

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**March 21, 2011 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:  
**Members Present:** Gertrude Baker, Kim Harden, Nick Holmes, III, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Jim Wagoner.  
**Members Absent:** Carlos Gant, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.  
**Staff Members Present:** Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Oswalt moved to approve the minutes of the March 21, 2012 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Oswalt moved to approve the midmonth COA's as amended by the Board. Midmonth #11 was corrected to reflect the approved sign's actual dimensions. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

**B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED**

1. **Applicant: Holiday Inn**
  - a. Property Address: 301 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/22/12
  - c. Project: Replace a generator. The generator is shielded from public view.
2. **Applicant: John Leach**
  - a. Property Address: 2251 Ashland Place Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/24/12
  - c. Project: Replace a front door to match original and repaint the same.
3. **Applicant: Boteler, Finley, & Wolfe**
  - a. Property Address: 1252 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/28/12
  - c. Project: Install a 28.75 square foot wooden sign (per the submitted design) within the existing monument framework.
4. **Applicant: George K. Noland**
  - a. Property Address: 1257 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/28/12
  - c. Project: Repair, and when necessary replace, deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the affected areas per the submitted color scheme.
5. **Applicant: Chris Bowen**
  - a. Property Address: 1010 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/28/12
  - c. Project: Replace a canopy as per the existing; also make minor wood repair and paint to match.
6. **Applicant: Anne Read with Oakleigh Custom Woodwork for Emanuel Gazzier**
  - a. Property Address: 153 South Monterey Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/2/12
  - c. Project: Remove two later doors. Install period appropriate doors per the submitted design.

7. **Applicant: Quality Signs for Commonwealth National Bank**
  - a. Property Address: 5 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/2/12
  - c. Project: Install a 4' long by 16" high bronze wall sign. The sign will be located within the one of the façade's quoins.
8. **Applicant: Anne Patton Moore**
  - a. Property Address: 1053 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/5/12
  - c. Project: Install picket and privacy fencing (per the submitted plan). A picket fence will extend from the northwest corner of the body of the house to the western lot line where it will extend to the northwest corner of the recessed rear wing. A six foot dog-eared interior privacy fence will enclose portions of the rear lot. Double gated entrances will be employed at the back and front entrances. Said gates will be the same height as the picket fencing. A second picket fence will enclose the remainder of the side and rear lots.
9. **Applicant: Wintzell's Oyster House**
  - a. Property Address: 960 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/6/12
  - c. Project: Install a sixteen square foot sign. The single-face metal sign board will be located between wooden posts. The height of the sign will not exceed 5' in height.
10. **Applicant: David Presnell**
  - a. Property Address: 101 South Monterey Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/9/11
  - c. Project: Install a 10' by 12' wooden storage shed in the rear of the lot. The storage shed will be placed to abide by setback requirements
11. **Applicant: Manja Leyk**
  - a. Property Address: 901 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/9/12
  - c. Project: Install a 16" x 12" aluminum sign. The sign will be located off the side entrance. The sign will feature the name of the occupying tenant.
12. **Applicant: Kiel Home Renovations Inc.**
  - a. Property Address: 1750 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/12/12
  - c. Project: Reroof the building with asphalt shingles.
13. **Applicant: Hancock Roofing for the Central Presbyterian Church**
  - a. Property Address: 1260 Dauphin
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/12/12
  - c. Project: Reroof the building to match the existing.
14. **Applicant: David Gwatkin Construction**
  - a. Property Address: 350 Michigan Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/12/12
  - c. Project: Replace rotten porch decking and column to match existing in material and dimension to match existing. Repair / replace sill.
15. **Applicant: Josh Burkett**
  - a. Property Address: 1211 Palmetto Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/13/12
  - c. Project: Install a storm door. The single glass panel door will not impede the view of the historic door.
16. **Applicant: Richard Tippy**
  - a. Property Address: 1105 Savannah Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/13/12

- c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the affected areas per the submitted color scheme.

**17. Applicant: Modern Signs Inc.**

- a. Property Address: 250 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/13/12
- c. Project: Slightly alter the design and size of a previously sign approved sign per the submitted design.

**18. Applicant: Kenbow Roofing**

- a. Property Address: 15 North Joachim Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/13/12
- c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2012-18-CA: 1365 Brown Street**

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for John Pickron
- b. Project: Addition and Ancillary Construction – Construct a rear addition; demolish an existing garage; and construct a new garage.

