

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
March 18, 2015 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, assistant director of the MHDC, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Robert Brown, Catarina Echols, Kim Harden, Nick Holmes, III, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, I, Craig Robert, Steve Stone, and Jim Wagoner.
Members Absent: Bob Allen and Carolyn Hasser
Staff Members Present: Cart Blackwell and Keri Coumanis.
2. Harris Oswalt moved to approve the minutes for the March 4, 2015 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.
3. Steve Stone moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: Joe Murray**
 - a. Property Address: 300 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/26/15
 - c. Project: Install a wall sign per the submitted design, materials, and location.
2. **Applicant: St. Louis Lofts**
 - a. Property Address: 303 Saint Louis Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/25/15
 - c. Project: Replace material on current awnings to Sunbrella material Slate in color. Repair armature as required.
3. **Applicant: Eleanor I. and Stephen M. Baker**
 - a. Property Address: 311 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/25/15
 - c. Project: Replace interior lot privacy fencing. The railings will be eight feet in height.
4. **Applicant: Douglas Burtu Kearley, Architect**
 - a. Property Address: 453 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/25/15
 - c. Project: Repaint per the submitted BLP color scheme (Jackson Street Rust). Repair/replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing. Repair/replace windows to match in all respects.
5. **Applicant: Sondra Dempsey**
 - a. Property Address: 261 North Jackson Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/27/15
 - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted Benjamin Moore color scheme: siding, Golden Stray; shutters, Knoxville Gray; door, Phillipsburg Blue; and detailing, Slate Blue. Install a wooden railing with balusters matching those employed on the porch. The carport will be painted with colors complementing the house. Install picket fencing across the front of the lot. The overall height of fencing will not exceed four feet.
6. **Applicant: DeLashmet & Marchand**
 - a. Property Address: 462 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/2/15

- c. Project: Replace fencing to match existing.
- 7. Applicant: K.I.M Kearley for the Restoration Group**
 - a. Property Address: 911 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/3/15
 - c. Project: Construct a side gallery on a non-contributing building. Said gallery will be minimally visible from the public view.
- 8. Applicant: Jeff Sims**
 - a. Property Address: 1109 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/4/15
 - c. Project: Reroof a front porch with roofing shingles to match the existing. Replace canvas awnings to matching the existing. Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material in the impacted areas. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme (where required).
- 9. Applicant: Mark Jackson**
 - a. Property Address: 5 North Cedar Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/9/15
 - c. Project: Reroof the house using architectural shingles. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork, siding, decking, and detailing to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the dwelling
- 10. Applicant: Paul Storrs**
 - a. Property Address: 115 Providence
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/27/15
 - c. Project: Erect 6' black metal fence across rear of property on Catherine Street per site plan on file.
- 11. Applicant: James Oates**
 - a. Property Address: 209 North Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/2/15
 - c. Project: Pull out one window, replace the sill, repaint to match.
- 12. Applicant: Randolph Wilson**
 - a. Property Address: 1004 Elmira Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/9/15
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated wooden siding and woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Reroof the house with a 5-V crimp metal roof (clay). Repaint the house (white).
- 13. Applicant: Randolph Wilson**
 - a. Property Address: 1006 Elmira Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/9/15
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated siding and woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Reroof the house with asphalt shingles. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Install brick fronted foundation piers.
- 14. Applicant: Ashley Clyatt**
 - a. Property Address: 1057 Elmira Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/9/15
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the house cream (body), white (trim), and green (door). Install storm windows within the window reveals. Install wooden shutters. Replace roofing shingles when and where necessary to match the existing. Pave (with concrete) an existing drive to the right of the house. The curbcut is existing.
- 15. Applicant: N.A.C. LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 1167 Elmira Street

- b. Date of Approval: 3/6/15
- c. Project: N.A.C. LLC

16. Applicant: Ben Mayer

- a. Property Address: 1757 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/3/15
- c. Project: Repaint house, body grey, brick columns and knee wall darker grey, foundation Bellingrath green, trim white.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2015-14-CA: 303 North Conception Street

- a. Applicant: John Dendy with John Dendy & Associates for Mary Anne & Rennie Brabner
- b. Project: Reconstruction of a rear addition – Make structural repairs to and slight alterations to the elevations of a rear wing dating from the 1980s.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2015-15-CA: 8 North Lafayette Street and 12 North Lafayette Street

