

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA
June 7, 2017 – 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. Cartledge Blackwell, MHDC Assistant Director, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Harris Oswalt, Robert Allen, John Ruzic, Catarina Echols, Nicholas Holmes, III, Steve Stone, Craig Roberts, and David Barr.
Members Absent: Robert Brown, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, and Jim Wagoner.
Staff Members Present: Cartledge W. Blackwell, Florence Kessler, Bridget Daniel, and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Stone made a motion to approve the minutes from the May 17, 2017 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.
3. Mr. Allen inquired as to Midmonth approval No. 10 (7 North Cedar Street) which called for the replacement of existing windows with six-over-six extruded aluminum windows. Mr. Blackwell explained that windows being replaced were one-over-one aluminum windows not original to the house and the replacement windows were extruded in construction (an approved replacement material for instances not involving the removal of original windows) and of a period and property appropriate light configuration. Mr. Stone moved to approve the COA's as granted by staff. Mrs. Echols seconded. The motion received a second was approved. Mr. Allen voted in opposition.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: E.A. Andrews**
 - a. Property Address: 52 Hannon Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/2/2017
 - c. Project: Install framed lattice between brick piers. Paint white.
2. **Applicant: Janice Morrison**
 - a. Property Address: 54 N. Cedar Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/5/2017
 - c. Project: Remove roof off of failing carport. Removed collapsed portions at later additions. Continue mothballing measures on building by boarding and securing openings. Install either board or tarp on back porch and rear addition.
3. **Applicant: Martha Slater**
 - a. Property Address: 1134 Montauk Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/5/2017
 - c. Project: Remove damaged porch ceiling caused by fallen tree. Reconstruct porch to match previously existing in dimension, profile, and material. Repurpose salvaged materials from existing porch.
4. **Applicant: Cheryl Dade**
 - a. Property Address: 308 Michigan Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/9/2017
 - c. Project: 6' Stucco Wall behind front of house with 2 iron gates.

- 5. Applicant: George Whillock**
 - a. Property Address: 156 S. Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/9/2017
 - c. Project: Replace rotten siding to match, replace crumbling brickwork, and repaint to match.
- 6. Applicant: Jane Daughtery**
 - a. Property Address: 1555 Blair Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/11/2017
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten wood as needed to match existing. Repaint Exterior of House with Dauphin Street Light Gold Paint Color. Repaint Trim, Posts & Spindles with DeTonti Square Off White Paint Color. And Repaint Shutters, Porch, Rails & Deck with Bellingrath Green Paint Color.
- 7. Applicant: Emanuel Roberts**
 - a. Property Address: 244 S. Warren Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/11/2017
 - c. Project: Install charcoal gray roof.
- 8. Applicant: Clayton Wallace**
 - a. Property Address: 1558 Blair Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/15/2017
 - c. Project: Restore porch columns, remove aesbestos shingles, reinstall wooden siding, repaint and reroof.
- 9. Applicant: Lyndsey Burkett**
 - a. Property Address: 15 S. Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/15/2017
 - c. Project: Repaint in the following color scheme:
Body: OL Sky Splash (Light Grey/Blue) Door/Trim: White.
- 10. Applicant: Windell Quimby**
 - a. Property Address: 7 N. Cedar Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/16/2017
 - c. Project: Replace windows with 6/6 extruded, reside, metal roof.
- 11. Applicant: Emily and Marlena Clark**
 - a. Property Address: 56 N. Reed Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/16/2017
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood on front porch to match existing in dimension, profile, and material.
- 12. Applicant: Shirley Jones Dumas**
 - a. Property Address: 354 Rapier Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/18/2017
 - c. Project: Replace brown roofing shingles on southeast corner of house to match rest of roof.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2017-24-CA: 958 Palmetto Street**
 - a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley of DBK Inc. on behalf of Melvin and Bernadette McNeil
 - b. Project: Addition Related- Construct a rear addition.**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
2. **2017-25-CA: 103 Lanier Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: Pete Vallas of Pete Vallas Architect on behalf of Jay F. and Lissa E. Watkins.
 - b. Project: Revised Plans for side and rear additions – Construct side & rear additions according to revised plans; and alter fenestration.**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
3. **2017-26-CA: 208 State Street**
 - a. Applicant: Robert Maurin of Maurin Architecture for 208 State Street, LLC
 - b. Project: Restoration and Rehabilitation – Conduct in-kind repairs and repaint; remove later additions & alterations; alter side & rear fenestration and elevations; construct a raised terrace; and install fencing & extend a wall.**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
4. **2017-27-CA: 1007 Selma Street**
 - a. Applicant: Allen and Ida Johnson
 - b. Project: Demolition - Demolish a dilapidated non-contributing residence.**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
5. **2017-28-CA: 1569 Bruister Street**
 - a. Applicant: Dr. Steven Roth
 - b. Project: Ancillary Related- Construct a new ancillary building on the rear portion of a lot.**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Rules and Regulations
2. Voluntary Board Representation

Following the review and vote on applications comprising the agenda, Mr. Blackwell introduced Ms. Florence Kessler from the City of Mobile Legal Department. Ms. Kessler explained that she and Mr. Blackwell had met to discuss the Board's Rules & Regulations and roles and responsibilities. Ms. Kessler stated she would provide a sheet to the Board with the aforementioned information at an upcoming meeting.

