

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
June 6th, 2018 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Harris Oswalt, Nick Holmes III, Carolyn Hasser, Bob Allen, Catarina Echols, Craig Roberts and Steve Stone.
Members Absent: Jim Wagoner, John Ruzic, David Barr, Robert Brown, and Kim Harden.
Staff Members Present: Marion McElroy, Bridget Daniel, and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Oswalt asked to holdover the approval of the April 18, 2018 minutes until the June 20, 2018 meeting.
3. Mr. Stone moved to approve the Midmonths. The motion received a second and was approved with one opposed, Mr. Allen.

B. MIDMONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

MidMonths from previous agenda of May 16th, 2018

- 1. Applicant: Suzanne Montgomery**
 - a. Property Address: 1411 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/6/2018
 - c. Project: Install back door, triple panel impact door.
- 2. Applicant: Broad Street Lofts, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 304 S Broad St 204
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/06/2018
 - c. Project: Reroof with charcoal gray shingles.
- 3. Applicant: Jay Altmeyer**
 - a. Property Address: 501 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/06/2018
 - c. Project: Remove metal roof, old asphalt shingles, at center rear remove decking and replace burned rafters, reroof with Timberline 3-tab shingles.
- 4. Applicant: Thomas M. Bernhardt, Bernhardt Roofing & General Construction LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 15 N Julia St
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/09/2018
 - c. Project: Reroof with black 3 tab asphalt shingles to match existing.
- 5. Applicant: Terry Maddox**
 - a. Property Address: 1137 Montauk Ave
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/10/2018
 - c. Project: Repair/replace rotten decking and repaint to match. Repair other rotten wood as necessary and repaint to match.
- 6. Applicant: Mobile Carnival Association**
 - a. Property Address: 356 Church St
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/12/2018
 - c. Project: Construct aluminum fence 5' in height around perimeter of lot 356 Church Street and extending into 351 Government Street. Fence will run along Church Street and Franklin Street. Install hedge screening where necessary. Fence will have both vehicular and pedestrian access gates.

- 7. Applicant: David Will**
- a. Property Address: 320 N Jackson St
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/13/2018
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood to match existing in dimension, profile and material. Repaint to match existing.
- 8. Applicant: Wendell McGhee**
- a. Property Address: 957 Old Shell Rd A
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/13/2018
 - c. Project: Remove flat roofing at rear, reroof with modified system.
- 9. Applicant: Kelli Johnson**
- a. Property Address: 1551 Old Shell Rd
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/16/2018
 - c. Project: Install sign with tenant panels mounted between two existing brick columnar posts. Sign will be 5' in width by 4' in height, painted metal.
- 10. Applicant: Charles L. Walker, C W Maintenance & Construction**
- a. Property Address: 1802 New Hamilton St
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/16/2018
 - c. Project: Construct 6' wooden dogeared fence behind the front plane of the house. Fence will run along east perimeter of lot and turn to continue along north perimeter.
- 11. Applicant: Michael and Michele Rumpf**
- a. Property Address: 963 Palmetto St
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/16/2018
 - c. Project: Repair and replace existing shutters on front facade to match. Install wooden or fiber cement board simulated louvered shutters. Install screen door on back porch.
- 12. Applicant: Bobby Joe Gipson**
- a. Property Address: 1000 Selma St
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/17/2018
 - c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in black.
- 13. Applicant: Jose Chavez**
- a. Property Address: 1107 Oak St
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/27/2018
 - c. Project: Renews approval of 12/5/2013. Make repairs to fire damaged house. Replace deteriorated siding (where necessary) to match that on the rear. Replace deteriorated windows to match existing. Reroof to match. Repaint per existing color scheme.
- 14. Applicant: Malcolm Roberts**
- a. Property Address: 36 S Lafayette St
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/30/2018
 - c. Project: Reroof house and garage with charcoal gray shingles.
- 15. Applicant: Alfreda Taylor**
- a. Property Address: 1750 Virginia St
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/30/2018
 - c. Project: Secure property.
- 16. Applicant: Suzanne Hoffer**
- a. Property Address: 1508 Monroe St
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/30/2018
 - c. Project: Reroof with Weatherwood color architectural shingles.
- 17. Applicant: Alfreda Taylor**
- a. Property Address: 1754 Virginia St
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/30/2018
 - c. Project: Seal house.

