

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

March 15, 2017 – 3:00 P.M.

Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Jim Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Jim Wagoner, Robert Allen, Nick Holmes III, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, Catarina Echols, and Kim Harden.
Members Absent: Harris Oswalt, Carolyn Hasser, Robert Brown, and David Barr.
Staff Members Present: Shayla Beaco, Marion McElroy, Florence Kessler, Cartledge W. Blackwell, Melissa Mutert, and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Stone moved to approve the minutes for the February 15, 2017 meeting. Mr. Allen moved to approve the minutes a revision noting the Architectural Review Board Ordinance does not override the Alabama Open Meeting Law. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.
3. Mr. Holmes moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and majority approval with one opposed.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant:** Paul Shestak
 - a. Property Address: 12 N. Dearborn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/23/2017
 - c. Project: Repair rotten wood as necessary to match, repaint house soft green.
2. **Applicant:** Tony Bartlett with Phoenix Restoration Services
 - a. Property Address: 169 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/2/2017
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated wooden siding to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repair windows to match existing in the impacted area. Repaint per same color scheme.
3. **Applicant:** Linda Hayes
 - a. Property Address: 407 Dunham Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/7/2017
 - c. Project: Repair existing privacy fence, and gate.
4. **Applicant:** Andrew Dooley
 - a. Property Address: 1122 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/7/2017
 - c. Project: Remove a later rear addition (See Board approval of 7 September 2016). Aforementioned portion of approval reissued for purposes for permitting. Work approved by ARB to be executed.
5. **Applicant:** Ray Carney
 - a. Property Address: 1256 Texas Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/10/2017
 - c. Project: Build rear deck, repair rot and repaint, reroof charcoal gray asphalt shingles.
6. **Applicant:** Avery Robinson
 - a. Property Address: 963 Savannah Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/10/2017
 - c. Project: Repaint in the following color scheme: body, white; ironwork, black.

7. **Applicant:** Wrico Signs
 - a. Property Address: 1275 Spring Hill Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/13/2017
 - c. Project: Relocate previously approved signage from one unit within the building to another.
8. **Applicant:** Coulson Roofing and Sheet Metal
 - a. Property Address: 10 S. Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/13/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in approved color (weatherwood).
9. **Applicant:** Hargrove Engineers
 - a. Property Address: 20-26 South Royal Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/16/2017
 - c. Project: Install two flag poles that that will extend from the façade of the building. The two metal poles will be so installed as to not jeopardize historic fabric.
10. **Applicant:** Donna & Sam Greene
 - a. Property Address: 152 S. Dearborn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/17/2017
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated wooden siding to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repair windows to match existing in the impacted area. Repaint per same color scheme.
11. **Applicant:** Chakli Diggs for NOJA
 - a. Property Address: 6 N. Jackson Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/16/2017
 - c. Project: Install a metal hanging blade sign. The double-sided sign will measure less than ten square feet per sign face. The sign will feature the name of the business establishment. Said sign will be so installed as to meet right of way height requirements.
12. **Applicant:** Cooner Construction
 - a. Property Address: 309 S. Georgia Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/17/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof dull black asphalt architectural shingles
13. **Applicant:** Sarah Canogallari
 - a. Property Address: 1 S. Royal Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/3/2017
 - c. Project: Install a non-illuminated, double faced, 3'0" X 3'0" painted metal diagonal corner sign on corner of building.
14. **Applicant:** Sarah Canogallari
 - a. Property Address: 1 S. Royal Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/20/2017
 - c. Project: Install a quantity of 1 temporary hanging blade sign, double faced, 3'0"H X 3'0"W, painted wood and metal sign, to be mounted with 11'0 above ground on West elevation of building for three months. Allow 6" H window decals on 5 windows and one on door.
15. **Applicant:** Dharam S. Pannu
 - a. Property Address: 907 Elmira Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/20/2017
 - c. Project: Replace rotten wood to match, repair windows, repair termite damage, and repaint to match.
16. **Applicant:** Chris McGough
 - a. Property Address: 960 Augusta Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/21/2017

c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match existing in dimension, profile, and material including lapsiding, soffit, fascia board, and window trim. Repair seven windows to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Replace glass pane on one window. Install new jamb, trim around existing back door to match existing. Install (2) new brick faced CMU piers where existing can not be replaced. Repoint (8) existing piers with appropriate mortar. Install framed lattice between piers. Remove existing asphalt shingles and replace with architectural shingles in approved colors of either weatherwood or charcoal. Repaint to match existing color scheme.

17. Applicant: Carrie F. Tombrello

- a. Property Address: 101 Levert Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 2/21/2017
- c. Project: Install a six foot tall interior lot privacy fence. The fence will not extend beyond the front plane of house.

18. Applicant: Taylor Atchison

- a. Property Address: 921 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 2/23/2017
- c. Project: Reframe and reface (to match) a shed addition of the rear of the building.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2017-07-CA: 256 and 260 Saint Anthony Street

- a. Applicant: Nicholas H. Holmes, III, of Holmes & Holmes or Thomas Latham of Greer, Clark, & Latham on behalf of TWC LLC
- b. Project: Rehabilitate a Non-Contributing Building – Construct a portico; alter/add fenestration; make changes to a rear elevation; and install fencing & landscaping.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2017-08-CA: 103 Lanier Avenue

- a. Applicant: Pete Vallas of Pete J. Vallas Architect on behalf of Jay F. and Elissa E. Watkins
- b. Project: Additions and Alterations to a Contributing Residence – Reconfigure a dormer; alter fenestration; and construct side & rear additions.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2017-09-CA: 250 Chatham Street

- a. Applicant: William Cutts
- b. Project: Addition to a Contributing Residence – Construct a small rear addition.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2017-10-CA: 462 George Street

- a. Applicant: Dennis Carlisle of Dennis Carlisle Architect on behalf of Restore Mobile
- b. Project: Restoration and Rear Elevation Related – Restore the historic core of a house; alter side and rear fenestration; remove a later addition and porch; and reconstruct a new addition.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

5. 2011-11-CA: 501 Eslava Street

- a. Applicant: John Wink
- b. Project: Ancillary Related - Demolish a non-contributing ancillary building.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

6. 2011-12-CA: 1452 Brown Street

- a. Applicant: Joseph Cortopassi
- b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain hardieboard siding installed on a non-contributing residence without issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
HELD OVER. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

7. 2011-13-CA: 522 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Andrew Dooley on behalf of JBE Properties
- b. Project: Reconstruction – Construct a replica of a 19th Century building that formerly stood on the site.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2017-07-CA: 256 and 260 Saint Anthony Street
Applicant: Either Thomas Latham or Greer, Clark & Latham OR Nicholas H. Holmes of Holmes & Holmes on behalf of TWC LLC
Received: 2/16/17
Meeting: 3/15/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning:
Project: Rehabilitate a Non-Contributing Building – Construct a portico, alter/add fenestration, make changes to a rear elevation, and install fencing & landscaping.

BUILDING HISTORY

This single-story commercial building was constructed in the 1960s atop the original site of Trinity Church (Episcopal). The current building was designed and later enlarged by Mobile architect Edward Baumhauer.