Ms. Kessler then moved forward to address concurrently with the Board any questions, comments or concerns provided by two Board members pertaining to the Board's Rules. Ms. Kessler began by referring to a set of suggested changes and general responses to the Rules and Regulations given by Board members to staff.

The Board, Ms. Kessler, and Staff reviewed the set of suggested changes and the existing Rules and Regulations. Mr. Oswalt asked Ms. Kessler to incorporate the changes discussed within a draft of revised Rules and Regulations for distribution at the next meeting. It was noted that a special meeting would be called for the discussion and individual vote on each proposed change. Mr. Blackwell announced the special meeting will be at the end of the next ARB meeting or one soon

thereafter. Mr. Oswalt asked if there was any other business. After no other business ensued there was a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded and the meeting ended.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-24-CA: 958 Palmetto Street

Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley of DBK Inc. on behalf of Melvin and Bernadette McNeil

Received: 5/16/2017

Meeting: 6/7/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: R-1

Project: Addition Related – Construct a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house was built in 1926. A fine local representation of a “bungalow”, a residential typology synonymous with the Arts and Crafts Movement that dominated America during the early 20th Century, the house features a prominent porch, dominant roof forms, and masculine details.

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. According to MHDC vertical files, this property has not before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review calls for the construction a rear addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site (site topography, character-defining features, trees, and significant vistas and public views) are retained.”
 - 2. “Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material, and/or character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.”
 - 3. “Design the building components (roof, foundations, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
 - 4. “Maintain the relationship of solids and voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as established by the historic building.”
 - 5. “Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color and/or wall plan. Alternative materials, such as cement fiberboard, are allowed when the addition is property differentiated from the original structure.”
 - 6. “Place an addition so that so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.”
 - 7. “Place a vertical addition in the rear so that it is not visible from the street.”
 - 8. As per camelback additions, those “substantially setback from the street” can be “appropriate.”
 - 9. “Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.”
 - 10. “Design a roof shape, pitch, material, and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.”

11. “Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze board, moldings, or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Perform general repairs and make replacements (when necessary) to the existing residence.
 - a. Reroof the house with architectural shingles.
 - b. Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match existing in dimension, profile, and material.
 - c. Repaint.
2. Remove a deck so as to enable the construction of the addition.
3. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The first-story portion of the addition will be a screened porch.
 - b. The second-story portion of the addition will feature a porch with surrounding enclosed spaces.
 - c. The addition will rest upon brick-faced foundation piers.
 - d. The additions’ walls will be clad with wood siding to match those found on the body of the house.
 - e. The addition will feature aluminum-clad wood windows and doors.
 - f. The aforementioned windows will be in a three-over-one in configuration so as to match those found on the body of the house.
 - g. The doors (French) will be multi-light in configuration.
 - h. The addition’s eaves will feature brace brackets and rafter tails matching those found on the body of the house.
 - i. The addition will be surmounted by a gabled roof sheathed with architectural shingles.
 - j. South (Façade) Elevation
 - i. A raked and louvered wooden vent will punctuate the addition’s façade-oriented gable (apex visible from).
 - k. West (a side) Elevation
 - i. The West Elevation’s first-story will feature the terminal bay of a porch.
 - ii. The porch bay will feature a square section porch pier and a screened panel (latter optional).
 - iii. The West Elevation’s second-story will feature a single three-over-one window and a pair of three-over-one windows.
 - l. North (rear) Elevation
 - i. The North Elevation’s first-story will be a full-length porch.
 - ii. Six square section porch piers will define the porch.
 - iii. A flight of wooden steps will cascade from the porch’s three central bays.
 - iv. Two sets of paired French doors will comprise the first-story fenestration.
 - v. The North Elevation’s second-story will feature a recessed porch.
 - vi. The aforementioned second-story porch will be recessed between advanced sections of enclosed space.
 - vii. A picketed railing will extend across the porch and between the two advanced sections of enclosed space.
 - viii. A multi-light French door flanked on either side by single three-over-one windows will comprise the second-story fenestration.

- m. East (a side) Elevation (addition and existing).
 - i. A pair of three multi-light windows will be removed from the East Elevation's first-story.
 - ii. A single sash one-over-one window will replace the aforementioned window.
 - iii. The second-story will feature three windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application calls for the construction of a rear addition onto a contributing residence. Minor in kind repair and replacement work also informs the scope of work. A rear deck would have to be removed to construct the addition. The aforementioned construction possesses neither architectural nor historical value. It is not visible from the public view. Minor fenestration changes on an earlier rear addition are also proposed.

In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the proposed addition is so designed that the overall characteristics of the property are retained (See B-1.). By virtue of being a located on rear of an inner lot property, the addition is subordinate to the public view (See B-6.). While a vertically attuned, the camelback design is located and designed do as to be an appropriate design solution in spite of being taller than the original dwelling. (See B 7 & 8.). Camelbacks are authorized and illustrated in the Design Review Guidelines. 257 Chatham Street constitutes a historically and architecturally sensitive camelback with the Board approved in Oakleigh. The camelback from only appears as the apex of a gable when viewed from straight on from the street. Many Arts and Crafts dwellings featured such devices.