- a. Applicant: Kent H. Broom with Kent H. Broom, Inc. for McGill-Toolen Catholic High School
- b. Project: Follow Up of a Concept Approval for Site Redevelopment – Install hardscaping, landscaping and fencing on an expanded parking area.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2015-16-CA: 1563 Spring Hill Avenue

- a. Applicant: Kent H. Broom with Kent H. Broom, Inc. for McGill-Toolen Catholic High School
- b. Project: Follow Up of a Concept Approval for Site Redevelopment – Install hardscaping, landscaping and fencing on an expanded parking area.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2015-17-CA: 101 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Anderson with SBA Communications for the Retirement System of Alabama
- b. Project: Mechanical/Technological Installations – Upgrade cellular antennae (3) atop a multi-story building.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

5. 2015-18-CA: 1650 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Joe Byrne for Tim & Marian Clarke
- b. Project: Painting – Paint a non-contributing brick residence.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-14-CA: 303 North Conception Street
Applicant: John Dendy with John Dendy & Associates for Mary Anne & Rennie Brabner
Received: 2/18/15
Meeting: 3/18/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T-3
Project: Reconstruction of a rear addition – Make structural repairs to and slight alterations to the elevations of a rear wing dating from the 1980s.

BUILDING HISTORY

Dating from 1842, 303 North Conception Street is one of three attached dwellings that have long referred to as the Parmly Houses. As an ensemble, the grouping constitutes Mobile’s most intact example of a picturesque terrace development. At the turn of the 20th Century, a greater number of similar attached dwellings lined Mobile’s downtown streets. A notable sweep similar townhouses once overlooked the northern side of Bienville Square. Bloodgood Row, a highly significant row of three four-story houses, has long been cited as the finest local iteration of the terrace approach to urban residential design. Those houses were demolished for construction of the Civic Center.

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 Architectural Review Board on February 3, 1986. At the time, the Board approved the construction the subject addition. With this application, the property owners propose the stabilization, repair, and slight alteration to the aforementioned addition.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, architectural features to project the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**
 - 1. Remove deteriorated wooden siding from the addition.
 - 2. Stabilize/reconstruct the addition’s structural system.

3. Minus changes noted below, replicate the fenestration patterns/bay sequences of the addition.
 - a. Pilaster-like posts will be reinstated.
 - b. The easternmost section of the reconstructed addition South Elevation will feature a pair of one-over-one wooden windows on the first floor and two-shuttered bays on second story.
 - c. The western section of the reconstructed addition's South Elevation will two pairs one-over-one windows on both first story and a single pair of one-over-one windows with a wood framed French door on the second story (Coupled windows previously occupied the location of the aforementioned door.).
 - d. The first floor of the reconstructed addition's West (Rear) Elevation will feature a double French door unit with surmounting multi-light transom and a pair of one-over-one wooden windows, while the second story will feature two shuttered window bays (Previously there were four shuttered bays.).
 - e. Reinstating a wood framed French door on reconstructed addition's South Elevation. Lattice railings and screenings will be reinstated.
4. Replace the addition's wooden siding with Hardiplank siding.
5. Install wooden or hardiboard lattice foundation screening between the addition's foundation piers.
6. Reconstruct a gallery that extended the length of the addition's South Elevation.
 - a. The two-tiered galleries piers will be of the same design as the pilasters employed on the addition's walls.
 - b. A second story gallery will be enclosed by a picketed railing.
7. Reroof the main house and the reconstructed addition with Timberline, American Harvest (Nantucket Morning, a dark grey) shingles.
8. Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material
9. Touch up the house per the existing color scheme.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the reconstruction of a later rear addition which is not visible from the public view. Said addition dates from the 1980s. The addition, which occupies the location of rear service wing and gallery, is beset by structural failures and cosmetic deterioration. With regard to the additions, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that the new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, architectural features to project the historic integrity of the property and its environment (See B-1.). While maintaining the look and feel of the enclosed porch and service wing, the addition will be successfully differentiated through materials, height, elements, and details. Hardiplank siding, which is an authorized material for new construction and additions, will contrast with the brick walls of the house. The window and their bays, while proportionally appropriate, are of a simplified light pattern. The aforementioned design considerations will allow the addition "to read" as a later alteration to an existing historic context.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Reynolds Brabner and John Dendy were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant and his representative. He asked Mr. Dendy and Mr. Brabner if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Neither Mr. Dendy nor Mr. Brabner had anything to allow.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant or his representative. Upon hearing no response from the Board, Mr. Ladd addressed the audience. He asked if any of those assembled were present to speak either for or against the application. No comments ensued from the audience. Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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: 3/18/16

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-15-CA: 8 North Lafayette Street and 12 North Lafayette Street
Applicant: Kent Broom with Kent H. Broom, Inc. for McGill-Toolen Catholic High School
Received: 3/2/15
Meeting: 3/18/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-2
Project: Follow Up of a Concept Approval for Site Redevelopment – Install hardscaping, landscaping and fencing on an expanded parking area.