18.Applicant: Alfreda Taylor

- a. Property Address: 1756 Virginia St
- b. Date of Approval: 04/30/2018
- c. Project: Seal house.

19.Applicant: Laleh Parvinrouh

- a. Property Address: 62 Semmes Ave
- b. Date of Approval: 05/04/2018
- c. Project: Reroof with black shingles.

20.Applicant: Jessica Davis

- a. Property Address: 279 Park Terrace
- b. Date of Approval: 05/07/2018
- c. Project: Repair areas of cracked and shifted brick due to house settling. Replace damaged brick & mortar (and any other damaged materials (s) which may be unveiled during repair process) to match existing in profile, material, and dimension. Repair & Replace Fascia Boards & Repaint to Match Existing.

21.Applicant: Barbara Minor

- a. Property Address: 402 Dunham St
- b. Date of Approval: 05/08/2018
- c. Project: Repair and patch in siding to match existing. Replace wooden lapsiding in 10' x 18' section. Repair and replace 30 feet of fascia and eaves to match existing in dimension, profile, and material.

22.Applicant: Christopher Hall

- a. Property Address: 1056 Augusta St
- b. Date of Approval: 05/08/2018
- c. Project: Reroof with weatherwood shingles, repair/replace any rotten decking or eaves.

23.Applicant: Charlotte Brown

- a. Property Address: 163 S Jefferson St
- b. Date of Approval: 05/08/2018
- c. Project: Construct 8' wooden fence along east perimeter of lot abutting commercial property. Construct 6' wooden fence with lattice above along the southern perimeter of property, with the exception of a 20' x 6' section of fence for vehicular access. 6' fence with lattice will turn at the southwest corner and continue running north until it meets the house. Fence does not exceed front plane of house. A 6' wooden fence will be constructed to meet the neighboring fence on the northern side of the lot.

MidMonths for agenda of June 6th, 2018

24.Applicant: Earl Hester

- a. Property Address: 309 S. Ann Street
- b. Date of Approval: 5/11/2018
- c. Project: Replace 3' x5' window and deteriorated casing and trim to match existing in dimension, profile and material.

25.Applicant: Charles Cox

- a. Property Address: 1737 Hunter Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 5/11/2018
- c. Project: Replace fascia board and repaint to match existing. Repair clay tile roof to match existing.

- 26.Applicant: Michael Boucher**
- a. Property Address: 7 N. Catherine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/15/2018
 - c. Project: Repaint with Benjamin Moore Historic Color Western Flax.
- 27.Applicant: Genny McCreary on behalf of Northpointe Bank**
- a. Property Address: 225 Dauphin Street Suite 200
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/15/2018
 - c. Project: Install 5'0" wide by 1'8" high sandblasted wood hanging blade sign to say "Northpointe Bank".
- 28.Applicant: Ranita Smith**
- a. Property Address: 910 Charleston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/17/2018
 - c. Project: Construct front porch balustrade from MHDC stock designs.
- 29.Applicant: Sign Lite**
- a. Property Address: 1754 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/17/2018
 - c. Project: Exchange panels on existing monument sign to painted aluminum. Sign will read "SEC Dentistry Midtown".
- 30.Applicant: Jeffrey Kent**
- a. Property Address: 1654 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/17/2018
 - c. Project: Replace wood privacy fence on rear perimeter of property; add iron fence front side yards; remove wooden gate on porch and replace with open iron gate; repaint body and trim--china white Benjamin Moore is body; trim to be determined.
- 31.Applicant: Gerhardt Government LLC**
- a. Property Address: 1750 Government Street A
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/17/2018
 - c. Project: Replace privacy fence and gate as per existing.
- 32.Applicant: Andrew Thompson on behalf of 751 Dauphin Street, LLC**
- a. Property Address: 800-802 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/18/2018
 - c. Project: Construct 4' black aluminum fence around 800 and 802 Dauphin with vehicular entrance and exit.
- 33.Applicant: Andrew Thompson on behalf of 751 Dauphin Street, LLC**
- a. Property Address: 763 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/18/2018
 - c. Project: Construct 4' black aluminum fence around lots at 763 Dauphin and 754 Conti with vehicular access.
- 34.Applicant: Daniel Coulter**
- a. Property Address: 103 Michael Donald Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/18/2018
 - c. Project: Repair/replace wood windows in front. Add wooden front steps.
- 35.Applicant: Layne Lynch**
- a. Property Address: 1110 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/18/2018
 - c. Project: Replace existing three foot fence with six foot privacy fence.
- 36.Applicant: Troy Nettles on behalf of Craig and Christine Bogar**
- a. Property Address: 107 Providence Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/21/2018
 - c. Project: Reroof with asphalt shingles in approved color.