In addition to siting, the proposed addition is so designed as to offer differentiation from and compatibility with the existing fabric. While set back from the street (less noticeable), the camelback nature of the addition affords a clear differentiation between old and new. Corner boards also allow the addition to "read" as a later and thoughtful alteration to historic and later fabric (See B-5.). Foundations, ceiling heights, siding, window light configurations, eave treatments, roof forms, and other elements match the existing features and negotiate an earlier addition (See B 2 -3 & 9-11.).

Fenestration changes on the existing house called for by the proposed addition are minimal. Both changes impact an earlier addition. One side window (East or driveway side) would be changed from doubled to single form and two sets of French doors would replace singular French doors on the North (rear) Elevation. The house features singular windows in at least one location. The North Elevation is not visible from the public view and the proposed fenestration changes on that elevation increase the number of openings. The increase in and observation of fenestration patterns respond better solid to existing void relationships. With regard to the addition, the light configuration and groupings of fenestration are responsive to those found on the historic portions of the building (See B-4.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-11), Staff does not believe this application would impair either the architectural or historical character of the building or district. Staff recommends the approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas B. Kearley, the owner's architect and representative, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Oswalt thanked Mr. Blackwell for the presentation.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Kearley and asked him as the applicant's representative if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Kearley stated that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full excellently.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow board members if they had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Kearley.

Mr. Stone asked if any other revisions had been made to the first floor, aside from those connecting the first floor to the second-story addition. Mr. Kearley responded no.

Mr. Stone then inquired into how the wood siding integrated into the house. Mr. Kearley explained the dwelling consisted of a brick base higher than that typically seen, with wood siding that feathered into the porch.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

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 written 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: June 8, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-25-CA: 103 Ryan Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Pete Vallas of Pete J. Vallas Architect on behalf of James F. and Elissa E. Watkins
Received: 5/22/17
Meeting: 6/7/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Revised plans for side and rear additions – Construct side & rear additions according to revised plans; and alter fenestration.

BUILDING HISTORY

This 20th Century Picturesque dwelling was completed in 1917. The house is one of Mobile’s most notable Arts & Crafts dwellings of an English medieval vernacular vein. The house is one of several notable vaguely medieval inspired designs drawn by the hand of Mobile architect C. L. Hutchisson, Sr.

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 March 15, 2017. On the aforementioned date, the Board approved the construction of side and rear additions. The application up for review constitutes a collection of revisions to the aforementioned plans.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site (site topography, character-defining features, tree, and significant district vistas and public views) are retained.”
 - 2. “Design an addition to be compatible with the character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.”
 - 3. “Design the building components (roof foundation, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
 - 4. “Maintain the relationship of solids and voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as established by the historic building.”
 - 5. Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color, and/or wall plane.”
 - 6. “Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze boards, moldings or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.”
 - 7. “Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.”

8. "Limit the height of a porch addition roofline so it does not interfere with second story elevations."
9. "Design the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure."
10. "Size, place and space a window for (or impacted by)/ an addition to be in character with the original historic building."
11. "Design piers, foundations and foundation infill on a new addition to be compatible with those on the historic building."
12. "For most contributing properties in historic districts, the windows that are on the front elevation and those on the sidewalls that are the most visible from the street will be the most important."
13. "Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible."
14. "Place an addition so that so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure."

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Reconfigure a dormer on the East Elevation (façade).
 - a. An existing and altered inset door will be converted to a projecting dormer.
 - b. The walls of the dormer will be faced with stucco.
 - c. The dormer will feature a four-over-one light wood window.
 - d. The dormer will feature a concave-shed roof and as simple fascia board.
 - e. The roof will be sheathed with shingles matching those found on the body of the house.
2. Alter other fenestration on the East Elevation (façade).
 - a. Remove louvered panels from the attic's windows.
 - b. Replace the aforementioned louvered panels with wood six-light windows.
3. Construct side and rear additions along with attendant changes to impacted elevations (fenestration-related).
 - a. The additions will take the form of enclosed and porch spaces.
 - b. Said additions will extend along the South (a side), West (rear), and North (a side) Elevations.
 - c. A continuous brick foundation matching that employed on the body of the house will be employed. Said foundation transitions without interruption into walls on those portions not engaged to porches.
 - d. Nine-over-one wood or aluminum clad wood windows will employed so as to match the dominant fenestration construction/light configuration found on body of the house. In certain locations other windows will be employed. See specific notations to the aforementioned effect herein and in plans.
 - e. Brick walls matching those defining the first-story of the body of the house will be employed on the first-story additions.
 - f. Stuccoed walls matching those employed on the second-story of the body of the house will be employed on the second-story additions.
 - g. Hipped and shed roofs will surmount the additions.
 - i. The roofs of the first-story additions (enclosed and porch) will be sheathed with standing seam metal roofing panels. Said roofs are to a side (South) and rear of the house.
 - ii. The roofs of a second-story nature will be sheathed with shingles roofing shingles matching those employed on the body of the house.