BUILDING HISTORY

A multi-family complex occupied the site of 8 North Lafayette. A late Queen Anne dwelling occupies the front half of 12 North Lafayette Street. Dating from 1898, the irregularly massed and two-storied dwelling features a wrap-around porch and varied roof forms.

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. These properties last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on October 15, 2015. At that time, the Board issued conceptual approval for a parking lot to be located atop the site of a 8 North Lafayette Street and an existing parking to be extended behind 12 North Lafayette Street. The application up for review is a follow up on the aforementioned concept approval. Fencing, landscaping, hardscaping and additional concerns are addressed in the submittal.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Parking areas should be screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences or landscaping.”
 - 2. “The appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design.”
 - 3. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location, and materials be compatible with the property.”
 - 4. “Ordinances relating to parking and landscaping will be enforced by the City of Mobile Urban Development Department in reviewing requests for parking lots.”
 - 5. “Proposed lighting should be designed to avoid invading surrounding areas.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):
 - 1. The parking lot will be accessed from an existing parking located to the south of the subject lots at the northeast corner of North Lafayette Street and Dauphin Street. No new curbcuts will be added. Ingress and egress will be afforded by existing curbcuts on aforementioned and adjoining lot.

2. Install paving
 - a. The parking lot will be laid with asphalt paving.
 - b. Concrete curbing will be employed.
 - c. There will be fifty parking spaces.
3. Install fencing.
 - a. The fencing will match the height (six feet), design (picket), and material (aluminum) of the fencing of the adjoining parking area.
 - b. The fence will extend in line with existing fencing along the western side of the lot.
 - c. The fencing will turn in easterly direction and wrap around the house located at 12 North Lafayette Street
 - d. The fencing will extend along the northern and eastern lot lines.
 - e. The fencing will tie into existing fencing.
4. Installing landscaping
 - a. A continuous landscaped barrier will extend around the whole of the parking area.
 - b. A landscape island will be located in the boot of the L-shaped parking area.
 - c. A storm water detention area will be located in the southeast corner of the parking area.
 - d. Twenty-nine (29) trees will be planted on property. Said trees will be Cathedral Live Oaks and Calipers in type.
 - e. Five (5) frontage trees will be planted along Lafayette Street.
 - f. Twenty-one (21) will be planted around the perimeter of the lot.
 - g. Three (3) trees will be planted within the landscape island.
 - h. Nellie Stevens Hollies will constitute the understory plantings.
 - i. Zoysia grass will be planted all landscaping areas.
5. Install lighting.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. Clarify the design, height, and location of the proposed lighting.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of paving, landscaping, fencing, and lighting about an expanded parking enclosure. The proposal received concept approval at the Board's October 15, 2014 meeting. Since that time, the plan has been further developed. Instead creating an additional curbcut to access the parking area as was originally proposed, the parking enclosure is now accessed from the adjoining parking lot to the south of the subject area. The amount of hardscaping has been reduced. Landscaping has been increased in amount, specified in type, and extended around the whole of the lot.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that parking areas should be screened from view by fencing and landscaping (See B 1.). Built and landscape features will minimize the impact of the proposed work (See B-2.). An existing six foot tall aluminum fence located on adjacent parking lot to the North of 8 North Lafayette Street would extend along frontage of the latter property and then wrap around the side and rear of 12 North Lafayette Street. Said fencing will extend along 12 North Lafayette Street's North (side) and East (rear) lot lines and will tie into matching fencing located on South lot line of 8 North Lafayette Street. Fencing of the proposed type and height is authorized for commercial and/or institutional properties. Perimeter and interior landscaping in the form of ground level, intermediate height, and upper level landscaping will be planted within the fenced enclosure. The Design Review Guidelines state that modern paving materials are at times acceptable in the historic districts (See B-3.).