**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**2. 2012-19-CA: 2254 DeLeon Avenue**

- a. Applicant: Pete J. Vallas for Mr. & Mrs. Ian Whelan
- b. Project: Renovation and Addition – Construct a side addition; add fenestration; add dormer to rear garage; and construct a terrace.

**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**3. 2012-20-CA: 11 Lee Street**

- a. Applicant: John & Donna Ricketts
- b. Project: Painting and Hardscaping – Paint the house and install hardscaping.

**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**4. 2012-21-CA: 12 South Ann Street**

- a. Applicant: Caldwell and Sandy Whistler
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a small rear addition.

**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**5. 2012-22-CA: 1401 Blacklawn Street**

- a. Applicant: J. Russell and Rene Culler
- b. Project: Roofing – Replace a Spanish Tile roof with metal Decra Tile replacement roofing sheets.

**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**6. 2012-23-CA: 306 Michigan Avenue**

- a. Applicant: Clarence and Virginia Irby
- b. Project: Addition - Construct a storage room off the Rear Elevation.

**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Window Replacements

Mr. Blackwell addressed the Board telling them that their April 4, 2012 packets would include additional literature relating to window replacements. Included therein would be guidelines from other municipalities and reports from the National Parks Service.

## 2. Discussion

Mr. Bemis reminded the Board of the 2012 meeting of the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2012-18-CA: 1365 Brown Street**  
**Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for John Pickron**  
**Received: 3/1/12**  
**Meeting: 3/21/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Addition and Ancillary Construction – Construct a rear addition; demolish an existing garage; and construct a new garage.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This Arts & Crafts inspired “bungalow” dates from circa 1920. The house features a forward facing gable and a full length front porch.

**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 calls for the construction of a rear addition (which would be constructed off an earlier addition), the demolition of an existing garage, and the construction of a new garage.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
  - 2. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic of the property and its environment.”
  - 3. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
  - 4. “Gravel and shell are preferred paving materials, however, a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment is required for commercial applications.”

5. “Foundation screening should be recessed from the front of the foundation piers. Lattice, if used, should be hung below the skirt board or siding, between the piers and framed with trim. Lattice secured to the face of the building is inappropriate.”
6. “The type, size and dividing light of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on a building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Make minor alterations to the house.
  - a. Remove the section of railing terminating the porch’s west (side) bay.
  - b. Construct a flight of wooden steps with railings matching those found on the porch.
  - c. Install boxed, framed, and suspended screening between the foundation piers. The wooden lattice screening would in some locations be set atop brick coursings.
2. Construct a rear addition
  - a. Remove an existing shed roof surmounting an earlier rear addition.
  - b. Construct a gable roof over the existing and proposed additions. The roof will continue the plane and pitch of the existing gable. The roofing shingles of this new section of roof will match the existing.
  - c. The existing corner board will remain in place.
  - d. The addition will be 6’ in depth and extend the full length of the rear elevation.
  - e. The addition will rest atop brick foundation piers matching those supporting the body of the house, as well as the earlier rear addition.
  - f. The addition will be faced with siding matching the existing with regard to profile, dimension, and material.
  - g. The addition will be painted to match the existing color scheme. The color scheme of the main house and the earlier addition will be touched up when and where necessary.
  - h. The addition will feature fenestrated units salvaged from the South and East Elevations.
  - i. A tripartite grouping of three-over-one wooden windows will be removed from the East Elevation of the earlier addition. Said window units will be reused. New siding will be “feathered” into the location of said fenestration.
  - j. The gable of the South or Rear Elevation will feature a tripartite louvered vent salvaged from the existing rear gable. The brackets of the overhanging eaves will match those found on the façade.
  - k. From west to east the fenestration of the South (Rear) Elevation will be as follows: a glazed wooden door; a salvaged three-over-one window; a salvaged tripartite grouping of three-over-one windows; and a salvaged single light window.
  - l. A gable roofed overhang will extend from the southwest corner of the rear elevation. Square section wooden posts will support the overhang. A wooden stoop with east and west facing flights of wooden steps will be located under the overhang. The aforementioned glazed door (See C (2) k.) will open onto the stoop. Boxed, framed, and suspended lattice skirting will be located under the stairs and stoop. A wooden picket railing will be employed on both the stairs and the stoop.
  - m. A shed-roofed, hipped cricket connector will be constructed between the rear overhang and the proposed new garage. The roofing shingles will match those employed on the main house and proposed garage (See B (3)).
3. Construct a new garage.
  - a. The new garage will measure 12’ in width and 18’ in depth.
  - b. The gable roofed garage will be faced wooden siding and will feature eaves matching those found on the house.
  - c. The roof shingles will match those found on the house.
  - d. The garage will be painted to match the house.