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 1, 1980. On the aforementioned date, the Board approved extensive changes to the exterior. The application up for review calls for the construction a side porch, alteration to addition/of fenestration, changes to the rear elevation, installation of fencing & landscaping.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Design changes to a non-historic/contributing building to be compatible with the district.”
 - 2. “Design an alteration to retain a placement and orientation that is compatible with the district.”
 - 3. “Design an alteration to appear similar in massing and scale with the historic commercial buildings in the area.”
 - 4. “Use building elements that are of a similar profile and durability to those seen on historic buildings in the district.”
 - 5. “Maintain a solid-to-void ratio on the building that is similar to those seen on historic buildings in the district.”
 - 6. “A new fence, wall or gate should be compatible with the architectural style of the primary building(s) and/or these same elements on other properties in the district.”
 - 7. “Based on the chosen fence material, use proportions, heights, elements, and levels of opacity similar to those of similar material and style in the historic district.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Construct a portico off the East (inner lot facing) Elevation.
 - a. The portico will measure 11' 4" x 11' 4" in plan.
 - b. Two free-standing and two engaged and two freestanding columnar piers.
 - c. The aforementioned cmu piers will be faced with traditional stucco.
 - d. A three part stucco-faced entablature will surmount the piers.
2. Alter fenestration and other elevation-related changes.
 - a. East Elevation (inner lot engaged)
 - i. Remove a single door.
 - ii. Remove infill from the three blind arches defining the East Elevation.
 - iii. Construct windows (recessed) within windows within the aforementioned bays. The windows will either be wood; aluminum clad wood, or extruded aluminum.
 - iv. The fifteen light windows will be situated above recessed bulkheads and surmounted by arrowed fanlights.
 - v. Construct a new entrance that will be fronted by the portico.
 - vi. A double door (two four panels) will be surmounted by a fanlight.
 - vii. The heights of the doors and fanlights will correspond to the windows and doors.
 - viii. Construct an entablature atop an existing wall extending off the northernmost portion of the East Elevation.
 - b. South Elevation
 - i. Install cast iron panels and lunettes in the blind door bays.
 - ii. The aforementioned ironwork will match the existing which distinguishes the southwest corner entrance.
 - c. West Elevation (North Jackson Street-facing)
 - i. Install cast iron panels and lunettes in the blind door bays.
 - ii. The aforementioned ironwork will match that which distinguishes the southwest corner entrance.
 - d. North Elevation
 - i. Remove a carport.
 - ii. Construct an addition on the location of the carport.
 - iii. Existing East and West walls enclosing the expanses of the parking area will serve as the respective elevations of the addition. The West wall extends along the pedestrian right of way. The East wall extends along an earlier addition.
 - iv. The North Elevation's cmu wall will be faced with stucco.
 - v. A shed roof will surmount the addition. Said roof will also extend over the earlier addition.
 - vi. A metal door and roll-up window constitute the fenestration on this service court addition.
3. Install fencing (both 256 and 260 Saint Anthony Street).
 - a. The fencing will extend along the South lot line. The fencing will be in line with and extend existing fencing located on the two lots to the East (254 and 256 Saint Anthony Street).
 - b. Cast iron panels matching those employed on 254 Saint Anthony Street will be employed. Said panels will be situated between existing and new brick piers.
 - c. Double cast iron gates (inward opening) will be placed within existing vehicular entrances.
4. Install three landscaping stations behind the solid expanses of fencing.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application entails the rehabilitation a non-contributing building. The scope of work involves the following: construction of a portico; alteration of/addition to fenestration; changes to a rear elevation; and installation fencing & landscaping.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that changes to non-contributing buildings should be compatible with the district (See B-1.). The proposed changes to fenestration, addition of the portico, continuation of fencing, and increase in landscaping are not only responsive to the historical and architectural context, but also the finer points of the subject building. The building elements are similarly appreciative to historic character and individual context (See B-4.).

The installation of cast iron grilles and lunettes within the blind or faux fenestrated bays on the South (Saint Anthony Street-facing) and West (North Jackson Street-facing) Elevations would further insinuate the rhythmic spacing and sensory sensation of windows (See B-5.), while simultaneously through their material repopulate an Antebellum Street with Mobile's signature "iron lace". Four of the five historic buildings located on the block employ cast or wrought iron in some form or fashion. One of Mobile's signature architectural expressions, decorative ironwork is notably employed within the DeTonti Square National Register District. The cast ironwork would serve also to reiterate the primacy of the streetscapes (See B-2.), of which two of the historic buildings located on the block in an easterly direction feature ironwork.

While the addition of the portico does give additional strength to the East or inner lot/side Elevation, the placement and orientation of the building would firmly remain engaged to the street (See B-2.). The massing and scale of the proposed portico are reflective of nearby historic buildings (in district and vicinity), as well as the subject buildings (See B-3.). As with many historic porticos, the design of the portico goes so far as to exhibit a proportional diminution in scale to the massing of the main building. The windows on East Elevations would serve as a similar role as the addition of cast iron grilles and lunettes on the South and West Elevations in that said fenestration would instate a historically attuned solid-to-void ratio (See B-3.).

The removal of the carport extending along the North (rear) Elevation and its replacement with an enclosed interior volume would not alter either the public view or the overall footprint as perceived by the vehicular or pedestrian passerby. The utilitarian nature of the fenestration proposed would not be out of keeping with service areas behind other commercial buildings located in Mobile's historic districts.

With regard to site improvements such as the instigation of fencing and landscaping, those oftentimes complementary elements also respond to existing enclosures an lawn spaces of a historic nature found within the district and, in this case, adjacent to the subject property. The historic fencing sections located at 254 Saint Anthony would be replicated in the existing fencing sections located in adjacent lot and the current drive of the subject lot. Design and opacity would be continued (See B 6-7.). The swing of gated sections of the fenestration would adopt the appropriate code compliant swing. Landscaping stations would be instated behind the fencing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Holmes recused himself from discussion. Thomas Latham on behalf of TWC LLC was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Mr. Wagoner then asked if any of his board members had any questions pertinent to the application that they wished to address.

Mr. Roberts asked the applicant if the property was being utilized by a mystic society. Mr. Latham replied yes.

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

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 as written in the Staff report.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: March 16, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2017-08-CA: 103 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Pete Vallas of Pete J. Vallas Architect on behalf of James F. and Elissa E. Watkins
Received: 2/13/17 – preliminary
Meeting: 3/15/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Additions to a Contributing Residence – Reconfigure a dormer; alter fenestration; and construct side & rear additions.

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 26, 2006. On the aforementioned date, the Board approved the demolition of a non-contributing garage and the construction of a new ancillary building designed (and now constructed) more in keeping with the style of the house. The application up for review calls for the reconfiguration a dormer, alterations of fenestration, construction of side & rear additions.
- 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.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Reconfigure a dormer.
 - 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 façade.
 - a. Remove later fenestration from the first-story sunporch.
 - b. Replace the aforementioned fenestration with wood French doors with surmounting transoms.
 - c. Remove louvered panels from the attic’s windows.
 - d. Replace the aforementioned louvered panels with wood six-light windows.
3. Construct side and rear additions along with attendant changes to impacted elevations (fenestration).
 - a. A wrap around portion will be constructed to the rear of an existing sunporch located off the South Elevation and extend along a portion of the West (rear) Elevation.
 - b. A T-shaped enclosed addition will extend from the northwest corner of the rear elevation.
 - 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. The paired porch posts will match those employed in the front porch, albeit in a simplified form (no bracket-like brace)
 - e. Hipped, gabled, and shed roofs will surmount the additions.
 - i. The roofs of the porch portions of the addition will be sheathed with standing seam metal roofing panels.
 - ii. The roofs of the enclosed portion of the addition will be sheathed with roofing shingles matching those employed on the body of the house.
 - f. South (a side/Old Shell Road facing) Elevation
 - i. Four bays of the L-shaped will extend from the existing sunporch, along the remainder of the existing South Elevation, and the southern expanse of the enclosed portion of the addition.