Any and all proposed lighting will design to avoid invading surrounding areas and coordinated with Urban Development (See B-5.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-5), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district. Pending clarifications as per the proposed lighting, Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ben Cummings and Kent Broom were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the representatives for McGill-Toolen. He asked Mr. Broom and Mr. Cummings if they any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Cummings reminded the Board that in October of the preceding year they had issued concept approval for the project. He explained that he and Mr. Broom were present to receive final approval for the landscaping and lighting.

Mr. Harden asked for clarification as per the type and location of fencing. Discussion ensued as to the where wooden fencing would be installed.

Mr. Holmes recommended that in those rear portions of the site, the applicants be able to choose between either wooden privacy or aluminum picket.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. 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 facts to note that upon wrapping around the rear of 12 North Lafayette Street the fencing could be either wooden privacy or aluminum picket.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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 approved. Mr. Stone voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/18/16

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-16-CA: 1563 Spring Hill Avenue
Applicant: Kent H. Broom with Kent H. Broom, Inc. for McGill-Toolen Catholic High School
Received: 3/2/15
Meeting: 3/16/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Follow Up of a Concept Approval for Site Redevelopment – Install hardscaping, landscaping and fencing on an expanded parking area.

BUILDING HISTORY

The subject lot formed part of the grounds of the Sanford-Ingate-Thompson estate, one of the grandest suburban villas to have been constructed in Mobile. A commercial building dating from 1973 occupied the northern portion of this L-shaped lot until recent months. A parking lot occupies the larger southern portion of the property.

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 15, 2014. At that time, the Board approved the demolition of a non-contributing office building and granted concept approval for the expansion of and improvements to an existing parking lot. The application up for review constitutes a more fully developed proposal for the redevelopment of the lot. This follow up involves the installation of hardscaping, fencing, and landscaping.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Parking areas should be screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences or landscaping.”
 - 2. “The appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design.”
 - 3. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location, and materials be compatible with the property.”
 - 4. “Ordinances relating to parking and landscaping will be enforced by the City of Mobile Urban Development Department in reviewing requests for parking lots.”
 - 5. “Proposed lighting should be designed to avoid invading surrounding areas.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):
 - 1. Remove, repave, extend, and connect parking lots.
 - a. Level the site.
 - b. Install asphalt paving.

- c. Install concrete curbing.
 - d. The total number of parking spaces will amount to one hundred and seventy-five spaces (175).
2. Install fencing.
 - a. The fencing will match the height (six feet), design (picket), and material (aluminum) of the fencing of the adjoining parking area.
 - b. Along Kilmarnock Street (east side of the property), the fencing will extend in a northerly from and be in plane with existing fencing.
 - c. The fencing will extend in westerly direction into the block along a section of the northern lot line.
 - d. The fence will then change direction and extend along the northern section of the eastern lot line.
 - e. Fencing with a gate of the same design will extend across the Northern entrance to the combined parking lot.
 - f. The fencing will extend along the western lot and tie into existing fencing.
 3. Install landscaping.
 - a. There will be fifteen (15) frontage trees.
 - b. There will be twenty-seven (27) perimeter trees.
 - c. Nellie Stevens hollies and Ligustrum japonicas well constitute the understory plantings.
 - d. Zoysia grass will be planted in a landscape areas.
 4. Install lighting.

CLARIFICATION

1. Clarify the design, height, and location of lighting.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of paving, landscaping, fencing, and lighting about an expanded parking enclosure. The proposal received concept approval at the Board’s October 15, 2014 meeting. Since that time, the plan has been further developed. The amount of landscaping has been increased, the type and number of plantings specified, and number of parking spaces reduced. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that parking areas should be screened from view by the fences or landscaping and that that the appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design (See B 1-2.). Paved and unpaved parking already inform the site. An existing parking lot located on the adjacent property to the South of the subject lot will inform the design and treatment of the property up for review. The latter property is enclosed by a six foot tall aluminum fence. Said fencing would extend in northerly fashion along the western side of Kilmarnock Street, wrap behind the medical office complex located at the southwest corner of Kilmarnock Street and Spring Hill Avenue, extend along Spring Hill Avenue (set back from the street), and the terminate at southern end of the West lot line. A recessed vehicular gate would provide access to Spring Hill Avenue. Existing curbcuts would be removed. A new concrete curbcut and drive will allow be installed. The Design Review Guidelines state that modern paving materials are at times acceptable in the historic districts (See B-3.). Any and all proposed lighting will design to avoid invading surrounding areas and coordinated with Urban Development (See B-5.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-5), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district. Pending clarifications as per the proposed lighting, Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ben Cummings and Kent Broom were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. After encouraging consideration of alternative means of transportation, Mr. Ladd welcomed the representatives for McGill-Toolen. He asked Mr. Broom and Mr. Cummings if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Cummings noted that as with the preceding application aluminum picket fencing would front the street frontages, while wooden picket fencing would be located side and rear portions of the parking enclosure.