- e. The North and South Elevations will be open vehicular bays with 1' plus sections of siding located to either side.
  - f. The East and West Elevations will be sheathed in siding.
  - g. The East Elevation will feature a door bay.
  - h. A small section of concrete walk will extend between the rear overhang and the garage's concrete slab.
4. Demolish an old garage.
  5. Install an irregular T-shaped extension of the gravel drive within the back yard.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the construction of a rear addition, the demolition of a garage, the construction of a garage, and additional work pertaining to the house and grounds.

The proposed rear addition would be located off an earlier rear addition. The work would be minimally visible from the public view. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that new additions should be differentiated from yet compatible with the existing historic fabric. (See B (2 & 3) of the Staff Report.) Both the earlier and the proposed additions would be surmounted by a gable roof. The roof would continue the pitch and be in plane with the main house's street facing gable roof. Existing corner boards would remain intact thereby demarcating the original end wall of the house. Salvaged windows, matching treatments, and replicated features would provide continuity between the old and the new.

The construction of the proposed addition requires the demolition of the existing garage. The garage is neither a contributing structure nor adaptable to many contemporary vehicles. Demolition of the existing garage would not adversely affect the historical integrity of the property or the district.

A new garage is proposed for the property. The design is somewhat unusual in that there are no proposed doors and no rear wall creating a drive through garage. Because of the small size of the garage, the front wall of the house is somewhat underscaled in comparison with most garages. A hyphen would connect the proposed addition to the proposed garage. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the proposed garage will complement the design of the main house. (See B (1) of the Staff Report.)

A T-shaped extension of the drive is proposed for the rear lot. The location and materials of the extension would not impair historical integrity of the district. (See B (4) of the Staff Report.)

Miscellaneous alterations include following: the removal of a portion of the front porch's railing; the construction of flight of steps; and the installation of lattice skirting. The proposed steps would be located off the porch's west facing bay. A section of railing would be removed. The railings flanking the proposed steps would match those employed on the house. The design and materials of the steps meet the standards outlined in the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. The proposed lattice skirting also meets the Design Review Guidelines. (See B (5) of the Staff Report.)

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-5), 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**

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Kearley if he had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Kearley answered no.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant's representative. No questions or comments ensued from the Board.

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

## **FINDING OF FACT**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Holmes 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: 3/21/13**



**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2012-19-CA: 2254 DeLeon Avenue**  
**Applicant: Pete J. Vallas for Mr. & Mrs. Ian Whelan**  
**Received: 3/2/12**  
**Meeting: 3/21/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Ashland Place  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Renovation and Addition – Construct a side addition; add a dormer to the rear garage; add fenestration; and construct a terrace.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This two-story Colonial Revival house dates from circa 1908. Designed by architect George B. Rogers, the house’s imposing facade features a full length gallery and projecting bay window.

**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 December 2, 1991. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a garage addition. The current owner/applicants propose the construction of a side addition, the addition of fenestration, and the construction of a terrace.
- 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 the historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic of the property and its environment.”
  - 2. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Construct a side addition.
    - a. Construct a 142 square foot addition off the East Elevation.
    - b. In plan, the addition will be comprised of a polygonal shaped southern portion and a squared northern portion.
    - c. The addition will measure 9’ 6” in width (at its greatest expanse) and 19’ in depth and will abut the original oriel.