- ii. Remove later fenestration from the first-story sunporch.
 - iii. Install wood French doors with surmounting transoms in the location of the aforementioned fenestration.
 - iv. An existing tripartite fenestration sequence will be removed from the first-story. Said windows are located at space that will access the new porch.
 - v. A new grouping of French doors with surmounting transoms will replace the aforementioned fenestration.
 - vi. Remove a tripartite grouping of second-story windows located just above the first-story fenestration to be altered. The brick window sill will be retained.
 - vii. A recessed stuccoed panel will be instated in place of the aforementioned fenestration. The stucco work will match that of the rest of the second-story.
 - viii. Framed louvered vents will be removed from the two attic windows.
 - ix. Six wood light windows will replace the aforementioned louvered panels.
- g. West (rear) Elevation
- i. The West Elevation's L-shaped porch portion of the additions will be four bays.
 - ii. The later fenestration in the first-story sunporch and three nine-over-one windows will be removed. Said windows all open onto the location of the porch addition.
 - iii. A flight on steps with flanking antepodia (cheeks) will extend along the northernmost portion of the porch.
 - iv. French doors with surmounting transoms will replace the aforementioned fenestration.
 - v. An existing exterior end chimney will be removed.
 - vi. A new exterior (situated and working) brick chimney centered within the northernmost portion of the porch will be constructed.
 - vii. A second-story six-over-six window (south of the new chimney stack) will be removed.
 - viii. A nine-over-one wood window will replace the aforementioned window.
 - ix. A second nine-over-one window will be instated on the second-story (north of the new chimney stack).
 - x. The L-shaped enclosed portion of the addition will be situated on and expand beyond an enclosed back porch.
 - xi. Two aluminum clad wood or wood nine-over-one windows will be located on the addition's first-story.
 - xii. Timber framing and stuccowork matching that found in the gables found on the body of the house will define the advanced and gabled portion of the addition.
 - xiii. The pitch of the existing West gable will be continued downward over portions of the enclosed addition.
 - xiv. The end bay of a shed dormer oriented to the north will be seen on the West Elevation.
 - xv. A four-over-one window will be removed from the West Elevation for purposes of the aforementioned shed roof.
 - xvi. The pitch of the larger roof structure will transition into a concave swoop over the northernmost portion of the addition's West Elevation.
- h. North (a side) Elevation
- i. Add a six-over-one window within the North Elevation's existing gable.
 - ii. Remove a pair of nine-over-nine windows located just west of the aforementioned windows.

- iii. Stucco the location of the windows to be removed.
- iv. The stuccoed area, executed to match the existing stucco, will be inset.
- v. The first-story of the addition's North Elevation will feature a tripartite grouping of nine-over-nine windows in its easternmost portion.
- vi. A wood or aluminum clad wood French door accessed by brick steps and a picketed railing will define the westernmost portion of the North Elevation of the additions.
- vii. A shed roofed dormer will punctuate the addition's roof.
- viii. The dormer will be faced with stucco.
- ix. A four-over-one wood or aluminum clad window will be located within the dormer.
- i. East (façade/Lanier Avenue facing) Elevation
 - i. The East Elevation of the enclosed portion of the additions will feature one wood or aluminum clad nine-over-one window.
 - ii. The concave swoop of shed roof will comprise the roof structure's eastern exposure.

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, later fenestration located within a sunporch would be removed and replaced with fenestration attuned to the existing and consistent with that proposed for the addition. The sunporch embraces three elevations – East, South, and North. The size, placement, and sequencing of the new windows would reflect the existing window bays (See B-10.). 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.

Additional changes to fenestration impact side and rear locations. Two upper-story window pairings, one on the South and a second on North would be infilled. Both proposed alterations would not directly engage the principle public view and are so designed as to maintain the rhythmic sequence solid of solids an voids through intimation of open fenestration (See B-4.). All remaining changes to fenestration are directly related to the proposed additions.

The additions proposed for the side and rear elevations are open and enclosed in porch. 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 galleries in original or later approved form are found across the district so the design concept is compatible with the environment (See B-2.). Many enclosed rear additions have been approved and constructed throughout the neighborhood. The foundation, columnar supports, and other detailing are down form the design of het house (See B-6.).

With regard to the open natured addition, a wraparound porch would extend along the South (Old Shell Road side) Elevation and wrap around to the West (rear) Elevation. By virtue of its single-story height, the porch is differentiated from original two-story massing of the body of the house (See B-5.), but architectural details such as porch posts and detailing match those found elsewhere on the dwelling so engender compatibility between old and new work (See B 6 & (.). The height of the proposed galleries do would not interfere with second-story elevations in terms of overall appearance and fenestration (See B-8.). While fenestration would be removed, new fenestration would be placed in the same location as the existing and designed to be compatible with style of the house. The rationale behind the removal and replacement of these side and rear fenestrated components is informed by the nature of this portion of the addition – a porch. Currently the subject windows do not engage a porch. To provide access to just such umbrage, the alteration is so proposed. The French doors are compatible with design and period of the building (See B-7). A house of the same style, period, and architect several blocks away, No. 112 Levert, features similar fenestration. The Board approved similar changes to fenestration 2256 DeLeon Avenue and 211 Lanier Avenue.

As per the enclosed portion of the house, said addition would be located at the northwest or side/rear portion of the house. Rear additions partially visible from side elevation are found across Mobile's historic districts. Notable examples in Ashland Place include the following: 207 Lanier Avenue; 102 Ryan Avenue; and 2301 DeLeon Avenue. Changes in wall plane and transitions in height serve to differentiate the proposed addition from the body of the house (See B-5). Compatibility of foundation treatment, wall surfaces, fenestration type, eave treatment, and roof form complement the main (See B 6-7.). The roof in particular negotiates a successful balance between the old and the new.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-13), 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. James and Mrs. Elissa Watkins were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner welcomed Mr. and Mrs. Watkins and asked if he or she had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Watkins stated that Mr. Blackwell addressed the application in full.

Mr. Wagoner then asked if any of his board members had any questions pertinent to the application that they wished to address.

Mr. Roberts noted the excellent execution of the addition and alterations as represented in the elevations and plans submitted for review

Mr. Stone asked for clarification regarding the location of the addition and its proximity to Old Shell Road. Mr. Watkins addressed Mr. Stone's query.