- h. East Elevation (façade)
 - i. The small expanse of East Elevation will not feature fenestration.
- i. South (a side/Old Shell Road facing) Elevation
 - i. A flight of steps will be removed from an existing sunporch.
 - ii. An enclosed eastern portion and an open terrace fronting the terminal bya of a westerly oriented porch will define the addition's South Elevation.
 - iii. A pronounced watertable-like beltcourse will be employed on the terrace.
 - iv. Two nine-over-one windows will be employed on the South Elevation's eastern portion.
 - v. Paired square section porch post will terminate the porch defining the South Elevation's recessed westernmost portion.
 - vi. An existing tripartite fenestration sequence will be removed from the second-story.
 - vii. Recessed expanses of stucco matching in texture and composition that of the surrounding stucco will be instated in the aforementioned window fields.
- j. West (rear) Elevation
 - i. The southern portion of the West Elevation will feature a terrace.
 - ii. The central portion of the West Elevation will feature a porch.
 - iii. The northern portion of the West Elevation will feature a small enclosed addition fronted by a stoop and steps oriented in a northerly direction.
 - iv. Minus the small enclosed section of addition, a pronounced watertable-like beltcourse will extend the whole of the addition.
 - v. A bank of three nine-over-one windows will comprise the fenestration overlooking the terrace defining the southern portion of the West Elevation.
 - vi. A three bay porch will occupy the central portion of the West Elevation. Said porch will extend from the West Elevation's prominent rear gable.
 - vii. The aforementioned gallery will be defined by four sets of paired porch piers.
 - viii. An existing chimney stack will be removed from the rear gable.
 - ix. A new chimney stack will punctuate the center portion of the rear gable.
 - x. Existing fenestration found on the rear gable will be removed and replaced.
 - xi. Multi-light wooden French doors will flank the chimney and heart on the ground floor of the gabled portion of the West Elevation.
 - xii. Single nine-over-one windows will flank the chimney stack as it rises up second-story of the West Elevation.
 - xiii. The aforementioned windows will feature sills and will be cased to match those existing on the body of the house.
 - xiv. The small enclosed northernmost portion of the West Elevation will feature a multi-light wooden French door.
 - xv. The stoop which the door and steps which the door accesses will feature a picketed balustrade with a terminal newel.
 - xvi. Above the single brick-faced northern portion of the West elevation will be a shed roofed second story area punctured in elevation by the end of shed-roofed dormer oriented in a northerly direction.
 - xvii. An existing terminal shed roof expanse recessed at the northernmost portion of the West Elevation will be changed from shed to hipped roof in construction.

- k. North (a side) Elevation
 - i. The terminal bay of the rear porch will define the westernmost portion of the North Elevation.
 - ii. A enclosed porch embracing the Northwest corner of the house will removed for construction of the addition.
 - iii. Two nine-over-nine windows will be placed within the easternmost portion of the North Elevation of this portion of the addition.
 - iv. A shed-roofed dormer will project from the shed-roofed second-story portion of the North Elevation.
 - v. The aforementioned dormer will feature a four-over-one window.
 - vi. A pair of nine-over-one window will be removed from the second-story.
 - vii. The aforementioned and impacted location will be faced with a recessed stucco field. The brick sill will be retained.
 - viii. A six-over-one window will be instated as the easternmost fenestrated unit on the North Elevation's second-story.
 - ix. Two paired louvered vents will be removed from the North Elevation's gable.
 - x. Two six-light windows will be instated in the aforementioned fenestrated units.
- l. Install an L-shaped concrete walkway between the rear stoop and existing garage.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of side/rear additions to and the alteration of fenestration on a contributing residential building.

The majority of changes informing this application impact side or rear elevations. The aforementioned allowed, several proposed fenestration related alterations would change the façade. As with most contributing buildings, the most visibly significant and architecturally notable fenestration is located on the façade (See B-12.). Above the porch there exists a recessed dormer. Dormers of the aforementioned construction were rarely constructed in Mobile for reason of their inability to address the Coastal South's climactic conditions – abundant and heavy rains. Based on physical evidence, documentary photographs, and owner testimony, the subject dormer has been altered over the course of almost hundred years. The application calls for the alteration of the dormer from an inward to a projecting form. The proportions would closely align with the existing, albeit in outward form. The slope of the altered dormer's shed roof would match other roof pitches on the house and some of those proposed by the side/rear additions. In addition being sized and placed (See B-10.) to complement the house, there exists precedent for changes of the proposed intervention. In 2000, the City of Fairhope's Architectural Review Board approved a similar conversion of inward dormers into projecting dormers. The subject property is located at 111 North Bayview Avenue, a 1927 residence designed by architect Richard Syfarth. Mobile's Architectural Review Board has authorized the construction of numerous dormers on buildings that did not originally possess them. A few instances of the aforementioned policy include the following: 260 Marine Street and 470-476 Dauphin Street. All the examples mentioned entailed review of size, placement, and detail. In addition to altering the form of a dormer, louvered panels located within existing attic gables would be removed and replaced with glazed sashes sized to fit reveals on the East, South, and North Elevations. Historic photographs record the existence of the proposed design change. Said change was approved at the property's last appearance before the Board.

Additional changes to fenestration impact side and rear locations. For the portions being fronted by enclosed additions, fenestration matching or based on that found elsewhere on house will be employed on

the new advanced wall planes. For those fenestration changes on areas not impacted by built additions, windows or doors either matching or based on those found on the body of the house will be employed. In two instances recessed expanses of stucco will be placed in the locations of side elevation windows proposed for removal. Sills will remain in place so as to retain solid-to-void patterns on those street and alley engaged locations (See B-4.). All of the aforementioned fenestrations are sized and placed so as be in character with existing historic windows found on the house (See B- 10.).

