

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**March 21, 2018 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**B. MIDMONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED**

1. **Applicant: Kevin Brown**
  - a. Property Address: 1005 St. Francis Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/23/2018
  - c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood, replace broken window panes, reroof with architectural shingles.
2. **Applicant: Philip McDonald**
  - a. Property Address: 300 McDonald Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/27/2018
  - c. Project: Erect six foot picket fence along back alley.
3. **Applicant: Adam Metcalfe**
  - a. Property Address: 55 S. Julia Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/27/2018
  - c. Project: Reconstruct existing 31'9-1/2"W x 12'0"D. Enclose by screening in porch. Porch skirt will be painted brick face to match house. Additional siding will be drop siding and painted to match house.
4. **Applicant: Iron Point, LLC.**
  - a. Property Address: 1215 New St. Francis Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/28/2018
  - c. Project: Replace deteriorated wood in profile, dimension and material.
5. **Applicant: Mary Howle**
  - a. Property Address: 350 Charles Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/28/2018
  - c. Project: Repair rotten wood, repaint, body Monterey Dark Blue, trim White.
6. **Applicant: Susan Baker**
  - a. Property Address: 1057 Savannah Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/28/2018
  - c. Project: Repair any rotten decking, reroof with 30 year Timberline.
7. **Applicant: Anna Kirby on behalf of Team K5 Construction and Development**
  - a. Property Address: 213 S. Warren Street
  - b. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles to match existing color.

**8. Applicant: Shirla Lundsford**

- a. Property Address: 56 N. Georgia Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 3/2/2018
- c. Project: Repair/replace rotten siding and windows to match existing in dimension and profile.

**9. Applicant: Joanna Coley**

- a. Property Address: 205 George Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/2/2018
- c. Project: Repaint house, body white, trim gray, door blue, skirt darker gray, shutters white.

**10. Applicant: Richard Flowers**

- a. Property Address: 1557 Monterey Place
- b. Date of Approval: 3/5/2018
- c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood to match existing and repaint to match.

**11. Applicant: Kevin Cross**

- a. Property Address: 1002 Selma Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/5/2018
- c. Project: Remove later porch infill. Repair any siding as needed to match. Install double window to match western portion.

**12. Applicant: Luke Peavy on behalf of BJE Properties**

- a. Property Address: 522 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/6/2018
- c. Project: Renews COA of March 16, 2017, for approved construction of mixed use building.

**13. Applicant: Luke Peavy on behalf of BJE Properties**

- a. Property Address: 510 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/6/2018
- c. Project: Repaint buildings per existing color, remove non-historic awnings.

**14. Applicant: Vaughn Drinkard**

- a. Property Address: 1070 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/8/2018
- c. Project: Repair and replace rotten wood to match existing.

**15. Applicant: 151 S. Claiborne Street**

- a. Property Address: Kenny Neese on behalf of Mobile Housing Board
- b. Date of Approval: 3/8/2018
- c. Project: Repair decorative tile on gallery to match existing. Remove existing tile and replace to match in material, dimension, profile.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2018-07-CA: 571 Dauphin Street**

- a. Applicant: Taylor Atchison on behalf of Wendell Quimby
- b. Project: Addition and Renovation Related: Alter fenestration on side elevation. Construct addition on rear of building.  
APPROVED: CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

**2. 2018-08-CA: 158 S. Broad Street**

- a. Applicant: Carlton Dortch of Dortch, Figures and Sons, Inc. on behalf of Original Dragons, Inc.
- b. Project: Demolish one story building.  
APPROVED: CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

**3. 2018-09-CA: 1062 Texas Street**

- a. Applicant: Mike Rogers on behalf of Porchlight, LLC.
- b. Project: Demolition Related: Demolish single multiuse building.  
APPROVED: CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

**4. 2018-10-CA: 204 State Street**

- a. Applicant: Robert J. Isakson, Sr. of State Street Land, LLC on behalf of PAM Building Company, LLC.
- b. Project: Relocation and Rehabilitation Related: Relocate 137 Tuscaloosa Street building to 204 State Street. Repair and replace to match existing.  
CONCEPTUALLY APPROVED: CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

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

**2018-07-CA:** 571 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Taylor Atchison on behalf of Wendell Quimby  
**Received:** 3/5/2018  
**Meeting:** 3/21/18

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: T5.1  
Project: Addition and Renovation Related: Alter fenestration on side elevation. Construct addition on rear of building..