Mr. Wagoner opened the application to public comment. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Wagoner closed the period of 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 as written in the Staff report.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: March 16, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2017-09-CA: 250 Chatham Street
Applicant: William Cutts
Received: 2/21/17
Meeting: 3/15/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Addition to a Contributing Residence – Construct a small rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

Completed in 1868 for John Little and Virginia Smith, this grand Italianate villa was among the first buildings to be constructed on Washington Square after the Civil War. Originally situated in the center of the block upon which it stands, the dwelling stood atop a higher foundation and featured an expansive rear wing. During the 1920s or 1930s, the house was relocated further east (toward the square) and lowered in elevation. The original front gallery was removed. Elements salvaged from other notable Mobile residences were incorporated into the interior and exterior. A garage received the front doors from the Emanuel House (demolished for construction of The Admiral). Interior fittings included mirrors and architectural elements from the Murray Forbes Smith House (demolished for construction of the Grey Hound Station, now a portion of the Government Plaza site). The current owner restored the porch in 2004/2005.

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 6, 2010. On the aforementioned date, the Board approved a garage and a hyphen (optional and not constructed). The application up for review calls for the construction of a small 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, 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. “Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.”
7. “Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.”
8. “Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.”
9. “Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.”
10. “Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Construct a small rear addition.
 - a. The addition will square out the northwest (rear oriented and engaged Palmetto Street) corner of the house.
 - b. The addition will rest atop an aluminum platform that will be fronted by foundation piers matching those employed on the house.
 - c. Pilasters will be retained and corner boards will be employed at the junctures between old and new on both the North and West Elevations respectively.
 - d. The walls will be faced with wooden siding matching that employed on the body of the house.
 - e. Existing windows and shutters we removed from the subject location
 - f. The aforementioned windows and shutters will be reemployed on new West Elevation. The upper-story window will drop down in height.
 - g. A hipped roof will surmount the addition.
 - h. The roof will be sheathed with asphalt shingles matching those employed on the body of the house.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application entails the construction of a small rear addition onto a contributing residence. Rear additions are the most frequently employed means of expanding an existing building (See B-6.). With the exception of one dwelling, every house within sight of the front porch of the subject dwelling has a rear addition or in some cases additions. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, the design of the addition changes neither the overall characteristics of the site, the property, or the district (See B 1-3). By virtue being so designed to be located beneath the existing entablature encircling the body of the house and square-out an existing addition, the proposed addition would be differentiated from the historic core of the dwelling (See B 5, 7, & 8.). An existing pilaster found on the North Elevation would be retained and corner would be employed on the West Elevation so as to further nuance the evolution of the house. The foundation, siding, and fenestration treatments will match the existing (See B-3.). Existing windows and shutters (lower-story for the latter) would be salvaged and relocated on the addition (See B-9.). The location of the second-story window would have to be lowered on account of negotiating/continuing the height of the roof that squares this portion of the larger dwelling. The solid to void ratio on that rear elevation would be maintained (See B-4.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-9), Staff does not believe this application would impair either the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. William Cutts was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Mr. Wagoner then asked if any of his board members had any questions pertinent to the application that they wished to address.

Ms. Harden noted that on plans the cornerboards would be 6" wide and asked if the existing cornerboards were to be changed from 4" to 6". Mr. Cutts clarified that the existing cornerboards would be kept at 4".

Mr. Wagoner opened the application to public comment. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Wagoner closed the period of 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, amending fact that existing cornerboards shall be retained at 4" width.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: March 16, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2017-10-CA: 462 George Street
Applicant: Dennis Carlisle of Dennis Carlisle Architect for Restore Mobile
Received: 2/23/17
Meeting: 3/15/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Restoration and Rear Elevation Related – Restore the historic core of a house; alter side and rear fenestration; remove a later addition and porch; and reconstruct a new addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house featuring late “Stick” work detailing appears in the 1904 Sanborn Maps. The house dates from the fourth quarter of the 19th Century. The dwelling is one of two “twin” 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 has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review calls for the following: restoration of the core of the dwelling; alterations to fenestration; removal of later additions; and reconstruction of an addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.”
 - 2. “Replace exterior finishes to match original in profile, dimension and materials.”
 - 3. “Use materials that are consistent with the architectural style of the structure.”
 - 4. “Replacements should reflect the age and style of the building.”
 - 5. “Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.
 - 6. “Replace a historic porch element to match the original.”
 - 7. When reviewing applications for partial demolition, the following criteria are taken into account: “historical significance; physical condition; impact on the streetscape; and nature of any proposed redevelopment.”
 - 8. “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.”

9. “Design an addition to be compatible with the character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.”
10. “Design the building components (roof, foundation, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
11. “Maintain the relationship of solids and voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as established by the historic building.”
12. “Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color, and/or wall plane.”
13. “Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.”
14. “Size, place and space a window for an addition to be in character with the original historic building.”
15. “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.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Restore a house.
 - a. Repoint foundation piers with the appropriate mortar.
 - b. Repair and when necessary replace wooden siding to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.
 - c. Repaint the house (color scheme to be submitted at a later date).
 - d. Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.
 - e. East (façade/George Street facing) Elevation.
 - i. Remove existing concrete steps accessing the front porch.
 - ii. Construct wooden steps in the location of the concrete steps.
 - iii. Remove the later front door from the main entrance.
 - iv. Replicate the door located in the main entrance of the “twin” house found on the lot to the south (no. 464) in the aforementioned doorway.
 - v. Repair and if necessary any deteriorated glazing of a French door. The woodwork will match.
 - vi. Repair and when necessary replace components of an existing window as per light configuration, profile, dimension, and material.
 - vii. Re-glaze when necessary the aforementioned window.
 - viii. Repair and if necessary replace portions of whole of front porch posts.
 - ix. Repair porch decking to the match the existing as per construction and material.
 - f. South (a side) Elevation.
 - i. Repair and when necessary replace components of the two easternmost windows to match the existing as per light configuration, profile, dimension, and material.
 - ii. Remove the westernmost window.
 - iii. “Feather in” siding to match that surrounding it in and about the location of the aforementioned window.
 - g. West (rear) Elevation
 - i. Remove the current door and a later window from southern portion of the West Elevation.
 - ii. Install a new doorway.
 - iii. A wooden stop and steps will provide access to the aforementioned door.
 - iv. Boxed and recessed lattice skirting panels will extend between the foundations of the steps and stoop.
 - v. Wooden picketed railings will be employed on both the steps and the stoop.
 - vi. A wooden awning will extend over the stoop.

- vii. Asphalt shingles matching those on the house and will be employed on the awning.
 - viii. Install a new six-over-six wood window.
2. Demolish a later porch addition (See C-1-f for the scope of work impacting that elevation.).
 3. Demolish a later rear/side addition located at the northwest corner of the house.
 4. Construct a new side/rear addition on the location of the aforementioned location.
 - a. The addition will rest atop brick-faced foundation piers so as to match the rest of the house.
 - b. Boxed, framed, and recessed lattice skirting will extend between the foundation piers.
 - c. Wooden siding matching the siding on the house in profile and dimension will be employed.
 - d. Six-over-six wooden windows will be employed.
 - e. A truncated hipped roof will surmount the addition.
 - f. The fascia and eave detail will match that found on the body of the house.
 - g. Asphalt and bitumen will comprise the roofing sheathing.
 - h. The West (rear) Elevation will feature two six-over six wooden windows.
 - i. The North (the side) Elevation will feature two six-over-six wooden windows.
 5. Corner boards will be retained/employed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the restoration of the body of a contributing residence, changes to fenestration, the demolition of two later rear additions, and construction of a new rear addition

With regard to restoration of existing features found on the main residence, the pertinent portions of the scope of work either involve exacting in-kind repair/replacement of existing features or the replacement of features with historically appropriate ones documenting known or period examples. Windows, sidings, porch posts, and decorative details would be consolidated or replaced to match the existing as per profile, dimension, light configuration, and material (See B 1-6.). The façade's existing main entrance is not original. The proposed replacement matches that found on the "twin" house next door (See B-10.).