Mr. Holmes noted that proposed plan represents a marked improved over the existing conditions.

Ms. Harden asked for additional clarifications as per the type and location of fencing. Mr. Broom addressed Ms. Harden's concerns.

No further discussion ensued among the assembled Board members.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. 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 approved by the Board

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 approved. Mr. Stone voted in opposition

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/18/16

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

20145-17-CA: 101-103 Dauphin Street

Applicant: David Anderson with SBA Communications for the Retirement System of Alabama

Received: 9/30/14

Meeting: 10/15/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: SD-WH Special District
Project: Mechanical/Technological Installations – Upgrade cellular antennae (3) atop a multi-story building.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Van Antwerp Building (101 Dauphin Street) holds a point of distinction in that it is Mobile’s first skyscraper. The ten-story building was built between 1904 and 1908 according to the designs of architect George B. Rogers. The three part division of the building into a base (ground floor and mezzanine), shaft (office stories), and cornice serves as illustration of Rogers’ awareness of contemporary theories animated the design of tall office buildings.

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 was last appeared before the Architectural Review Board November 19, 2015. At that time, the Board approved the installation of signage. The application up for a review calls for the reinstallation of roof top cellular equipment. A previous application calling for the same request was scheduled to appear before the Board on October 15, 2014. The aforementioned application was not reviewed as a representative was not present to review the application. The current submittal is a revised version of the aforementioned application.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize a property.”
 - 2. “Accessory roof elements not original to the structure; such as vents, skylights, satellite dishes, etc. shall be located inconspicuously.”
 - 3. “Rooftop equipment such as turbine vents, skylights, satellite dishes, and T.V. antennae shall not be visible from the street.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Reinstall rooftop cellular antennas.

- a. One antenna (labeled Alpha Sector) will be placed on the northern side of the northwest corner penthouse/mechanical structure.
- b. A second antenna (labeled Beta Sector) will be placed on the eastern side of the northwest corner penthouse/mechanical structure.
- c. A third antenna (labeled Gamma Sector) will be installed atop the equipment platform of the southeast corner penthouse/mechanical structure and will face east.
- d. The antennae will measure approximately be six feet in height.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the reinstallation of mechanical equipment, more specifically cellular antennae, atop the newly constructed and expanded “penthouses” located atop the RSA/Van Antwerp Building. Four taller antennae stood atop an earlier mechanical construction that was demolished on account of the building’s restoration/renovation. Only three new antennae will be positioned on or two the penthouses. Said technological devices will not extend over the wall of the outer walls of so-called penthouses. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards state that new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize a property (See B-1.). The so-called penthouse is new construction. No historic materials are impacted.

The Design Review Guidelines state that accessory roof elements not original to the structure shall be located inconspicuously (See B-2.). The proposed reinstallations will be lower in height and less visible than the previous constructions. The Board and Staff have reviewed numerous applications of the proposed nature over recent decades. Within the past five years, the Board has authorized Staff to review and in applicable cases approve such reversible interventions. Considerations include: the impact to historic fabric; the location of the interventions; the height of the devices; and visibility of the constructions. As previously accounted, no historic fabric will be impacted. The interventions will not extend onto the wall of the historic or more visible portions of the building, a location-informed consideration important to visual and structural integrity of the building. The installations will not take away from historical and architectural character of the building.

The Downtown Development District (DDD) Code states that rooftop equipment such as turbine vents, skylights, satellite dishes, and T.V. antennae shall not be visible from the street (See B-3.). Taking into account criteria of all of the aforementioned standards, guidelines, and codes, the City of Mobile’s Urban Development Department is in the process of developing procedures addressing technological interventions which impact existing buildings located within the Downtown Development District. Views from the street and nearby corners are employed as the points of the consideration for visibility and impact. Using that working method, cellular towers have been approved for 106 St. Francis Street (Board of Zoning Adjustment Meeting of 8 September 2015). The visibility of the three six foot tall cellular towers proposed for location atop the RSA/Van Antwerp Building would shielded from view by the reconstructed and expanded mechanical penthouses, reconstructed cornice, height of the building, and angles of view.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the B (1-2) and taking into account the Board of Zoning Adjustment’s ruling, Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding districts. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

David Anderson and Chris Reynolds were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representatives. He asked Mr. Anderson if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Anderson clarified that he and his colleague were represented Sprint which leases the rooftop from the RSA. He explained that upon the RSA's purchase of the property, equipment had to be moved on account of construction work impacting the roof deck. Mr. Anderson allowed that the installations had been reduced in number and size.