- d. The foundation and skirting treatments of the addition will match those found on the body of the house.
  - e. The siding of the addition will match that employed on house with regard to profile, dimension, and material.
  - f. The entablature of the addition will match that employed on the main house.
  - g. The addition's hipped roof will be sheathed in shingles matching those employed on the main house.
  - h. The South Elevation will not feature fenestration.
  - i. Each face of the East Elevation's polygonal bay will feature a nine-over-one wooden window. Said window configuration is the predominant window treatment of main house.
  - j. A six-over-one window will be located within the squared northern section of the addition.
2. Add a shed roofed dormer on the 1990s rear addition.
    - a. The dormer will extend the length of the addition's North Elevation.
    - b. The dormer's siding will match that employed on the body of the house with regard to profile, dimension and material.
    - c. The roofing shingles will match the existing.
    - d. The dormer will feature four regularly spaced six-over-one wooden windows.
  3. Add fenestration to West Elevation.
    - a. The double French door will be wood in composition and multi-light in configuration.
  4. Construct a terrace off the West Elevation.
    - a. The terrace will be located between the rear elevation of the body of the house and the existing terrace and steps.
    - b. The foundation and paving treatment of the terrace will match the aforementioned terrace.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the construction of a side addition, the addition of a dormer, the addition of fenestration, and the construction of a terrace. All affected areas are either minimally visible or not visible from the public view.

The proposed side addition would take the form of polygonal bay with an elongated extension. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that additions should be differentiated from yet compatible with the existing historic fabric. (See B (1) of the Staff Report.) The single story height of addition contrasts with the two story body of the main house. The foundation, skirting, siding, and window treatment would match the existing thereby providing a sense of continuity between the old and new. Staff discussion of the addition was divided. While two Staff members did not find the addition to be an impairment to the building, one Staff member considered the alteration, on account of its size and proximity to the existing oriel, as adversely affecting, the architectural and the historical integrity of the building.

The proposed dormer would be located on the 1990s rear addition. The shed roofed dormer will feature fenestration, siding, and roofing shingles matching those employed on both the body of the house.

A French door and terrace are proposed for the rear portion of the West Elevation. The dimensions and light configuration of the proposed door negotiate with the heights and designs of those of the main house and earlier addition.

The foundation and pavement treatments of the terrace would match those of the existing terrace. The proposed terrace would extend an earlier terrace and would connect it to the rear elevation of the body of the house.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), 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**

Pete J. Vallas was present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Vallas if he had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Vallas spoke to the Board with regard to the fenestration proposed for the West Elevation. He stated the 1992 addition did not feature fenestration that was in keeping with design of the main house. Pointing to the slide featuring imagery of the proposed door unit, Mr. Vallas said that he hoped the proposed units would at some point replace those on the 1992 addition.

Mr. Karwinski asked if the windows reflected the design of the main house. Mr. Vallas answered yes.

Ms. Harden asked Mr. Vallas if the terrace was extension of the existing. Mr. Vallas answered yes.

Mr. Ladd spoke to the proposed side addition. He told his fellow Board members that he was familiar the house and property. Noting the location of the proposed addition and the interior plan, he said it would improve the latter without impairing the exterior.

Mr. Vallas noted that the design of the proposed addition's bay reflected the West Elevation's bay window in its design and detail.

Mr. Karwinski said that proposed side addition seemed to be in conflict with an existing oriel window. He pointed out that water runoff might cause damage to the proposed addition and the body of the house. Referencing the first floor plan, Mr. Karwinski stated that the oriel window was not depicted on any interior plans. Ms. Harden and Mr. Vallas consulted the second floor plan. Ms. Harden noted that oriel falls between the two floors. Mr. Vallas sketched the location of the oriel on one of the plans. Ms. Harden distributed the plan among her fellow Board members.

Mr. Karwinski reiterated that he found the proposed bay window problematic on account of its proximity to the exiting projecting bay. He said that the remainder of the application was alright.

Mr. Harden asked Mr. Vallas if it was possible to reduce the size of the addition in such a way as minimize the impact on the oriel window. Mr. Vallas again directed the Board's attention to plan. He pointed out the proposed addition corresponded with size of the room. That said he could reduce it in size. Mr. Vallas added that though it might not be apparent in the drawings, the proposed addition plus gutters could be installed without affecting the oriel.

Mr. Karwinski stated that as proposed the addition would take away from the oriel, a dominant feature of the East Elevation.

Mr. Vallas agreed that the oriel was a prominent feature. He stated that unfortunately it was obscured and unnoticed because of the depth of the lot and the location of the house. Referencing the submitted photographs, Mr. Vallas said that it is even difficult to record properly.

Mr. Ladd agreed with Mr. Vallas as to the location of the addition. He said that it would not only be minimally visible at best, but it would also improve the plan.

Mr. Holmes reminded his fellow Board members that the location of the addition is off a secondary elevation.