- 37.Applicant: Anne and Gideon Jeffrey**
a. Property Address: 312 McDonald Avenue
b. Date of Approval: 5/21/2018
c. Project: Repair existing wooden fence to match.
- 38.Applicant: Therese Morris**
a. Property Address: 64 Bradford Avenue
b. Date of Approval: 5/22/2018
c. Project: Repaint house in alabaster white.
- 39.Applicant: Eugene Moore on behalf of Big Zion AME**
a. Property Address: 112 S. Bayou Street
b. Date of Approval: 5/23/2018
c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in black.
- 40.Applicant: Larry Scott of Lit Cigars**
a. Property Address: 258 Dauphin Street
b. Date of Approval: 5/24/2018
c. Project: Install one metal wall plaque.
- 41.Applicant: Kelli Johnson of Wrico Signs on behalf of Little Sisters of the Poor**
a. Property Address: 1655 McGill Avenue
b. Date of Approval: 5/25/2018
c. Project: Install one (1) double faced monument sign composed of painted stucco and brick no more than 60 square feet for both sides of sign.
- 42.Applicant: Marcus Neto**
a. Property Address: 920 Dauphin Street
b. Date of Approval: 5/25/2018
c. Project: Remove portion of failing porch and reroof building.
- 43.Applicant: Jeff Deen**
a. Property Address: 207 Church Street
b. Date of Approval: 5/25/2018
c. Project: Remove asphalt paving and install concrete on same footprint. Install aluminum fencing. Repaint building to match existing.
- 44.Applicant: Ryan Lewis**
a. Property Address: 161 Michigan Avenue
b. Date of Approval: 5/25/2018
c. Project: Replace balusters per existing; repair/replace rotten wood per existing; remove non-historic apartment stair at rear; repaint in approved colors.

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 2018-13-CA: 250 St. Anthony Street**
a. Applicant: Follies Fun House
b. Project: Ancillary Related: Demolish portion of non-contributing ancillary building. Relocate existing window on ancillary building.
APPROVED: CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
- 2. 2018-14-CA: 1110 Palmetto Street**
a. Applicant: Marcio Simao on behalf of Lance and Ellen Lynch
b. Project: Extend existing porch across façade.
DENIED: CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2018-15-CA: 920 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Marcus Neto
 - b. Project: Construct gallery on a non-contributing building.
- APPROVED: CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2018-16-CA: 615 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Robert Maurin of Maurin Architecture on behalf of Wendell Quimby.
 - b. Project: Install sail cloths in courtyard. Install metal awnings over windows.
- APPROVED: CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

5. 2018-17-CA: 1654 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Pamela and Jeffrey Kent
 - b. Project: Porch Related: Retain porch railing, planters, and gate installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- HELDOVER: CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Largue announced that the next meeting of the ARB will be held on June 20, 2018.

Ms. Largue then introduced Mr. Marty Colby of Winco Window Company. Mr. Colby conducted a presentation on "Impact Historic Replica Window".

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-13-CA: 250 St. Anthony Street
Applicant: Follies Fun House
Received: 5/10/2018
Meeting: 6/6/18

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Non-Contributing Ancillary Building
Zoning: T-4
Project: Ancillary Related: Demolish portion of non-contributing ancillary building.
Relocate existing window on ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This highly significant edifice dates circa 1850. An artful blending of Greek Revival and Italianate impulses and elements, the building was constructed as a private residence. It is one of less than forty of what once numbered over six hundred side-hall with wing houses.

