order to coexist in harmony with adjacent historic structures in the historic districts, porches are strongly encouraged. Designs for new porches should also reference historic porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, rails, and ornamentation. Porches of new buildings should also be similar in height and width to porches of nearby historic buildings. Proper care should be taken in the detailing of new porches. Scale, proportion and character of elements such as porch columns, corner brackets, railings, pickets, etc. should be compatible with adjacent historic structures. Wood or a suitable substitute material should be used. In addition, elements such as balconies, cupolas, chimneys, dormers, and other elements can help integrate a new structure with the neighborhood when used at the proper scale.”
 9. “The number of and proportion of openings – windows and entrances – within the façade of a building creates a solid-to-void ratio (wall-to-opening). New buildings should use windows and entrances that approximate the placement and solid-to-void ratio of nearby historic buildings. In addition, designs for new construction should incorporate the traditional use of windows casements and door surrounds. Where a side elevation is clearly visible from the street, proportions and placement of their elements will have an impact upon the visual character of the neighborhood and must be addressed in the design.”
 10. “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples. The choice of materials and ornamentation for new construction is a good way for a new building to exert its own identity. By using historic examples as a point of departure, it is possible for new construction to use new materials and ornamentation and still fit into the historic districts. Historic buildings feature the use of materials for roofs, foundations, wall cladding and architectural details and architectural details. In new buildings, exterior materials – both traditional and modern – should closely resemble surrounding historic examples. Buildings in Mobile’s historic districts vary in age and architectural styles, dictating the materials to be used for new construction. Traditional buildings which are

not present on nearby historic buildings or buildings in the area that contain only Victorian-era houses, a brick ranch-style house would be inconspicuous and disrupts the area's visual continuity. Modern materials which have the same textural qualities and character as materials of nearby historic buildings may be acceptable.”

11. “The degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings.” Although new buildings should use the decorative trim, window casings, and other building materials similar to nearby historic buildings, the degree of ornamentation should not exceed that characteristic of the area. Profile and dimensions of new material should be consistent with the examples in the district.”
12. The type, size and dividing light of windows, and their location and configuration (rhythm) help establish historic character of a building and compatibility with adjacent structures. Traditionally designed windows openings generally have a raised surround on frame buildings. New construction methods should follow this method in the historic districts as opposed to designing window openings that are flush with the wall.”
13. Often one of the most important decorative features, doorways reflect the architectural style of a building. The design of doors and doorways can help establish the character of a building and compatibility with adjacent facades. Some entrances in Mobile's historic districts have special features such as transoms and decorative elements framing the openings. Careful consideration should be given to incorporating such elements in new construction.”
15. “New materials that are an evolution of historic materials, such as Hardiplank concrete siding or a simulated stucco finish, should suggest profile, dimension and finish of historic materials. True materials such as brick, wood siding, or stucco are encouraged. Some synthetic materials, such as fiberglass porch columns may be appropriate in individual cases as approved by the Review Board.”
16. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the Historic Districts. However, it is important that the design, location, and materials be compatible with the property. Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting. The appearance of parking areas should be minimized. “

C. Scope of Work (Per Submitted Plans):

1. Demolish the existing brick wall fronting the lot.
2. Construct a single family residence
 - a. The house will be setback 20' from the inner edge of the sidewalk.
 - b. The house will be located 24' 7" from the southern lot line and 8' from the northern lot line.
 - c. The house will measure 52 wide and 49' 11" deep.
 - d. The house will rest atop a raised slab foundation. The foundation will be faced with a brick veneer. Oval-shaped foundation iron vents will be set within the foundation.
 - e. The house will be faced with Hardiboard siding.
 - f. A two-tiered porch will wrap around the Façade (East Elevation) and North Elevation
 - g. The house will feature aluminum clad wooden windows (of varying light configuration)
 - h. A hipped roof will surmount the two-story dwelling. A secondary gable roof will project from the façade. A shed roof with a projecting gable (covering a stoop) will be located off the rear elevation.
 - i. Asphalt shingles will sheath the house's roof.
 - j. A brick veneered chimney will rise through the north-facing roof slope.
 - k. Façade (East Elevation)

- i. The southern portion of the asymmetrical façade will be surmounted by slightly advanced bay. The advanced bay will be surmounted by a gable roof.
 - ii. The first-story of the southern portion of the façade will feature three pilaster defined bays. The pilasters will feature bases, necking, and capitals. Fixed shutters will extend between the pilasters.
 - iii. The L-shaped wraparound porch extends across the length of the northern portion of the façade's first-story.
 - iv. A gallery extends the full length of the second-story.
 - v. The upper and lower galleries will feature square section porch posts with bases, necking, and capitals. Said supports will match the pilasters fronting the southern portion of façade's first-story. Picketed railings will extended between the square section porch posts.
 - vi. A double (glazed and paneled) door with flanking door-like windows and surmounting transoms will comprise the front entrance.
 - vii. Brick steps will access the porch.
 - viii. Three Glazed and paneled double French door units with surmounting transoms will be located on the façade's second-story.
- l. South Elevation
- i. Two two-over-two windows and a double (glazed and paneled) garage door will be located on the South Elevation's first-story.
 - ii. Two two-over-two glazed windows will be located on the South Elevation's second-story.
 - iii. An intermediate beltcourse/entablature band will extend the length of the South Elevation and surround the whole of the building.
- m. West (Rear) Elevation
- i. The shed-roofed first-story of the West Elevation will feature a tripartite grouping of two-over-two windows and a pair of one-over-one windows.
 - ii. A gabled-roofed stoop featuring square section posts and picketed railings (for stoop and bricks stair) will be locate between the first-story's aforementioned window grouping's.
 - iii. A glazed and paneled door will open onto the stoop.
 - iv. A flight of brick steps featuring picketed railings will access the wraparound porch.
- n. North Elevation
- i. The wraparound porch will extend the length of the North Elevation.
 - ii. The end chimney will project into the galleries.
 - iii. The North Elevation's first-second story will feature two pairs of double (paneled and glazed) French doors with surmounting transoms and a tripartite grouping of two-over-two windows.
 - iv. The North Elevation's second-story will feature a double French door unit with surmounting transom and a one-over-one window.
3. A concrete driveway featuring a curved apron-like entrance will allow for access to the garage. A concrete walkway featuring curved apron-like arms will access the front porch and connect to the aforementioned driveway.