A window on the existing South (a side) Elevation would be removed and siding "feathered" in to match that which surrounding as per profile, dimension, and material. The location is minimally visible from the public view and located to the rear of the house. The overall historic character of the house and the whole of the façade would remain the same (See B-15.). Similar fenestration changes are proposed for the West Elevation on original rear ell.

The demolition of a later porch and rear addition are proposed. When reviewing applications for partial demolition, the following criteria are taken into account: historical significance; physical condition; impact on the streetscape; and nature of any proposed redevelopment (See B-7.). With regard to the historical significance, the two portions of the house proposed for demolition are not original to the building. Sanborn Maps, physical fabric, and stylistic evidence corroborate to show these parts of the larger whole are of a later date. Neither addition is of the same construction and design quality of the main residence. Both additions suffer from deferred maintenance. The enclosed addition has a roof structure has caused structural damage. Viewed at angles from two streets, both later additions do not directly engage the public view. As per the nature of interventions impacting the redevelopment of the pertinent portions of the building, a stoop and awning are proposed for construction instead of a porch and the addition would be reconstructed with a roof structure that would better compliment and would not jeopardize the house (See B-10.). See the below as per the new additions.

The porch and reconstructed enclosed addition would retain and better enhance the character defining features of the site (See B-8.). Porch umbrages and roofing reconfigurations represented by the two design interventions are based on and compatible with historic and/or approved examples in the neighborhood (See B-9.). The lower height and complementary pitch of the roof of the awning and the rear set & corner board employment (North Elevation) would serve to differentiate the historic fabric from the later sympathetic construction (See B-12.). Individual fenestrated units would be employed and would match the existing in terms of appearance and placement (See B 11, 13, & 14.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-15), Staff does not believe this application would impair either the architectural or the historical significance of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Dennis Carlisle and Mrs. Sydney Betbeze of Restore Mobile were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner welcomed Mr. Carlisle and asked if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Cutts stated that Mr. Blackwell addressed the application in full.

Mr. Wagoner then asked if any of his board members had any questions pertinent to the application that they wished to address.

Mr. Roberts inquired about the originality of an existing French door north of the main entrance on the principal façade. Mr. Blackwell explained the set of doors could have been added in the 1920's or 1930's. Mr. Blackwell noted the proposed design of the principal façade maintains its current configuration.

Ms. Harden requested clarification regarding the south elevation rear window being proposed for infill. Mr. Carlisle replied that the proposed infill window was to accommodate the layout of the kitchen. Ms. Harden suggested inserting blind shutters to maintain the rhythm of original fenestration. Mrs. Betbeze stated Restore Mobile would be amenable to the suggestion except none of the other windows have shutters currently. Mr. Blackwell assured the blind shutter solution would be acceptable. Ms. Harden noted the rear window is not in public view.

Mr. Wagoner asked if Restore Mobile owned the dwelling south of 462 George Street. Mrs. Betbeze confirmed Restore Mobile's ownership of the subject property.

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

Mr. Roberts thanked Restore Mobile for there work.

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, amending fact to reflect the installation of blind shutter at the southwest corner of the dwelling.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: March 16, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2017-11-CA: 501 Eslava Street
Applicant: John Wink
Received: 3/1/2017
Meeting: 3/15/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T-3
Project: Ancillary Related- Demolish a non-contributing garage structure.

BUILDING HISTORY

As initially constructed, this house comprised a vestigial “Creole” cottage in that it was a full-length galleried, gabled roofed, and passageless interior dwelling. The core of the building dates from 19th Century. Early and mid 20th Century alterations such as an extended overhang, and solid brick balustrade on the porch lend the house an Arts & Crafts Movement aesthetic.

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 in recent years.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. When reviewing applications calling for the demolition of non-contributing ancillary construction, the following criteria are taken into account: “significance of the building; condition of the building; impact on the landscape; and nature of any proposed redevelopment of the site.
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):
 - 1. Demolish an existing ancillary structure (garage).
 - 2. Remove debris from site..

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a non-contributing ancillary building. When reviewing applications calling for the demolition of ancillary buildings, the same criteria for accessing the demolition of principle buildings is taken into account. The major points of consideration are as follows: significance of the building; condition of the building; impact on the landscape; and nature of any proposed redevelopment of the site.

With regards to historical significance, the ancillary building is a non-contributing building. Though older than fifty years, the structure is not of the same period of early core of the house, the reason for the main

building's contributing status. The architectural caliber of the design is not of the same quality contemporaneous modifications of same period found on the principle dwelling.

As per physical condition, the ancillary building suffers from both cosmetic and structural maladies. By virtue of buildings on grade construction, moisture is absorbed from the sunken slab foundation directly into the framing. Abetting deterioration from below, there is found water damage from above for the roof is leaking.

The building is located behind the principle residence. While not visible from the Eslava Street, the principle streetscape informing this corner lot property, the building directly engages Lawrence Street, the side street which the lot also interacts.

As to any proposed redevelopment, the applicant would remove the physical fabric from the site and use the building's slab as a patio.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

While the non-contributing ancillary building does engage the secondary street, Staff does not believe the demolition of the building would impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Based on B (1), Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked if any of his board members had any questions pertinent to the application that they wished to address.

Ms. Largue clarified the location of photographs taken.

Ms. Harden questioned if the structure was between two houses. Mr. Blackwell replied yes.

Ms. Harden commented that auxiliary buildings are usually lost and if notable should be saved. She noted that this may not be the situation for the proposed accessory structure under review. Mr. Holmes cited the T105 siding which places the structure at a later date than the main house. Ms. Harden asked for clarification on the period of the significance for the property. Mr. Blackwell addressed Ms. Harden's query by noting that the 1850s date of the house informed the designation of the property.

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

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: March 16, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2017-12-CA: 1452 Brown Street
Applicant: Joseph Cortopassi
Received: 3/1/2017
Meeting: 3/15/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain hardieplank siding installed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story dwelling constitutes an assemblage of two buildings. Neither of the buildings was original to the site.

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 10, 1981. At that time, a request was made and accepted to extend an overhang by four (4) feet so as to convert that shallow umbrage into a gallery.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Design exterior materials and finishes associated with additions and alterations to non-historic/contributing structures to be compatible with the historic district”
 - 2. “Use materials with a character compatible to those used historically and with proven durability.”
 - 3. “Maintain the original material wherever possible provided the material is durable and compatible with the surrounding district.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per application submitted):**
 - 1. As per an application for after-the-fact-approval, retain hardieplank siding.
 - a. The siding faces all elevations.
 - b. The siding matches in profile and dimension that which it replaced.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application constitutes a proposal for the after-the-fact-approval of work conducted beyond the scope of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

The applicant received a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) on February 2, 2017 for the repair and replacement of deteriorated materials to match the existing as per profile, dimension and material. On February 16, 2017, Historic Development received a Service Request Order (SRO) or 311 call concerning ongoing work without the display of a CoA. MHDC went to the site and noticed the removal of all wooden siding on the building & the installation of hardieplank siding on the east elevation. The applicant was notified of two options: 1.) to stop work and apply to the Architectural Review Board (ARB); OR 2.) to continue construction by installing wood siding to match the original in dimension, profile, and material.