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 October 18th, 2017 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time infill of a pool, relocation of gate, and removal of non-historic stucco over CMU fencing was approved. The proposed scope of work includes partial demolition to a non-contributing outbuilding and relocation of window.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “When considering demolition of later portions of a building, the following criteria are taken into account “significance, condition, impact on the street and the district, and nature of proposed development.”
 - 2. “Acceptable materials for accessory structures include...masonry.”
 - 3. “Design exterior building walls associated with additions and alterations of non-historic structures to respect the character of the historic district.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):

1. Demolish portion of ancillary building.
 - a. Remove existing window on east elevation and doors on eastern portion of south elevation.
2. Construct new wall. Wall will extend from remaining portion of south wall and terminate at remaining portion of east wall.
 - a. New walls will match existing stucco treatment.
 - b. Aforementioned window will be salvaged and relocated to easternmost portion of the second story of the south elevation.
 - c. Install double door on first story of eastern portion of south elevation.
 - d. Door will be 3'0" by 7'0" and composed of wood.

STAFF ANALYSIS

When reviewing applications for the demolition of buildings, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts take into account four criteria. The aforementioned criteria are as follows: significance, condition, impact on the street and the district, and nature of proposed development (See B-1.).

The ancillary building falls not within either the property's or the district's periods of significance. Dating from after the issuance of the 1955 Sanborn Map, the building is not of the same historical nature, architectural importance, and construction quality as the main principle building defining the property. The building is located at the very rear of the main building's side lawn behind two landscapes areas and intermediate fencing. The structure, while visible from the public view, neither engages the street nor contributes to the density of the streetscape. The structure will have the southeast portion removed. Stucco walls will be constructed, extending from the remaining portion of the south elevation wall and terminating at the southeast corner, where the south elevation meets the remaining portion of the east elevation. The newly constructed walls will match the existing stucco on the building (See B2 and B-3). Principal buildings with stucco treatments are found in the district. A window will be salvaged and relocated, and a set of double doors will be installed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-1), Staff does not believe the application will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the properties or district. Staff recommends approval of the application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Cart Blackwell, representative for the owner, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Nick Holmes III recused himself.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Oswalt welcomed the owner's representative and asked if there were any comments, clarifications or questions he would like to make.

Mr. Stone asked if a portion of the wall along the West property was being removed. Ms. Largue explained the removal of the wall was previously approved at an ARB meeting. Mr. Blackwell noted the removal of the wall as indicated on plans was to promote circulation.

Mr. Blackwell stated a building used by the Red Cross had previously been demolished on the property. Ms. Largue explained the building in question was built in the 1960's.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

APPLICATION EXPIRES June 8, 2019.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-14-CA: 1110 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Marcio Simao on behalf of Lance and Ellen Lynch
Received: 5/18/2018
Meeting: 6/6/18

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Porch Related: Extend existing porch to extend along front façade.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Victorian influenced workman’s cottage was constructed somewhere between 1910 and 1920. The wood framed house features a half width porch with turned post and balustrade.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on June 17, 2002 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time a rear addition was approved. The proposed scope of work includes extending an existing porch along the front façade.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “For most historic resources, the front façade is the most important to preserve intact.”
 - 2. “The distinguishing original qualities or character of a historic building, structure, or site and its environment shall not be destroyed.”
 - 3. “Preserve an original porch or gallery on a house.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):

- 1. Extend existing porch along façade on south elevation by 15’0”.
 - a. Porch will be a total of 30’0” in width.
 - b. Porch will maintain height of 9’0” and 6’0” in depth.
 - c. Existing turned posts will be replaced with square columns.
 - d. Repaint to match existing color scheme.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This workman's cottage has an unusual half width porch, and Victorian influence. The application up for review involves extending an existing half width porch on a front façade. The *Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts* state the front façade is the most important to preserve (See B-1). Alterations are proposed for a street facing porch. The porch is highly visible from the street. The existing porch width is consistent with the 1925 Sanborn map, making it an original feature. Original porches and galleries are to be retained (See B-3). The application also proposes to alter porch supports from turned posts to box columns. Altering both the width and posts style of the porch would give the intimation of a Creole cottage. Removing the Victorian style posts and balustrade would destroy a characteristic feature (See B-2).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff does believe the application will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the properties or district. Staff recommends denial of the application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Roberts noted that the drawing submitted changed to configuration of posts. He further explained the addition of a post as proposed would create too much space between two of the posts. Mr. Roberts noted a set of architectural drawings may help better convey the extension of the porch. Mr. Stone agreed with Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Allen commented there was no photographic evidence of the porch ever being full width.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt 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. Holmes moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-15-CA: 920 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Marcus Neto
Received: 5/21/2018
Meeting: 6/6/18

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-1
Project: Gallery Related: Construct new gallery.