Mr. Vallas said that when taking into account the 1992 addition and the main house, the proposed addition is of little significance with regard to size.

Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Vallas how much the addition could be reduced in size in effort to lessen the impact on the oriel. Mr. Vallas responded saying that the addition could be reduced by half a foot to a foot.

Mr. Karwinski recommended that the addition take the form of freestanding pergola accessed via a hyphen-like connector.

Mr. Ladd stated the Board's task is to review the application at hand and not to redesign it.

Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Vallas what affect the reduction of the size of the addition would have on the windows. Mr. Vallas said that windows could be adjusted.

Mr. Ladd asked if his fellow Board members if they had any further questions to ask or comments to make. No further discussed ensued.

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

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Oswalt 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**

Following several failed motions, Mr. Oswalt 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 on the condition that the addition would be scaled down by one foot.

The motion passed. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/21/13**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2012-20-CA: 11 Lee Street**  
**Applicant: John and Donna Ricketts**  
**Received: 2/24/12**  
**Meeting: 3/21/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Painting and Hardscaping – Paint the house and install hardscaping.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This house dates from the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. The façade, one featuring a projecting polygonal bay and a recessed porch, constitutes an elevation treatment employed throughout the Deep South from the 1870s to the 1910s.

**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 applicants propose painting the house and installing hardscaping.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. As per painting “period color schemes are encouraged.”
  - 2. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.”
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Paint the house per the submitted BLP color scheme.
    - a. The body will be Flo Claire Yellow (BLP).
    - b. The trim will be white.
    - c. The shutters will be repainted black.
    - d. The porch decking will be black.
  - 2. Raise existing hardscaping and install new hardscaping.
    - a. Install a 4” deep concrete driveway and walkway atop the existing.
    - b. Install a 6” section of concrete coping (round topped) along the sidewalk.
    - c. Level the lawn.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the painting of the house, the raising of hardscaping, and the installation of sections of coping. The owners stated that the yard and drive flood during heavy rains and the hardscaping is an attempt to minimize the water.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts encourage "period" appropriate color schemes. The proposed color scheme is in keeping age and style of the building.

The proposed raising of the driveway and walkway would not result in a new hardscaping plan. The materials meet the standards outlined in the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. (See B (2) of the Staff Report.)

The proposed coping would extend along the inner side of the sidewalk. An existing section of coping exists along the southern lot line. The materials and profile of the coping would not impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the property or the district.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), 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**

Joe Ricketts was present to discuss the application

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked if Mr. Ricketts if he had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Ricketts stated that the application for the hardscaping results from flooding related issues that plague his section of Lee Street.

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

While Mr. Karwinski said that he had no objection to the curbing/coping, some of the existing concrete would have to be removed because placing new concrete on top of existing would result in the ramp being too severe. Mr. Ricketts stated if he did as was suggested that it would bottom out his vehicle. Citing another nearby example, Mr. Ricketts explained his intentions.

Mr. Karwinski said that raising the drive and adding curbing/coping would keep water out while simultaneously preventing water from exiting the lot. Mr. Ricketts said that he intended to bank the lawn.

Mr. Ladd asked if his fellow Board members had any further questions or comments. No further discussed ensued.

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

## **FINDING OF FACT**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/21/13**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2012-21-CA:** 12 South Ann Street  
**Applicant:** Caldwell and Sandy Whistler  
**Received:** 3/5/12  
**Meeting:** 3/21/12

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Demolition – Demolish a small rear addition.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This Aesthetics Movement inspired Queen Anne residence dates from circa 1910. The house’s façade features two projecting polygonal bays flanking a central recessed entrance.

**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 applicants proposed the demolition of a small rear 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. “The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.”
  - 2. “Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.”
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Demolish a later rear addition.
    - a. The addition measures 8’ 5” in width and 9’ 2” in depth.
    - b. Siding matching the profile, dimension, and material of that found on the main house will be installed on re-exposed areas of the West and South Elevations.
    - c. Eave and fascia treatments will be re-exposed and repaired when and where necessary.
    - d. The work will be painted to match the existing color scheme.



## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the demolition of a later rear addition. The addition is not visible from the public view. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that alterations to either historical features or latter features which are of architectural or historical significance should be avoided. (See B (1-2) of the Staff Report.) The small addition is neither of the same structural integrity nor the architectural caliber as the main dwelling. Though illustrative of architectural accretion, demolition of the 8' 5" x 9' 2" addition would not impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), 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. Staff recommends that the applicants salvage the addition's windows.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Caldwell Whistler was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Whistler if he had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Whistler explained to the Board that the application at hand was part of his and his wife's ongoing efforts to improve the three adjacent properties. He said that the addition was not only later in date, having no architectural significance, but also inferior with regard to its construction. Mr. Whistler said that a deck previously surrounded the addition on its two exterior exposures and believed that significant components of the siding had survived.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask or comments to make.

Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Whistler if fenestration was proposed. Mr. Whistler said if a door was required one might have to be installed on the re-exposed section of the South Elevation. Discussion ensued as to any proposed fenestration. Mr. Bemis noted that the application, as proposed and discussed, did not involve fenestration.

Ms. Harden asked for clarification regarding the various sections of roofing.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/21/13**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2012-22-CA: 1401 Blacklawn Street**  
**Applicant: J. Russell and Rene Culler**  
**Received: 2/24/12**  
**Meeting: 3/7/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Roofing – Replace a Spanish Tile roof with metal Decra Tile Sheet replacement roofing.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This Spanish Colonial Revival informed Arts & Crafts “bungalow” dates from circa 1928.

**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 April 28, 2008. At that time, the Board denied a request to remove the house’s terracotta roofing tiles. The current owner/applicants propose the removal of the roofing tiles and their replacement with metal roofing sheets.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**
  - 1. Remove the house’s clay tile roofing shingles.
  - 2. Install metal Decra Villa tile roofing sheets in place of the aforementioned clay tiles.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the removal of tiled roofing and the installation of replacement metal roofing sheets designed to approximate the appearance of traditional tiles. Openings between the existing tiles caused by weather, age, and lack of repair allow rodents to enter the building. The proposed replacing roofing would prevent pests from entering the roof structure.

Tiled roofs are a characteristic feature of Spanish Colonial Revival buildings. This house is fine example of the Spanish Colonial style. The Design Review Guidelines state that when repair is no longer feasible

replacement roofing should be appropriate to the form, pitch, and color of the roof. See B (1) of the Staff Report.)

In reviewing previous applications involving the replacement of tile roofs, the Board has examined the degree of deterioration, the significance of the building, and nature of the proposed replacement. (See B (1) of the Staff Report.)

The applicants have investigated a number of repair/replacement options. Of the submitted alternatives, the most preservation minded and cost effective approach is the repair of the existing tiles. Not only would historic fabric be retained, but also historic character. On account of an assessment provided by one of the city's most reputable roof contractors, Staff believes that the existing tiles can be repaired. The same estimate would involve securing the roof against further rodent infestation. While the proposed roofing is similar in size and profile to the existing, its appearance and the loss historic fabric and detail would alter the integrity of the building.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. J. Russell and Rene Culler were present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Blackwell addressed the Board and the applicants. Referencing supplements submitted by the applicants, he stated that Staff had misunderstood some of the paperwork in the original submission. What Staff assumed to be a third estimate for repairing the roof was actually a bill of payment for previous repair work. He informed the Board of previous Board rulings regarding proposed replacement of tiled roofs. Mr. Bemis elaborated further.

Mr. Roberts referenced a presumed cost estimate for replacing the roof. Having missed the preceding comments, Mr. Holmes and Mr. Culler informed him that the document was a bill of repair not an estimate for replacement.

Mr. Roberts continued saying that he understood the applicant's predicament. He noted the cost and labor involved in properly installing and repairing tile roofs. He asked Mr. Culler as to composition of the roofing tiles. Mr. Culler responded saying currently it was a mixture.

Mr. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. and Mrs. Culler if they had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report.

Mr. Culler further explained the various estimates comprising the submission. He told the Board that he and his wife had obtained split estimates in effort to not fully investigate their options but also illustrate their predicament. Mr. Culler told the Board that the issue stemmed from earlier improper repairs and reinstallations.

Mr. Roberts reiterated the expanse and expertise involved in repairing tile roofs.

Mr. Roberts asked the Staff and the Board for comparable examples of when slate roofs were allowed to be removed and replaced with alternate treatments. Mr. Ladd cited the old Abbott House at 910 Government Street. Mr. Bemis cited the former Convent of Mercy.