The portion of the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts addressing non-historic or non-contributing buildings state that alterations to that classification of building should be so designed as to be compatible with the historic district (See B-1.). The Design Review Guidelines go on to state that for materials employed on changes to non-contributing buildings that they should possess a proven durability in addition to compatibility (See B-2.). The Guidelines further clarify that original materials should be maintained wherever possible provided that the material is durable and compatible (See B-3.).

Compatibility and procedure are two principle concerns in this application. The scope of work was exceeded on multiple counts. Wholesale material replacement is discouraged. Replacement as needed and in kind was articulated clearly. While replacement of wood siding with hardieboard siding on non-contributing is not disavowed, it was not authorized in the approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Taking into account the extent of the after-the-fact approval and precedent nature of the application, staff defers to Board as to the approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Joseph Cortopassi was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner welcomed Mr. Cortopassi and asked if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Cortopassi responded that he did not.

Mr. Wagoner asked if any of his board members had any questions pertinent to the application that they wished to address.

Mr. Roberts asked if staff received a 311 call or SRO request. Mr. Blackwell replied yes.

Upon being asked of the architectural status of the house, Mr. Blackwell clarified the property file noted that dwelling was made of pieces from two buildings that were moved to the lot prior to the creation of the National Register district. The porch addition occurred in 1981. It was noted that the opening of the Staff Report should be corrected to note that building was non-contributing in status.

Ms. Harden asked if the wood dimensions were different from that of the hardieplank. Mr. Cortopassi replied no. Mr. Stone clarified that wood lapsiding is 5/8" thick while hardieplank is 7/16" thick.

Ms. Harden asked the applicant if the hardieplank was matched to the wood siding and trim. Mr. Cortopassi responded it was matched.

Mr. Allen stated according to a portion of the MHDC ordinance that an application approved on staff level if over-extended could not come before the Board for work done in violation to the Guidelines.

Mr. Blackwell noted the application could be held over.

Mr. Roberts suggested holding over the application for the April 5th ARB meeting to resolve the aforementioned issues. Mr. Cortopassi asked for the worst case scenario regarding the application. Mr. Wagoner stated the board may not be able to hear the application and/ or the hardieboard would not be permissible.

Mr. Allen read applicable parts of the ordinance. Mr. Wagoner stated the board would need to wait before it could review the application, if at all.

Mr. Cortopassi asked if he could proceed with using the hardieplank siding on the sides and rear of the dwelling. The applicant was reminded of the stop work order impacting the project.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board moves to hold over the application to the April 5th meeting.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

The application was voted to be held over until the next ARB meeting on April 5, 2017.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2017-13-CA: 522 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Andrew Dooley of Andrew Dooley Design Associates
Received: 3/1/16
Meeting: 3/15/16

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: T5-1
Project: Reconstruction – Reconstruct a replica of a two-and-one-half-story masonry building that formerly stood on the site.

BUILDING HISTORY

Until November of 2016, a two-and-half-story masonry building dating circa 1850 stood on this site.

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 at an emergency meeting of November 18, 2016. On the aforementioned date, the Board approved the deconstruction and reconstruction of the building. Only a small portion of the building was deconstructed. Municipal Offence Tickets (MOTS) and Notices of Violation (NOVS) were issued by multiple City Departments. With this application, the property returns before the Board with a proposal calling for the reconstruction of the building.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Historic Preservation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. Reconstruction is defined as “the act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features, and detailing of a non-surviving buildings, structure, or object for the purposes of replicating the appearance at a specific time and in its historic location.”
 - 2.
- C. **Scope of Work (per plans):**
 - 1. Reconstruct a replica of a two-and-one-half-story masonry building.
 - a. The building will measure 53’ 1” in width and 63’ in depth.
 - b. The walls will be constructed in the following layering (from outside to inside): true stucco, one course of brick, cmu block.
 - c. The building will feature eight-over-eight and six-over-six aluminum clad wood windows.

- d. The aforementioned windows will be recessed into the reveal so as to adopt the location of traditional wooden sash windows situate within masonry buildings (matching the original).
- e. The building's gable will roof will be sheathed with Architectural shingles.
- f. South (Dauphin Street facing) Elevation
 - i. The South Elevation will be fronted by a three bay two-tiered cast iron gallery.
 - ii. Circular section posts with bases and capitals will be employed on the gallery.
 - iii. Conventionalized, stylized, and vegetative motives will be employed in the gallery's railings, valences, and brackets.
 - iv. A hipped roof will surmount the gallery.
 - v. Standing seam metal roofing panels will be employed on the aforementioned gallery roof.
 - vi. The first-story storefront will feature a three bay sequence comprised of centrally located entrance and flanking window bays.
 - vii. Vertically, the first-story storefront will feature a paneled dado, display window, and transom.
 - viii. The second-story will also feature three fenestrated bays.
 - ix. Eight-over-eight windows will comprise the outer bays.
 - x. An eight-over-eight jib window will comprise the central bay.
 - xi. The garret or attic-story will feature two pedimented dormer windows.
 - xii. The aforementioned dormers will feature casement windows deigned to resemble six-over-six sash windows.
- g. West (Cedar Street facing) Elevation
 - i. The first-story of the two-story portion of the building's West Elevation will feature five fenestrated bays.
 - ii. The bay sequence of the first-story will feature three two glazed and paneled French doors flanking three eight-over-eight sash windows.
 - iii. The single-story portion of the West Elevation will feature a paneled carriage-like door with surmounting fanlight and overthrough with (electric or gas) light.
 - iv. Mechanical (electric and water meters) gauges will be placed to either side of the aforementioned access to the one-story portion of the building.
 - v. The second-story of the two-story portion of the building will feature five fenestrated bays.
 - vi. The bay sequence of the second-story will be comprised of five eight-over-eight sash windows.
 - vii. The garret or attic-story will feature three fenestrated bays with within in stepped and raked gable parapet wall.
 - viii. The bay sequence of the garret or attic-story will be comprised of three six-over-six windows.
 - ix. Reconstruct chimney stacks with caps.
- h. North (rear) Elevation
 - i. The North Elevation will be faced with salvaged brick.
 - ii. second-story of the North Elevation will feature three fenestrated bays
 - iii. The bay sequence from west to east will be as follows: two six-over-six windows followed by a glazed and transom topped French door.
 - iv. All three of the aforementioned fenestrate bays will feature articulated hoods.
 - v. Two lighting fixtures will be placed in intermittent wall bays.
 - vi. The garret or attic-story will feature a tripartite dormer.
 - vii. The dormer design will be comprised of two pedimented doors flanking a recessed wall dormer.