The additions proposed for the side and rear elevations are open and enclosed in nature. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the overall characteristics of the site would be preserved (See B 1 & 13.). Side and rear additions are not only preferred, but also found across the district so the design concept is compatible with the environment (See B 2 & 13.). Many comparable examples can be cited. Building components - foundation to fenestration to walls to roofs - are compatible with those employed on the house (See 3, 6, 7, 9, & 11.). While the aforementioned continuity of materials and elements affords compatibility, both the enclosed and open portions of the proposed additions are so designed as to be sensitively differentiated from the existing historic fabric. Changes in height and transitions in roof plane all serve to allow the proposed additions to "read" as later, albeit historically and architecturally attuned, alterations to historic fabric (See B 5 & 8.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-14), Staff does not believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends of the approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Jay Watkins, owner, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Oswalt thanked Mr. Blackwell for the presentation.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Watkins and asked him if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Watkins explained the circumstances for which a larger addition proposal approved by the Board at their March 15, 2017 meeting was being resubmitted in revised form.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Stone noted that the revised plans did not annotate any materials. Mr. Blackwell stated that staff would inform the architect of record to note materials in future applications. Mr. Watkins confirmed the intent to match materials on the new additions.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

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 written 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: June 8, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-26-CA: 208 State Street
Applicant: Robert Maurin of Maurin Architecture for 208 State Street, LLC
Received: 5/8/17
Meeting: 6/7/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T-4
Project: Restoration and Rehabilitation – Conduct in-kind repairs and repaint; remove later additions & alterations; alter side & rear fenestration and elevations; construct a raised terrace; and install fencing & extend a wall.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Aesthetics Movement inspired Queen Anne building formerly housed the Rescue Mission. The property is being converted back into private residence. Of the extant Queen Anne dwellings in DeTonti Square, this house is the most notable.

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 March 13, 1993. At that time, the Board approved the construction of the exterior staircase located off the rear elevation. The application up for review calls for the following: in kind repair work and repainting; removal of later additions & alterations; alteration of side & rear fenestration and elevations; construction a raise raised terrace; and install of fencing & extension of a wall.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Preserve historic stylistic and architectural details and ornamentation.”
 - 2. “Where repair is impossible, replace details and ornamentation accurately.”
 - 3. “Preserving a front porch is a high priority. A rear or side porch also may be important to preserve, especially for a building located on a corner lot, their preservation is encouraged.”
 - 4. “Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color, and/or wall plane.”
 - 5. “Place an addition so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.”
 - 6. “Design an addition to be compatible in massing and scale with the original historic building.”
 - 7. “Use exterior materials and finishes that comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension, and composition.
 - 8. “Design a window on an addition to be compatible with the original historic building.”

9. "For most contributing properties in historic districts, the windows that are on the front elevation and those on side walls which are visible from the street will be the most important to preserve. Windows in other locations that have distinctive designs and that represent fine craftsmanship may also be important to preserve."
10. "Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood."
11. Also as per fencing "consideration up to 48', depending on the location of the fence shall be given."
12. "Design a wall to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing walls in the district."

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

1. Conduct in-kind repairs and repaint.
 - a. Repair or when and where necessary replace deteriorated woodwork, siding, elements, and detailing to match the existing as per profile, dimension and material.
 - b. Repair or when necessary replace wooden or components thereof to match the existing as per light configuration, muntin profile, and material composition.
 - c. Paint the house per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme: body, Anchors Away; trim and decorative details, Pure White; porch decking, Mineral Gray; accent elements, Pure White; and shutters, a pale green.
2. Alter fenestration on the East Elevation.
 - a. Alter three secondary windows from functional to fixed in construction.
 - b. Casings will remain in place and shutters will be affixed to the window fields.
3. Remove later additions and alterations (infill and staircase) impacting the North (rear) Elevation.
 - a. Remove porch infill from the rear gallery.
 - b. Remove a later rear addition.
 - c. Remove a later exterior staircase located off the rear elevation.
4. Construct a pergola on the location of the late rear addition.
 - a. Said pergola will feature solid wall on its western expanse.
 - b. The pergola will be situated on the same floor elevation as the porch.
5. Construct a raised terrace.
 - a. The terrace will occupy and extend beyond the locations currently occupied by the later shed addition and exterior staircase.
 - b. The terrace will "square out" the rear footprint of the building.
 - c. The raised terraced will feature a brick foundation treatment matching that of the main residence.
 - d. The raised terrace will be planted with grass.
 - e. A flight of inset steps off the North side of the terrace will provide access to and from the rear lawn.
6. Alter fenestration and other aspects on the rear portions of the North (rear) Elevation and West (a side) Elevation and infill the inner portion of the rear gallery.
 - a. Install a bank of three two-over-two windows on the first-story and western (recessed) portion of the North Elevation.
 - b. Remove a door and a window from second-story of the western (recessed) portion of the North Elevation.
 - c. Infill the inner portion of the recessed portion of the North Elevation's gallery employing the same fenestration pattern.
 - d. "Feather" in siding at the impacted location.
 - e. Remove later paneled doors from the first-story and secondary recessed portions of the North Elevation.