Mr. Roberts said that if featuring an asphalt roof was old enough, it undoubtedly had an earlier type of roofing at some point in its history. Referencing the proposed roofing, he said that Decra Tiles look like traditional tiles but attention should be given to flashing.

Mr. Culler said that upon investigating their options he and Mr. Culler came to the conclusion that the proposed roofing was the best solution for their house.

Ms. Harden asked the applicants if they had obtained an estimate for repairing the roof. They answered yes, but did not include it on account of the costs.

Mrs. Culler explained to the Board that they did not want to alter the appearance of the house. The charm of the exterior was one of their reasons for acquiring the property. She added that they had been misled when purchasing the house in belief that the roof was in good repair.

Mr. Karwinski said that he had several comments to make. He stated that while the house is listed as a contributing dwelling, it is not a significant example of the Spanish Colonial Revival style. Taking that observation into account, he suggested that the tiles be retained on the single story portions of the dwelling but the proposed or another alternative roofing be employed on upper story sections of roofing.

Referencing the Guidelines, Mr. Holmes said that they provided little guidance. He said that precedence ruled in favor of retaining the roofing. Citing previous cases where applications for alternative replacements had been denied, the Antoinette Apartments for instance, Mr. Holmes noted the difference in significance between these structures and the fine, but not as important dwelling. He told his fellow Board members that he was not familiar with the proposed roofing.

Mr. Culler stated that the proposed roofing approximated the original with regard to pitch, form, and color. He explained that a major reason for replacing the roofing was to stop squirrels from entering the dwelling through the current damaged tiles.

Ms. Cullers acknowledged that while her home might not be a significant contributing home, she nonetheless would like to maintain its appearance.

Mr. Ladd complimented the house.

Ms. Baker addressed her fellow Board members and Staff. She asked if she was correct in saying that in previous applications of this nature, the Board had approved a product or replacement as a test case. Mr. Bemis and Mr. Ladd answered yes.

Ms. Harden stated that some effects and details might not be able to be replicated in the proposed replacement roofing, namely extensions and finials.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Oswalt 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. Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building, but that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued on as a test case for the roofing material. The finials and ridges which are to be reinstalled. It was noted that the building, while a contributing structure, is not an exemplar of its style. Mr. Ladd requested that Staff photograph the property upon completion of the work and that the Board discuss the merits of completed installation.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/21/13**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2012-25-CA: 306 Michigan Avenue**  
**Applicant: Clarence and Virginia Irby**  
**Received: 3/5/12**  
**Meeting: 3/21/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Leinkauf  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Construct a rear storage room off the Rear Elevation.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This 20<sup>th</sup> Century Picturesque residence dates from 1928.

**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 applicants propose the construction of a small storage room off the rear elevation.
- 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 the historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic of the property and its environment.”
  - 2. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Construct a storage room off the Rear (West) Elevation.
    - a. The storage room will be located off the northwest corner of the house.
    - b. The storage room will measure 8’ in depth and 6’ in width.
    - c. The storage shed will rest of atop brick foundation piers.
    - d. A skirt board will be located between the foundation piers and the wall sheathing.
    - e. The walls of the storage shed will be sheathed by board-and-batten wooden siding.
    - f. The storage room will be painted to match the color scheme of the body of the house.
    - g. The roofing shingles will match those found on the body of the house.
    - h. The West Elevation will feature a four panel wooden door.
    - i. A flight of wooden steps will access the door.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the construction of a storage room off the Rear Elevation. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that additions should be differentiated from yet compatible with existing historic fabric. Though minimally visible from the public view, the design and materials of 8' by 6' addition are not in keeping with the historic integrity of the house. (See B (1-2) of the Staff Report.) Staff recommends that the partially completed addition be removed and reconstructed as a detached structure. If surmounted by a hipped or gabled roof, the freestanding building would then be appropriate for ancillary construction within Mobile's Historic Districts.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Clarence Irby was present to discuss the application

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Irby if he had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Irby answered no.

Ms. Baker asked Mr. Irby if he were amenable to the Staff Recommendation. Mr. Irby answered yes.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Ms. Baker moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that the proposed addition would be detached from the house, situated according to approved setbacks, and be surmounted by a gable or hipped roof.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Ms. Baker 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 upon Staff review of site plan indicating the proposed location of the building and its new roofing treatment.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/21/13**