- viii. Single six-over-six appearing windows will be located in the pedimented dormers and three four-over-four appearing windows will be located in the shed roofed dormer between them. All the aforementioned windows will be casement in construction.
 - ix. Possibly employ a cast iron railing atop the parapet wall enclosing the second-story terrace.
 - i. East Elevation
 - i. The East Elevation will be faced with brick.
 - ii. A corbeled, stepped, and raked parapet will be constructed.
 - iii. No fenestration will be employed on this interior lot elevation.
2. .

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the reconstruction of a demolished building that formerly stood upon the site. Under both the Secretary of Interior Standards and the Design Review Guidelines authorized reconstruction as an approved preservation intervention. This preservation alternative was approved by the Board on November 18, 2017.

Reconstruction is defined as the act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features, and detailing of a non-surviving buildings, structure, or object for the purposes of replicating the appearance at a specific time and in its historic location.

Reconstruction should be based on documentary, physical, and pictorial evidence. During the mid and latter half of 2016, the building was measured. Immediately prior to the building's destruction, additional measurements, both rule and digital (via laser), were conducted. Abetting the physical documentation of the built conditions of the lost building are photographs going back into the 1960s. Actual physical fabric salvaged from the former building will be employed in the reconstruction. So as to recapture the mural experience of prominently masonry building, the South (Dauphin Street facing) and West Elevation will be constructed with following layering (from outside to inside): true stucco, one course of brick, and lastly cmu block.

Certain changes departing form the appearance of the building as it lastly stood have been proposed. Those changes are as follows: instead of a 1970s first-story storefront on South or Dauphin Street, a traditional storefront sequence is proposed; instead of sash windows as employed in the latter dormers, casement windows designed to appear-like sash windows would be employed on both the South and North dormers; instead of replicating infilled window bays on the West or Cedar Street Elevation, all windows bays would be manifested and two first-story fenestrated bays would feature more stylistically appropriate doors (the southernmost one was at an earlier point and the northernmost was most recently a door); instead of double door on the single-story portion of the West Elevation, a carriageway-like door would be employed; instead of recreating a window on North Elevation's second-story, a French door would be employed; the aforementioned door will access a terrace; the later dormers would reconstructed, albeit their design changed so as to part of tripartite gable-shed-gable sequence.

With regard to the proposed changes on first-story of the South or Dauphin Street Elevation, it was suggested at the Architectural Review Board meeting of October 19 2016 that the applicant consider redesigning that portion of the building so as to adopt a design vocabulary more in keeping with the overall character of the building, an Antebellum two-and-one-half-story storefront. The proposed designed employs a paneled bulkhead, expansive display area, and transom like that found on mid to late 19th Century commercial buildings that existing and were documented in Mobile.

As originally constructed, the building did not feature dormers. The dormers were constructed only in the 1990s. Said dormers were constructed on the roof slopes of both the South and North Elevations. While the dormers are proposed for reconstruction, the window constructed specified in the scope of work calls for transom windows instead of sash windows. The design change is response to code-related concerns. The construction is said to be so designed as to simulate the appearance of sash windows.

Several fenestration changes are proposed for the new West Elevation. Fenestrated bays that had been closed up over the passage of time will be reinstated. All fenestration within the masonry walls, regardless of elevation, will be so constructed as to be situated within the mural confines in a manner replicating the traditional of wooden windows within a masonry surface. On the first-story of the two-story portion of the West Elevation, a door will be reopened and a previous door designed improved. Both of the aforementioned bays would employ glazed and paneled French doors. Photographs of Mobile buildings of the stylistic period which the reconstruction is based depict this type of door design. Several replications can be found on Dauphin Street. Chimney stacks would be reconstructed. At the time of the building's demolition, there were no chimney stacks present. The designs of the chimney stacks are based on extant and documented examples. The single-story portion of the West Elevation formerly featured a double door. A carriage-like door is proposed. Less than a dozen carriage entries survive in downtown. All extant examples minus one featured an arcuated design such as the overall form proposed.

The design of the North (rear) Elevation also features several changes. The easternmost fenestrated bay of the second-story would be reconfigured as a door accessing a parapet-fronted terrace. A cast iron railing of some sort might be required for purposes of complying with building codes. As mentioned previously, later dormers would be reconstructed, albeit in a different design. Instead of two independent dormers, the dormers would be connected by way a recessed wall dormer. While not a design feature encountered on late Antebellum commercial terrace rows in Mobile, the design feature was employed on the Gulf Coast in later periods. The recessed placement of the intermediate shed portion allows for primacy of the flanking gables.

REQUESTS

1. Provide a more detailed drawing of the dormer windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff does not believe this application would impair the architectural or the historical character of the historic districts. Pending clarification of the dormer design, Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Andrew Dooley, Mr. Luke Peavy of BJE Properties, and Ms. Denise Molding were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner welcomed Mr. Dooley, Mr. Peavy, and Ms. Molding and asked if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Dooley stated that Mr. Blackwell addressed the application in full and did a wonderful job describing the application in the Staff Report.

Mr. Wagoner asked if any of his board members had any questions pertinent to the application that they wished to address.

Mr. Allen stated he did not see a sign posted at the physical address of 522 Dauphin when he rode by earlier on March 15, 2017. Mr. Blackwell replied the sign had been posted by two members of the MHDC staff on March 8th. He stated that agenda and staff report had been posted on the MHDC website on same date and the same document had been emailed to MHDC, neighborhood representatives, and ARB members on the same date.

Mr. Roberts asked for clarification regarding the dormers located on the north elevation. Mr. Dooley stated that the design was intended to allow for egress access to the third floor for code requirements. He noted the design could be using double hung windows or casement, if the board had a preference.

Mr. Roberts noted that 19th century dwellings would not have seen this type of dormer and it would have been added at a later date. He proposed using larger windows. Mr. Stone commented that the rear dormer proposed was not proportional.

Mr. Stone asked if any awnings would be installed in the future over the aforementioned dormer windows. Mr. Dooley stated it was a possibility, but not at this time.

Mr. Holmes commented that the dormer was not an issue, but voiced concerned with the window configuration. He went on to explain the eight-over-eight window configuration would not be typical for the mid 19th century building. Mr. Holmes noted that a six-over-six window configuration would be period appropriate.

Mr. Blackwell explained the evolution of the previous structure beginning in its construction during the mid 19th century. He noted the next photographic evidence we have is from a photograph dated 1972 where jalousie windows were employed. He continued by explaining the eight-over-eight windows, iron work, and reconstruction of the dormers was completed in the early 1990's.

Mr. Dooley explained the windows are wide windows and the eight-over-eight windows are proportionate to the larger openings. Mr. Stone pointed out the six-over-six window configuration was employed on the 3rd floor of the proposed design.

Mr. Holmes stated the six-over-six configuration would be wide on an opening of 3'4"-3'8". Mr. Roberts reiterated by commenting the glass panes configured in the drawings look proportional. Mr. Dooley added there was no evidence to suggest the window sizes had been altered on the previous structure.

Mr. Dooley clarified the windows would be simulated divided light in aluminum clad for Mr. Stone and the board. He also noted windows would be impact resistant to meet code.

Ms. Harden asked for clarification as to how the windows would be recessed into the façade. Mr. Dooley responded the windows would recess 4". Ms. Harden asked the applicants if the windows were going back to fit the openings as they had fit the previous structure. He answered yes.