- f. Install glazed and paneled doors at the aforementioned locations.
- g. Remove two windows and two doors from the first-story rear portion of the West Elevation.
- h. Place a bank of three glazed and paneled fenestrated bays (a door and two windows) in aforementioned and impacted portion of the West Elevation.
- i. Remove two doors on the rear portion of the West Elevation's second story.
- j. Convert a window bay into a door bay in the aforementioned expanse of elevation.
- k. The aforementioned door bay will feature a glazed and paneled wooden door.
- l. Remove a slightly elevated window from the eastern portion of the North Elevation.
- m. Instate a two-over-two wooden window and glazed and paneled door in the aforementioned and impacted location.
- n. Construct a flight of brick steps and check and check wall in the aforementioned location.
- o. Construct an oriel window off the eastern portion of the North Elevation.
 - i. The oriel windows have as its base band-like extension of the beltcourse that separates the first-story from the second-story of the main residence.
 - ii. The oriel will feature wooden siding matching that found on the body of house.
 - iii. A bank of three one-over-one wooden windows will employed on the oriel window.
 - iv. The frieze/fascia that extends around the body of the house will extend around the oriel window.
 - v. A hipped roof will surmount the oriel window.
 - vi. The pitch of the roof will match that of the house's principle roofs.
 - vii. The hipped roof will be sheathed with asphalt shingles matching those found on the body of the house.
7. Install fencing around the front lawn.
 - a. The fencing sections will be comprised of steel pickets and railings.
 - b. The fencing sections will be four (4) feet in height.
 - c. The aforementioned sections will be interspersed between brick post.
 - d. Inward opening vehicular and pedestrian gates will afford access to and from the property.
8. Construct an extension of a wall.
 - a. Extend a brick wall extends the length of the North (rear) lot line along the West (a side) lot line.
 - b. The wall will be of the same design, material, and height as the existing.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application for review involves the following: repair and replacement of deteriorated elements; removal of later additions and alterations; construction of a terrace; alteration of fenestration; minor infill; installation of fencing; and extension of a brick wall.

With regard to the in-kind repair and replacement of the existing features, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that historic stylistic and architectural details should be preserved, but note that when repair is impossible, replacements should match the existing (See B 1 & 2.). All wood repair work would match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.

With regard to the removal of later porch infill, additions, and stairs on the rear elevation, the Design Review Guidelines state that preserving a front porch is a high priority. The Guidelines go on to say that the preservation of rear or side porches is encouraged (See B-3.). Removal of on grade addition off the porch, infill on first-story of the porch, exterior stairs would reinforce the original footprint and as aspects

of the original rear elevation. Said alterations are not of the same architectural quality of the house. The first-story fenestration of the pertinent portion of the North Elevation, that where the infill is located, is not intact. The Design Review Guidelines state that windows should be designed to compatible with those on the original building (See B-8.). The proposed window configuration employs the same type of light configuration as the house. The tripartite grouping echoes to some degree that of the faceted bay window distinguishing the front of the house.

A trellis is proposed for construction off the recessed portion of the North or Rear Elevation. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that additions should be differentiated from, yet compatible with the existing (See B 4 & 6.). A balance of differentiation from and compatibility with can be achieved multiple ways. The trellis would be setback in plan from the side elevation. The setback plane and single-story height would serve to differentiate that which exists from that which is new (See B-4.). The lower height of the addition would also serve to make the addition subordinate to the original fabric (See B-5.). The skirt board found on the body of the residence would be employed on the foundation of trellis. The floor heights would remain the same. The trellis' terminal walls would feature siding matching the existing. Exterior materials are compatible (See B-7.).

A raised terrace would square out the rear footprint of the house. Said brick-faced and earth filled terrace will be at lower elevations than the galleries that line the two sides of the house which it impacts so as to be subordinate to original fabric (See B-5.).

Doors and windows on East and West (both side) Elevations are proposed for alterations. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that for most historic properties, the windows that are on the front elevation and those most visible from the street will be the most important (See B-9.). None of the fenestration is directly visible from the public view. Most of the windows are not visible from the street. The Design Review Guidelines go on to state that windows in locations other than the façade or prominent locations might possess distinctive designs or exhibit fine craftsmanship so thus warrant preservation (See B-9.). The two secondary windows proposed for alterations on the East Elevation are within less than four feet of adjoining masonry building. The windows would be changed from operable to fixed in nature. Shutters would be placed within the window fields. Said intervention is at the most extremely minimal in observation and reversible in terms of intervention. The appearance from the street would be the same. The fenestration proposed for alteration on northern or rearmost portions of the West Elevation. The work would be at best minimally visible from an angle at along Joachim Street, the next to the west of the property. A bank of fenestration would replace separate fenestration on first-story and two units would be removed and their locations "feathered" on the second story. Off the Rear or North Elevation, a window would be replaced by a door and a transom window on the first-story and an oriel window would replace transom window. The proposed windows and doors are designed to be compatible with the historic windows (See B-8.). Brick steps and check would be constructed flanking new rear brick steps.