BUILDING HISTORY

This commercial building was heavily altered in the 1960's with the addition of a hipped roof and colonnade. Recently, the building housed law offices.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on June 15, 2004 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time the installation of new signage was approved. The proposed scope of work includes removing an existing colonnade and constructing a gallery.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "Non-contributing structures are addressed separately in the Design Review Guidelines document from contributing structures."
 - 2. "Alterations to non-historic commercial buildings must be compatible with the historic district."
 - 3. "Design an alteration to retain a placement and orientation that is compatible with the district."
 - 4. "Design an alteration to appear similar in massing and scale with historic commercial buildings in the district."
 - 5. "Use building elements that are of a similar profile and durability to those seen on historic buildings in the district."
 - 6. "Reference traditional articulation patterns on the façade of a new commercial structure."
 - 7. "Use brick, true stucco or stone as the primary exterior building material."

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):

1. Remove later hipped roof and colonnade and construct new gallery.
 - a. Gallery will maintain depth and width of current colonnade.
 - b. A bronze metal canopy will be installed.
 - c. Aforementioned canopy will be supported by decorative metal column on a brick veneer plinth base.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This circa 1900 building was heavily altered in the 1960's and consequently lost its contributing status. The *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts* address non-contributing commercial buildings separately from contributing commercial buildings (See B-1). The proposed application is two parts in plan. The first part of the application involves removing a later hipped roof and colonnade. The current façade is not a fine example of mid-century design and does not contribute to the older landscape of Old Dauphin Way Historic District (See B-2). The removal of later additions will expose the original height of the early 20th century building and fit the massing of commercial buildings in the district and neighboring Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District (See B-4).

The second portion of the application involves constructing a new gallery. The gallery will be one story in height. A metal canopy supported by metal columns on plinth bases. The bases will be constructed of repurposed brick from the colonnades. While the metal columns consist of the traditional base, shaft and column, the use of metal columns on brick plinths is not common in the district (see B-5). Staff recommends the use of a simpler metal columnar design extending the height of the gallery (from slab to canopy) in keeping with the district and neighboring districts if the applicant would be agreeable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Marcus Neto, owner, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Oswalt welcomed the owner and asked if there were any comments, clarifications or questions he would like to make. Mr. Neto stated the materials proposed are extremely sturdy.

Mr. Stone inquired into a recently replaced window. Mr. Neto responded a car had recently driven into the window, therefore requiring it to be replaced. Mr. Neto noted the reason for the brick plinths was for a safety barrier.

Mr. Roberts noted it was unusual for a commercial building to have a cast iron column on a brick plinth. Mr. Neto confirmed the post went through the brick plinth for Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Stone stated in concept he was not opposed to a cast iron column on plinth. He further explained that a 3' brick plinth is high for columns to sit on. He noted the height of the plinth was more of an aesthetic issue for this building.

Mr. Allen questioned the detail of the column. Mr. Roberts noted there are not many options for capitals and bases. Mr. Roberts continued by commenting it may be more attractive to have a more simplistic design.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was approved with Mr. Stone in opposition.

APPLICATION EXPIRES June 8, 2019.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-16-CA: 615 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Robert Maurin of Maurin Architecture on behalf of Wendell Quimby
Received: 5/29/2018
Meeting: 6/6/18

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.1
Project: Alteration Related: Install sail cloths in courtyard and metal awnings over openings.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to materials located within this property's MHDC vertical file, the two-story eastern portion of the building dates circa 1870 and the later one-story western portion dates from circa 2002.

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 November 2nd, 2017 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time the alteration of a front elevation and courtyard was approved. The proposed scope of work includes the installation of sail cloths and awnings.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "Preserve and repair an original detail or ornamentation on a historic commercial building."
 - 2. "New awnings may be added in a manner that retains the character of a historic building."
 - 3. "The ARB will consider new awnings based on the design of the awning, the design of the building, and the location and placement on the building."