Mr. Allen stated that he was still concerned with the adequacy of notice. Mr. Wagoner responded that based on staff's response an appropriate notice was given. Mr. Wagoner noted that staff response that a the sign had been placed on property, as well as the report on the website, and email notifications to Commissioners, city employees, and people of interest. Ms. Harden iterated that signs had been stolen in

the past. Mr. Allen restated he had not seen the sign on the property. Mr. Wagoner continued by saying staff could not guarantee the sign remains on site once placed at every single moment.

Ms. Mutert clarified that the ordinance stipulates that a 24 hour notice be given to parties and on website. Mr. Allen asked if the ordinance stated whether or not a physical sign was supposed to be posted on the property. Ms. Mutert responded she did not see a sign requirement.

Mr. Allen inquired about the proposed gallery. Noting the scope of work, he asked if the design would match that which was removed.

Mr. Dooley confirmed for Mr. Allen that the gallery proposed will match the previous structure. He continued by stating the many of the former structure's gallery iron work was still in tact and damaged pieces will be replaced. Mr. Blackwell noted that if the description in the scope of work caused for confusion, it was the result of staff.

Mr. Allen inquired about the west elevation and its configuration of doors and windows. The description of the west elevation, first story needed clarification. Mr. Dooley replied that the first story will have two French doors flanking three windows. Mr. Blackwell acknowledged the gaffe in number of windows and doors. Mr. Allen asked if any documentation was utilized for this configuration. Mr. Dooley stated while there was no documentation, two larger openings flanked the three windows in the previous structure and he used buildings in the area around the same period for inspiration. One of the previously mentioned openings was a door; the other was a large storefront window. Mr. Blackwell further cited an example of a building located catty corner to 522 Dauphin Street with French doors, as well as numerous photographs in multiple historical collections. He added that the one bay showed physical signs of being a door while the other had a door prior to demolition.

Mr. Dooley confirmed there was no pictorial evidence for the carriage door proposed carriage door design. He also confirmed there was no documentation. Mr. Blackwell mentioned four extent examples in the Downtown Henry Aaron Loop featuring arched shapes and mentioned documentary evidence of paneled door bays.

Mr. Allen asked if the east and north elevations would be rebuilt with brick facing. Mr. Dooley replied it would be and then painted, not stuccoed. Mr. Allen inquired if there was any documentation for the east and north elevation of the prior structure being stuccoed at an earlier point. Mr. Dooley replied he was unsure, but had not seen any. Mr. Blackwell stated the original north elevation exhibited no physical evidence of having been stuccoed and that the east wall originally abutted another multi-story building.

Mr. Allen raised the concern that the board was considering the application as "reconstruction" by the Secretary of Interior Standards. He pointed out the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts do not contain all the components informing reconstruction. Mr. Allen stated that the project did not meet all of those criteria.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Allen to read the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Reconstruction in full. Mr. Allen read as follows:

1. "Reconstruction will be used to depict vanished or non-surviving portions of a property when documentary and physical evidence is available to permit accurate reconstruction with minimal conjecture, and such reconstruction is essential to the public understanding of the property."
2. "Reconstruction of a landscape, building, structure, or object in its historic location will be preceded by a thorough archeological investigation to identify and evaluate those features and

artifacts which are essential to an accurate reconstruction. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.”

3. “Reconstruction will include measures to preserve any remaining historic materials, features, and spatial relationships.”
4. “Reconstruction will be based on the accurate duplication of historic features and elements substantiated by documentary or physical evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different features from other historic properties. A reconstructed property will re-create the appearance of the non-surviving historic property in materials, design, color, and texture.”
5. “A reconstruction will be clearly identified as a contemporary re-creation.”
6. “Designs that were never executed historically will not be constructed.”

Mr. Roberts asked if the property could be classified differently. Mr. Allen responded the board does not have to follow these standards; however the staff report stated “reconstruction”.

Mr. Stone asked if the property was classified as reconstruction for tax credit purposes. Mr. Allen stated the property was not able to receive tax credits for reconstruction.

Mr. Blackwell noted there are several preservation standards within the rubric of the Secretary of Interior’s Standards. He cited rehabilitation and restoration. Mr. Blackwell noted that most project employ aspects multiple standards. He added that most communities, Mobile included, have guidelines based on rehabilitation and the basic definition of reconstruction was added to the new Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic district so as to provide and define that preservation intervention which has long been employed in Mobile. He said that all of the preservation standards were being considered for revision..

Mr. Wagoner opened the application to public comment.

Mrs. Sydney Betbeze of Restore Mobile stated she did not believe a “reconstruction” classification was correct and did not believe the proposed project meet the Secretary of Interior’s Standards Guidelines for Reconstruction. She noted the proposed design was not an exact replica of the prior structure, and said the design looked “disneyfied”. She also did not favor the rear dormer as proposed.

Mr. Blackwell reiterated the classification was taken directly from the opening definition Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Reconstruction. He also stated several examples of reconstructed structures in Mobile including two on Marine Street in the Oakleigh Garden District.

Mr. Holmes commented his firm, Holmes and Holmes Architects, had reconstructed several structures including the Durand House. He noted the Durand house was disassembled in the block where Cathedral Square is, stored, and later rebuilt a portion. He also stated the rebuilt portion the rear of the re-erected Durande House was reconfigured for contemporaneous use. Mr. Holmes continued by citing the Spear-Barter House which was reconstructed utilizing drawings after it was demolished. The Spear-Barter house was altered in the rear to appeal to buyers. Mr. Holmes closed by saying the minor alterations of reconstructed properties are not unusual.

Mr. Dooley stated that documentation was gathered prior to the demolition of the structure. He further explained alterations made that were not previously documented were based on local structures of the period. He noted the proposed carriageway design as an example stating inspiration was taken from a mid 19th century design, but as it previously stood the design was not from the mid 19th century.

Mr. Wagoner closed the period of discussion after the audience discussed the application concurrently with staff.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Stone moved to find the facts in the Staff report, amending fact that the west elevation first story will have two French doors flanking three windows, and the North and East elevations will be surfaced with painted brick.

Ms. Harden was concerned with the staff report calling the proposed project reconstruction. Mr. Allen echoed the concern based on the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Reconstruction. Mr. Blackwell stated staff used the term reconstruction since the proposed design aligned closely with the original structure.

Mr. Allen proposed the change the term from Reconstruction to New Construction. Mr. Blackwell noted the proposed design did not meet all the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Reconstruction, but still complied with the majority of them. He also commented the property described as new construction will be listed as non-contributing. Mr. Wagoner then reiterated the property could be reviewed as New Construction and there was a responsibility to follow rules and to the community.

Mr. Dooley stated if it is not deemed reconstruction it was not for lack of attention to detail or prior documentation.

Ms. Harden noted the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Reconstruction also apply to interiors.

Mr. Dooley was asked if he, as representation for his clients, was amenable to classifying the application as new construction. Mr. Dooley responded yes.

Mr. Stone then moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that proposed project be listed as new construction, the west elevation's first-story will have two French doors flanking three windows, and the North and East elevations will be surfaced with painted brick.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Steve Stone 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: March 18, 2018.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion

- a. Mr. Blackwell noted the next meeting of the Architectural Review Board will be held on April 5, 2018 in the Multi-Purpose Room of Government Plaza.

Mr. Wagoner moved to close the meeting.