Fencing and walls are proposed for two portions of the property. The Design Review Guidelines state that fences should be compatible with the architectural character of the house and existing fencing in the district (See B-10). Metal fencing often surrounded Aesthetics Movement inspired dwellings such as the subject example. Many examples can be cited and additional instances have been approved in recent years. The four foot height is authorized by the Guidelines (See B-11.). With regard to the wall proposed for the rear lot, the wall would be an extension of an existing brick wall that extends along the North (rear) lot line. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, said extension of wall is compatible with the architectural styling of existing historic walls in the district (See B-12.). Numerous examples can be cited.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-12), Staff does not believe this application would impair either the architectural or historical character of the building or district. Staff recommends the approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Robert Maurin, the owner's representative, and Mr. Robert Isakson Jr., owner, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Oswalt thanked Mr. Blackwell for the presentation.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Maurin and Mr. Isakson and them if there were any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Maurin and Mr. Isakson stated the application had been addressed in full.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask.

Mr. Oswalt asked what year the house was built. Mr. Isakson replied 1895.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

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 written, 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: June 8, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-27-CA: 1007 Selma Street
Applicant: Allen and Ida Johnson
Received: 5/16/2017
Meeting: 6/7/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition – Demolish a dilapidated non-contributing residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to the MHDC vertical file the property was built circa 1960.

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 not appeared before the Architectural Review Board.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, the ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
 - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
 - 1. According to the National Register Survey for the Oakleigh Garden District, this house dates from the 1960s. The building is listed as a non-contributing structure.
 - ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. While the dwelling adds to the built density of the district and continues the rhythmic spacing of streetscape, the building does not contribute to the architectural or historical character of the surrounding Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 - 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced. Of the exterior facings and elements, almost all those which are still in place would have to be replaced. The asbestos siding is less than desirable.
 - iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 - 1. So-called “minimalist traditional” dwellings such as the subject dwelling were constructed in advance of, during, and in the decades following World War II. They dominate new lesser grade residential developments of the period. They constitute a small share of the early infill housing constructed in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
 - v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 - 1. If granted demolition approval, the house would be demolished, debris would be removed, the lot would be leveled, and sod would be planted.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. The property was purchased was by Allen and Ida Johnson, neighbors of the residence, in May 2013.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. The property has stood vacant for several years.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The property has not been listed for sale.
 - ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 - 1. N.A.
 - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. N.A.
 - xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
 - 1. Application submitted by the owners.
 - xiii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the Board.
 - 1. N.A.
2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

- C. Scope of Work:
1. Demolish residence.
 2. Remove debris from property.
 3. Level site.
 4. Plant sod.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Mr. Oswalt thanked Mr. Blackwell for the presentation.

This application involves the demolition of a deteriorated dwelling located in the Oakleigh Garden National Register Historic District. The District survey lists the building as a non-contributing structure in the Oakleigh Garden National Register Historic District. When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into the account the following considerations: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

As previously mentioned, the house located at 1007 Selma Street is a non-contributing building located within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The dwelling is neither a representation of a distinctive architectural typology nor is instance of stylistic distinction (on the municipal, state, regional, or national levels).

This building is in an advanced state of disrepair. The condition extends far beyond cosmetic concerns for structural maladies are numerous. Not only are sills rotten and the roof structures collapsed, but also sizable portions of walls are in jeopardy of collapsing. The southwest corner of the house is in imminent danger of collapsing.

While the building contributes to the built density and rhythmic sequencing of the street, the demolition of the residence would not adversely affect the historic character or architectural ambience of the Oakleigh Garden District. It is pertinent to note that the pertinent sheet of the 1904 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map of Mobile corresponding to the subject area records the property as being vacant at that date. It existed as such until the 1960s.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be removed, site would be leveled, and sod would be planted. The owners would maintain the lot.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application would not impair the property. Additionally, Staff does not suggest listing the property on MLS since the property as it is not a contributing building. Staff recommends approval of the application for reasons of the considerations cited herein.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Allen and Mrs. Ida Johnson, owners, were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Ruzic recused himself from discussion.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. and Mrs. Johnson and asked them if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mrs. Jackson asked if she and her husband decided to rebuild in the future, would the designs have to be historically based. Mr. Roberts replied the design would not have to be historic in an exacting sense, however it would need to be in keeping with the historic context. Mr. Blackwell reassured Mrs. Jackson that if she and Mr. Jackson decided to build on the site in the future Staff would assist them in their efforts prior to, during, and after submitting plans to the Architectural Review Board.

Mr. Kevin Cross, owner of 1002 Selma Street and other properties in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District, commented that it was his normal inclination not to be in favor of demolition applications. He further explained that he had visited the dilapidated site and could foresee no other alternative other than demolition.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask the Johnson's.

Roberts asked for clarification as to the designation of the property. Mr. Blackwell confirmed that the property was non-contributing in its designation. Mr. Stone asked how this application differed from an application submitted at 1055 Elmira Street. Mr. Blackwell explained that while 1055 Elmira Street was classified as a non-contributing property and listed as such in the staff report, further examination showed that the property was one of the oldest examples of a shotgun dwelling dating back to the 1850's thus having a historic and architectural significance that should be included in the public record. Mr. Stone also noted like 1055 Elmira Street, this application has no plans. Mr. Blackwell reiterated that the property up for review was undoubtedly non-contributing, whereas the 1055 Elmira Street's classification was an obvious misclassification.

Mr. Oswalt asked the applicants if the metal fence surrounding the property would be removed to which they replied yes.