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):

1. Install sail cloth shades over courtyard.
 - a. Sail cloths will extend from a secondary (west) elevation with street frontage to two (2) metal poles.
 - b. Sail cloth will be white.
2. Install custom steel sheet metal awnings over windows located on west and north elevations.
 - a. One (1) metal awning will be installed over secondary entrance on historic portion of building.
 - b. Seven (7) metal awnings will be installed on later portion of building dating to 2002.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of sail cloth shades and metal awnings over door and window openings. Both installations are contemporary in nature.

The sail cloth shades will be attached to the northern portion of the west elevation. The West elevation is a secondary frontage that faces Dearborn Street. The shades will be anchored to a contributing masonry building. Anchor points will be easily removed and repaired if tenant should decide to remove. The other points of the shade will be attached to two newly installed metal poles. The historic portion of the building will be maintained (See B-2).

The metal awnings will be a custom design of steel mesh over metal frame. One (1) of the seven awnings will be attached to the historic portion of the building, while the six (6) other awnings will be attached to the later addition (see B-3). The creative use of metal and location of installation (over openings) makes the awnings differentiated from, yet compatible with the building and districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Robert Maurin, representative for the owner, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Oswalt welcomed the owner’s representative and asked if there were any comments, clarifications or questions he would like to make. Mr. Maurin presented the Board with a model of the proposed metal awnings.

Mr. Stone asked what the finish for the poles for which the sail cloths are attached would be. Mr. Maurin stated the poles and awnings would be unpainted to match existing metal planters. He continued by explaining the metal of the awnings over the windows is a steel mesh.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

APPLICATION EXPIRES June 8, 2019

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-17-CA: 1654 Government Street
Applicant: Pamela and Jeffrey Kent
Received: 5/21/2018
Meeting: 6/6/18

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Porch Related: Retain wooden porch railing, planters, and gate constructed without Certificate of Appropriateness.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Arts and Crafts influenced bungalow was designed by notable local architect C.L. Hutchisson, Sr. and constructed in 1924.

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 October 24th, 1995 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time the repair of a roof was approved. The proposed scope of work includes retaining wooden railings and planters.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The removal or alteration of any historic landscaping features, materials, or distinctive architectural features should be avoided.”
 - 2. “Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible.”
 - 3. “Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure or site should be treated with sensitivity with particular emphasis on preservation of the features.”
 - 4. “Preserve an original porch or gallery on a house.”
 - 5. “Replace a historic porch element to match the original.”
 - 6. “Use replacement materials and elements that are appropriate to the style, texture, finish, composition and proportion of the historic structure.”
 - 7. “When reconstructing a porch, pay particular attention to matching the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
 - 8. “Do not use a railing that is too elaborate for the building (of a different style).”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):

1. Retain the following porch components:
 - a. Wooden slats will stack to form a wooden railing.
 - b. The railing will be placed between existing brick plinths and planters.
 - c. The wooden planters will be constructed on top of brick plinths.
 - d. A wooden stair with gate will be located on the east elevation and access the side yard.
 - e. Wood will be stained.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the retention of porch railing, planters and wooden stairs with gate installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness.

The house had featured a Craftsman style, geometric patterned railing. There is no pictorial evidence which shows this railing was original to the house. Photographic evidence shows this Craftsman style railing was in place until 2017. When replacing a porch detail, the *Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts* state that where a deteriorated detail is beyond repair, a porch element should match the original (See B-5). No evidence exist in the vertical file that this railing had been replaced in previous years, although it is safe to assume the railing had at least been repaired.

The guidelines further address replacement of porch elements are to be appropriate to the style, finish and texture, composition and proportion of the historic building (See B-6). While the wood material of railings, planters, and gate is acceptable, the composition of boards is not in keeping with the guidelines. Specifically, the height of the railing above the brick plinths and planters are not compatible to the bungalow nature of the structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-6), Staff does believe the application as is will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the property or district. Staff recommends denial of the application as proposed.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mrs. Pamela Kent, owner, and was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Oswalt welcomed the owner and asked if there were any comments, clarifications or questions he would like to make.