Mr. Roberts complimented the applicant's efforts.

Ms. Harden asked for clarification as per the imagery. Mr. Anderson and Mr. Reynolds addressed Ms. Harden's query.

No further discussion ensued among the assembled Board members.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Stone 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: 3/18/16

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-11-CA: 1650 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Joe Byrne for Tim and Marian Clarke
Received: 2/2/15
Meeting: 3/4/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Painting – Paint a non-contributing brick residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This distinctive 1950s “ranch house” tapped into several modernist trends and features a number of period materials.

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 September 2, 2009. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a rear addition. With this application, the applicants proposed the painting of the dwelling.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The exterior of a building helps define its style, quality, and historic period.”
 - 2. “Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted materials):
 - 1. Paint the house.
 - a. The body will be “Worldly Gray”.
 - b. The trim will be “Shaji White.”

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the painting of an unpainted brick residence. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that the exterior of a building helps define its style, quality, and historic period and that distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved (See B 1-2). This house is one of three Midcentury Modern residential buildings located in Old Dauphin Way which feature yellow bricks. As with the two other

buildings, the bricks facing the exterior of this dwelling not only typify the period of construction, but also the character of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and historical character of the building. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tim and Marian Clarke were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicants. He asked Mr. & Mrs. Clarke if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Clarke addressed the Board. He explained that he and his family had lived in their home for seventeen years. He noted that they chose to live in a historic district on account of appreciation the many benefits they possess. Mr. Clarke began to distribute to the Board photographs of brick buildings that had been painted. Mr. Ladd addressed Mr. Clarke by saying that while he was welcome to continue, but some might not be applicable. Mr. Clarke thanked Mr. Ladd and stated that while some might not be applicable, he wanted to present the facts. The examples in DeTonti Square included: 250 St. Anthony Street, 254 North Jackson Street, and 161-163 State Street. Several examples in Leinkauf located within Flo Claire were mentioned, as well as three instances Beverley Court. Mr. Clarke reminded the Board that they had most recently approved the painting of the house located at 1400 Dauphin Street. He said he could cite the painting of numerous blond brick dwelling in and around the historic districts. Mr. Clarke mentioned 1660 Government Street as example of house of the same style and period. He noted that it had been painted. Additional houses on Dauphin and Marine Streets were mentioned.

Mr. Stone informed the applicants and his fellow Board members that from Houston to Pine Streets, he had counted eleven brick houses that had been painted. He mentioned additional examples featuring painted bases.

Mr. Clarke told the Board of numerous painted Mid Century Modern houses in Jefferson County's Hollywood neighborhood.

Mr. Clarke stated that in his opinion painting the house would enhance the architectural aesthetic. He explained that he and his family had invested heavily in their home and love where they live. Mr. Clarke said that the proposed painting would not impair the house or the surrounding district.

Mr. Ladd noted that the house is non-contributing.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Blackwell if the house could qualify as a contributing dwelling. Mr. Blackwell explained that if the Old Dauphin Way Historic District were resurveyed, the house would be listed as a contributing dwelling.

Mr. Ladd said that the painting of 1400 Dauphin Street did not impair the house or the district. He stated that it was his opinion that the painting of the subject property would not do so either.

Ms. Harden pointed out that the house has a strong character to it and that the situation might prove different if the dwelling was listed as a contributing structure, but she noted that the overall form of the house would remain the same and that the colors were complimentary to the house.

Mr. Holmes also noted that the overall form and character defining features of the house, the curved glass wall for instance, would be unaltered.

Mr. Clarke reminded the Board of the property's last appearance before the Board. He said that upon the Board's approval of the construction of a rear addition, said addition was constructed out of bricks matching those on the house. He stated that if he and his went to such lengths to respect the house they were only continuing that mindset with the subject application.

No further discussion ensued among the assembled Board members.

There was no one present which to speak either for or against the application so Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/18/16