Mr. Allen asked Mr. and Mrs. Johnson when they acquired the property. Mr. Johnson responded that they had purchased over one and a half years prior. Mr. Allen inquired of the applicants if they had made any attempts to stabilize or secure the deteriorated property. Mr. Johnson replied the house had been boarded up for 10 years prior to the purchase of the property, and confirmed no effort was made to stabilize it since the condition was so poor at the time of purchase. Mr. Allen asked if the applicants if they had any intention to sell the site. Mr. Johnson responded to Mr. Allen that he and his wife had no intention of selling the property.

Mr. Allen stated his concern was that the application was a result by demolition by neglect. He continued by noting that to the west two vacant lots are rumored to be built upon soon and the approval to demolish this house without proper development plans would be detrimental to the landscape.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

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 was approved. Mr. Allen voted in opposition.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as written 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 was approved. Mr. Allen voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: June 8, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-28-CA: 1569 Bruister Street
Applicant: Dr. Steven Roth
Received: 5/22/2017
Meeting: 6/7/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing Main House (not impacted)
Zoning: R-1
Project: Ancillary Related- Construct an ancillary building on the rear portion of lot.

BUILDING HISTORY

The principle building defining this property dates from 1912. The dwelling features Arts and Crafts detailing.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review calls for the construction of an ancillary building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “A new accessory or ancillary structure should be compatible with those in the district.”
 - 2. “Locate a new accessory or ancillary structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district. These are traditionally located at the rear of the lot.”
 - 3. “Design an accessory or ancillary structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.”
 - 4. “Cement-based fiber siding” is listed as acceptable material for ancillary new construction.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Construct an ancillary building.
 - a. The ancillary building will rest atop a raised concrete slab foundation.
 - b. The walls of ancillary building will be clad with cementitious fiber siding with profiles and dimensions matching that found on the siding of the principle residence.
 - c. The windows will be extruded aluminum.
 - d. A 5V-crimp Galvalume roof with 1/12 pitch will surmount the building.
 - e. The East Elevation will feature an extruded aluminum window and paneled vehicular door.
 - f. The West Elevation will feature a single window.

- g. The North Elevation will feature a paneled door and sliding cementitious siding door fronting a roll up metal garage door.
- h. The South Elevation will not feature fenestration.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of an ancillary building behind a contributing residential construction. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that ancillary construction on contributing properties should be compatible with historic ancillary construction in the district (See B-1.). New ancillary construction involves review of considerations pertaining to placement, scale, massing, design, and material.

Placement takes into account setbacks. The proposed ancillary building's side and rear setbacks are authorized by the Historic District Overlay, a planning regulation that offers for reduced setbacks in Mobile's locally designated historic districts situated in eastern Midtown. As seen in surrounding properties and Midtown back lots in general, ancillary buildings were generally placed on or close to lot lines so the lot. In accord with The Design Review Guidelines, the building is in line with the specific and the same general location as traditional ancillary construction (See B-2.).

With regard to scale, the Design Review Guidelines state that new ancillary construction should be subordinate in scale to the principle building (See B-1.). The building is subordinate in scale to the main dwelling. Additionally, properties abutting and across the street possess buildings of comparable scale. While situated on a slab, many ancillary buildings adopt on grade or low foundations. The ceiling heights are responsive to a historic context.

With regard to design, compatibility of features serves as a means to preserve the character of a property and district. The proposed ancillary building features siding that would match that on the body of the house in terms of profile and dimension. Said siding would be cement-based. Cementitious siding is authorized by the Design Review Guidelines for additions and new construction. Staff suggests altering the proposed single-light windows to a multi-light configuration so to match those found on the principle dwelling for reason of further compatibility with the historic dwelling which defines the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff believes this application would not impair the property. Staff recommends approval of the application and further suggests that multi-light windows be installed.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Eric Schmidt, the owner's representative, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Oswalt thanked Mr. Blackwell for the presentation.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Schmidt and asked him if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Schmidt stated Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full,

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Schmidt.

Mr. Roberts asked for clarifications about what looked like three panes of glass on the door. Mr. Schmidt replied it was three wood panels.

Mr. Roberts then asked Staff to be more specific as the recommendation for multi-light windows. Mr. Schmidt noted there would be no vinyl windows. Mr. Blackwell noted the applicant was open to aluminum clad, extruded aluminum, or wood in terms of material.

Mr. Roberts inquired as to the roof overhang. Mr. Schmidt confirmed for Mr. Roberts there was no overhang on the structure. Mr. Roberts also inquired as to roof material. Mr. Schmidt confirmed that the proposed roofing material was metal, and the dark shaded portion below the roofline was to be cement fiberboard.

Mr. Roberts then asked if the home was painted white with dark green trim. Mr. Schmidt clarified that the trim was black. Mr. Roberts asked if the large red building seen in photos was on the 1569 Bruister Street parcel. Mr. Schmidt replied that building was located on another property. Mr. Roberts then inquired if a small shed located on the rear corner of the property would remain or be removed. Mr. Schmidt clarified Mr. Roberts query.

Mr. Roberts asked if the Board could require a multi-light pattern. Mr. Blackwell stated that staff report did not call out a configuration due to lack of visibility but recommended the use a multi-light pattern and the Board could require its employ. No other questions ensued from the Board

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Stone Board finds the facts in the Staff report as amended to note the following: to require the window be configured with three-over-one light pattern.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Holmes 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: June 8, 2018