Mr. Roberts stated the bungalow was a well known piece of Mobile architecture. Mr. Roberts asked if the applicant had been given permission to remove the front fence along the southern perimeter of property and repaint. Ms. Lague stated the owner received approval to repaint and that the focus of the Board is approval or denial for a railing, gate and planters constructed without a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mrs. Kent stated before the removal of foliage and fence installed along the southern perimeter of the property, you could not visibly see porch. She further explained that terracotta pots had sat on the brick piers prior to the installation of newly constructed planters. Mrs. Kent continued by saying the rail was replaced because of rot, termites and concern over the height of the rail for safety. She noted at this point

it be a financial burden to replace the railing.

Mr. Allen emphasized the Board was only reviewing the railing, gate, and planters installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Stone expressed concern for the height of the railing and that it did not fit between the brick piers. Mrs. Kent proposed landscaping in front of the porch to conceal portions of the rail. Mr. Roberts noted the installation of shrubs or plantings would not solve the issue.

Mrs. Kent stated the height of the railing was 36-1/2" and the height of the brick piers are 26". She proposed the removal of a couple of the horizontal boards to bring the height down. Mr. Stone stated that in the photographic evidence seen, previous railing was no higher than the height of the brick piers. Ms. Largue the acceptable height for a residential railing per code is at least 34" in height. She stated constructing a railing not based on recent photographic evidence would trigger code compliance and would not be grandfathered in.

Mr. Roberts stated the configuration of the railing overpowers the rest of the house. Mr. Stone asked if the railing, one gate, and planters were stained. Mrs. Kent replied the wood was stained to a dark walnut color.

Mr. Roberts asked if the color of the house was going to be white. Mrs. Kent confirmed the color of the house was to be white with a darker trim.

Mr. Stone proposed removing a few of the horizontal boards which compose the railing and installing a simplistic metal rail between the planters for height. Mrs. Echols stated she would be agreeable to Mr. Stone's proposal and suggested the railing be painted bronze.

Mr. Holmes stated the owner should replace the railing according to photographic evidence or what was previously installed. He further explained the previous railing was in keeping with the bungalow nature of the house. Mr. Holmes commented this house is the finest example of architecture for that period. Mr. Roberts agreed with Mr. Holmes.

Mrs. Kent stated her family owns three large dogs and that the removal of the fence on the southern perimeter, and the cleaning of the landscape allow them to access the yard. She further noted she was not sure if the railing was the original. Mrs. Kent cited a similar house in Old Dauphin Way that has no railing. She commented the family is concerned with safety and that people have been coming to the porch.

Mr. Stone inquired into protocol if the railing was not original. Mr. Holmes stated a thin handrail to achieve the height above a Chippendale railing (like one previously installed) or something fitting to the period would be appropriate.

Mrs. Kent stated the removal of the metal fence and landscaping allowed the house to be viewed. She stated most people did not notice it before. Mr. Roberts explained the Board reviews certain landscape components as well. He further explained the house is a famous Government Street house.

Mr. Allen noted if the application was denied the applicant would have to wait six months to return before the Board. Mrs. Hasser suggested organizing a Design Review Committee to potentially present the Board a solution at a later date.

Ms. Largue stated the removal of fence along the front perimeter, the installation of a new fence surrounding a side yard, and the installation of a metal gate at the front entrance had been approved at staff level.

Mrs. Echols reiterated her statement that Mr. Stone had a viable solution. Mr. Stone stated there were two possible solutions: modifying the rail or placing a rail more suitable to the period. Mr. Oswalt suggested a Design Review Committee as well. Ms. Largue explained the issue is multi-faceted. She further explained the issue pertains to compatibility with the house, compatibility with the neighborhood, composition of railing, and code issue if a new railing not based on photographic evidence is constructed.

Mrs. Kent stated issues with the homeless population on her property, specifically front porch. Mr. Roberts stated the Government Street corridor is known to be a major thoroughfare for the city.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

Mr. Holmes suggested a Design Review Committee should convene, with the understanding the Board will discuss the suggestions of the Design Review Committee and vote at a later date. He noted if the application is denied, the applicant can appeal to City Council.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Holmes moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, a Design Review Committee meet on site and report back to the Board for a final vote. He stated while the rail might not be original to the house, it had been installed for a long period of time and was in keeping with the style of the house.

Mr. Robert Allen and Mrs. Catarina Echols volunteered to be on the Design Review Committee.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

The application was held over until July 18th, 2018.