CLARIFICATIONS/REQUESTS

1. Clarify the following heights/dimensions: ground to foundation; foundation to first-story ceiling; second-story floor to second-story roof; overall height.
2. Provide detail drawings of the main entrance, columns, railings, and representative window types.

3. Provide samples of the proposed bricks.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a single family residence on a vacant lot. Applications for new residential construction must meet the criteria outlined in the Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts. The goal of the New Residential Construction Guidelines is to integrate new buildings in existing historic settings.

The proposed new construction meets municipal setback requirements and adopts the traditional façade line of nearby residential buildings (See B-1). The materials are in compliance with the Design Guidelines (See B-10). While the overall height and footprint of the building is comparable to the scale of adjacent historic buildings, the breakdown of the mass could not be determined from the plans submitted for review. Staff requests that revised drawings with vertical dimensions be provided. Additionally, Staff asks that the applicant submit detail drawings of elements mentioned in the preceding section. Submission of the aforementioned will allow for a better understanding of not only the overall built mass, but also the arrangement and proportion of the components thereof. The proposed windows appear in the drawing to be of a more modern type than the traditional design adopted by the design as a whole. More detailed drawings will allow for clarification of the design, dimensions, and appearance of the windows (See B 2-13).

The proposed Façade (East Elevation) is asymmetrical in composition. The Southern portion calls for shuttered ground floor. Staff recommends the use of siding instead of shutters. The use of siding between the proposed pilasters would allow for continuity of vertical and horizontal planes, thereby integrating the two parts of this the most prominent built face. The North (Side) Elevation has a discrepancy. The upper right portion of the rendering shows an expanse of siding. According to the plan, this end bay of the porch will feature a railing and open field. The Rear (West) Elevation features minimal fenestration. Staff understands that the west side of the house is the least visible from the public view, but Board ordinarily requires that blank expanses be relieved by either fenestration or pilasters. Staff encourages the use of windows (sash or transom) to break up the expanse of wall. The South Elevation features expanses of undifferentiated wall. Staff encourages the use of upper-story fenestration vertically aligned with that found on the first-story.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

On account of lack of information (See the clarifications and requests listed above) and consequent bearing on B (2-13), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and historical character of the surrounding district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Peter F. Burns and Ms. Lucy Barr were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell addressed the Board. He explained that the applicant submitted revised drawings that took into account all of Staff's concerns. Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that the existing brick wall would remain and that with exception of the view through said wall's vehicular and pedestrian gates, only the second floor would be visible. He also stated that the applicants would like to be approved with option of using either siding or shuttering on the façade's advanced bay

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant and his representative. He asked them if they had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address. Ms. Barr raised the subject of two site related conditions. She stated the siting of the house was conditioned by the brick wall and an oak tree.

Mr. Wagoner complimented the lot.

Mr. Burns addressed the exterior facing of the façade's advanced bay. He explained that a storage area would be located immediately behind the wall and that a window would interrupt the shelving. Mr. Bemis explained the reasoning behind the Staff's Recommendation against the shuttering. He stated that the Guidelines prohibit the infill of front porches. He said the proposed shuttering of the porch by resembling an infilled porch would be an unsympathetic enclosure. Mr. Holmes disagreed. Ms. Harden stated that it would be good to consider the design from the standpoint of not having either the fence or the wall.

Mr. Karwinski stated that the house was awkward for the context. He said that while it might be suitable for a location in Ashland Place or in West Mobile; it was not in keeping with an urban location such as this lot in the DeTonti Square Historic District. Mr. Burns responded to Mr. Karwinski's comments by showing a picture of a nearby house that he said did not take into the historic context. He then spoke of the proposed design. Mentioning the porches in particular, he said that house incorporated design features and elements traditionally associated with Southern architecture. Mr. Roberts said that while he appreciated Mr. Karwinski's concerns, the area in which the house is located features a mixture of building styles and plans. He stated that there a number of fine Victorian period residences in the vicinity. Mr. Karwinski stated there were not any on the block in question. Mr. Roberts politely disagreed. He said that it he would be hardpressed to define the area's built environment as strictly urban in that it was not wholly composed of townhouses.

Mr. Holmes said the project was in way a negative development or an impairment for the district. He said a new home on a formerly vacant lot is an improvement.

Mr. Harden asked if the property was a combination of two lots. Mr. Burns explained that the lot had been enlarged by the purchase of a portion of the lot to the south.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant's representative. No further Board discussion ensued. Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd closed the period of the 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, amending facts to note the following: the lower story of the façade's southern bay will feature either wooden siding or shuttering; the alteration of light configuration and increased number of windows; and the retention of the wall.

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.

The motion received a second. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/5/14