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This building was constructed around the early 1960's and was previously occupied by Catholic Social Services.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board according to the MHDC vertical files. The proposed scope of work includes alterations of secondary elevations, and an addition to the rear of the building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. "Design an alteration to retain a placement and orientation that is compatible with the district."
  - 2. "Design an alteration to appear similar in massing and scale with historic commercial buildings in the district."
  - 3. "Use building elements that are of a similar profile and durability to those seen on historic buildings in the district."
  - 4. "Maintain a solid-to-void ratio on building walls that is similar to those seen on historic buildings in the district."
  - 5. "For all additions, the materials, window sizes and alignment of trim elements on the addition should be compatible with those of the existing structure."
  - 6. "Locate a ground level addition to the rear or side of the main building"
  - 7. "Use a compatible roof form and building volumes. An addition with a pitched roof form is inappropriate for a building with a flat roof."
  - 8. "Use new materials on an addition that appears similar in texture and finish to those of the original building."

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

1. Alter an existing building.
  - a. Install overhead roll up garage door on existing West elevation. Door will be centrally located on elevation.
  - b. Install new storefront system of French doors with sidelights.
2. Construct rear addition.
  - a. Addition will abut an existing building.
  - b. Addition will be 16'0 in depth and 32'3-1/2" in width.
  - c. Roof will match the existing roof.
  - d. Walls will be stucco over CMU and painted to match existing.
  - e. Construction will be on grade.
  - f. West elevation will not feature any fenestration.
  - g. A flat metal door will be installed on the South elevation.

### **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application calls for alterations and additions to an existing building informing the side and rear elevations of a non-contributing commercial building. Most of the proposed scope of work would impact the West (a side) Elevation and South (rear) Elevation. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, neither the alterations to nor the construction of addition would impair the overall site conditions (See B-1.).

The alterations to the existing building will be minimal. A new garage roll up door will be installed on the West (a side) elevation. Similar alterations have been made to the front elevation of a neighboring property located at 562 Dauphin Street. The existing South (rear) elevation will have a storefront system taking the form of a set of French doors with sidelights installed. Both alterations are located on secondary elevations.

A new addition would engage with and extend from the rear portion of the South elevation. By virtue of its situation on the lot and design the addition is subordinate to the non-contributing building (See B-6). The proposed addition is an enclosed space. The proposed addition is so designed as to afford compatibility with existing fabric (See B-5). Foundation elevation would be maintained. The proposed stucco walls would match the finish of the existing fabric (See B-8). Roofing form to match existing is proposed (See B-7).

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Taylor Atchison, representative for the owner, was present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Oswalt welcomed the owner's representative and asked if there were any comments, clarifications or questions he would like to make. Mr. Atchison stated the addition will be out of public view from the primary frontage and include a kitchen and bathroom. He further explained the installation of a garage door on the west elevation was to allow for access to Warren Street.

Mr. Atchison confirmed for Ms. Allen that the garage door was composed of metal and glass, similar to neighboring pub, O'Daly's Hole in the Wall.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. Mr. Ross Holladay of 609 Conti Street asked for the location of any new mechanical equipment. Mr. Atchison replied new exhaust fans would be located out of public view on the roof. Mr. Holladay asked if a buffer could be installed to lessen noise from fan such as lattice screening. Mr. Holladay confirmed for Mr. Ruzic the screen installation would be out of concern for noise, not aesthetics. Ms. Largue clarified the noise would be a zoning issue. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Ruzic 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.

Mr. Holmes asked Mr. Atchison if the client would be willing to screen the mechanical equipment. Mr. Atchison stated he did not believe so and cited several examples of exhaust fans in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District. Mr. Atchison further explained for a neighboring restaurant, "Chuck's Fish House," the National Park Service denied the installation of any mechanical equipment screening. Ms. Harden explained the addition of a screen could create a false sense of history.

### **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 building and the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

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

**2018-08-CA: 158 S. Broad Street**

**Applicant:** Carlton Dortch of Dortch, Figures and Sons, Inc. on behalf of Original Dragons, Inc.

**Received:** 3/7/2018

**Meeting:** 3/21/2018

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Demolish one story building.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This one story building was included in the Oakleigh Garden District expansion. The non-contributing building received extensive damage on December 29, 2017 when a vehicle drove through the building.

**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. 158 S. Broad Street has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board according to the MHDC vertical files. The application up for review entails the demolition of a non-contributing building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - A. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
    - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
      - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
        - 1. This property was built in the 1960s. This building is listed as a non-contributing structure in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. It holds neither architectural merit nor historical significance.

- ii. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
    - 1. While the dwelling adds to the built density of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District and Broad Street, it does not contribute to either the architectural or historical character of neighborhood or streetscape.
  - iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
    - 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced or acquired.
  - iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
    - 1. This building is not an example of a particular style and does contribute to the historic aesthetic of the neighborhood or street.
  - v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
    - 1. If granted demolition approval, the house would be demolished, debris would be removed, the lot would be leveled, and fence installed on the property.
  - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
    - 1. The date the current owner acquired the property is unknown.
  - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
    - 1. The property was occupied before the accident.
  - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
    - 1. N.A.
  - ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
    - 1. N.A.
  - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
    - 1. N.A.
  - xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
    - 1. N.A.
  - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
    - 1. See submitted materials.
2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

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

- 1. Demolish a non-contributing residence.
- 2. Remove the debris from the site.
- 3. Stabilize the site.
- 4. Construct 6’ wooden dogeared fence around property.



## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application concerns the demolition of a deteriorated building which is listed as a non-contributing building in the Oakleigh Garden National Register Historic District. The property was extensively damaged after a vehicle crashed into it in December of 2017.

When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into the account the following considerations: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

158 S. Broad Street is a non-contributing building located within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The building is not an example of any notable architectural typology or style.

This brick veneered building is in an extremely advanced state of disrepair. Conditions extend far beyond cosmetic concerns. Damages are seen most visibly on the West and East Elevations, where the vehicle entered and exited the house. The house caught fire as a result of the accident.

While house contributes to the built density and rhythmic sequencing of the landscape, it does not lend to historic character or physical experience of Broad Street. As an inner block dwelling, the building is only viewed from head on angle.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be removed, site would be leveled, ground would be stabilized, and a fence installed. The owner's would like to use the property for a side addition to an adjacent commercial building in manner fully in keeping with Mobile's Historic District Guidelines.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application for the demolition of the non-contributing building would impair the property or historic district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Stephen Dinkins, representative for the owner, was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Oswalt welcomed the owner's representative and asked if there were any comments, clarifications or questions he would like to make. Mr. Dinkins stated the residence would be demolished and the lot fenced in until a decision for the future use has been made.

Mr. Ruzic inquired as to the options of future use for the property. Mr. Dinkins stated the lot would become a courtyard or be the site for an addition to the neighboring building.

Mr. Dinkins clarified for Ms. Harden the fence would be wooden dogeared and six feet in height.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. Mr. Carlton Dortch stated he would be the contractor for the demolition. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

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

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

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

**2018-09-CA: 1062 Texas Street**  
**Applicant:** Mike Rogers on behalf of Porchlight, LLC.  
**Received:** 2/15/2018  
**Meeting:** 3/21/2018

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Demolition Related: Demolish single multiuse building.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This building at 1062 Texas Street is comprised of a former commercial store and residence.

**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. 1062 Texas Street has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board according to the MHDC vertical files. In 2012 the Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund had possession of the property and intended to rehabilitate it as a green grocery store.
- B With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
  - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
    - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
      - 1. This building is listed as a contributing structure in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The residential portion is of the Queen Anne style, while the commercial building represents turn of the century vernacular neighborhood store. The store is not contemporaneous with the house.
    - ii. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;

1. The building adds to the built density of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District and Broad Street, it contributes to both the architectural or historical character of neighborhood or streetscape.
  - iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
    1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced or acquired.
  - iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
    1. The vernacular commercial store is a rare example in Mobile; however other corner stores are still extant in the neighborhood. It does contribute to the historic aesthetic of the neighborhood or street.
  - vi. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
    1. If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be removed, the lot would be leveled, and it would be redeveloped as residential or commercial.
  - vii. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
    1. The date the current owner acquired the property is February 10, 2017.
  - viii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
    1. The property has been vacant for a number of years.
  - ix. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
    1. This property was purchased from the Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund in 2017.
  - x. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
    1. N.A.
  - xi. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
    1. Plans of the existing building were made. Plans of the proposed redevelopments have not been submitted.
  - xiii. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
    2. N.A.
  - xiv. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
    1. See submitted materials.
2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

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

1. Demolish a contributing building.
2. Remove the debris from the site.
3. Stabilize the site for eventual redevelopment.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application concerns the demolition of a deteriorated building which is listed as a contributing building in the Oakleigh Garden National Register Historic District. The property is in an extreme state of disrepair. The owners have researched the rehabilitation of this property and found it not feasible.

When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into the account the following considerations: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

1062 Texas Street is a contributing building located within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The building is an example of both the Queen Anne style and vernacular commercial typology.

This wooden building is in an extremely advanced state of disrepair. Conditions extend far beyond cosmetic concerns. Damages are seen in the deteriorated wood of the building (including sills and joist), collapsed roof system, and dilapidated interior.

The building contributes to the built density and rhythmic sequencing of the landscape. Situated on a corner lot, the building is only viewed from both a head on and oblique angle.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be removed, site would be leveled, and ground would be stabilized in preparation for redevelopment. The owner's would like to construct either commercial or residential properties.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-3) and the extreme state of disrepair, Staff does believe this application for the demolition of the contributing building would impair the property or historic district, but is necessary. Staff recommends approval of the application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Mike Rogers, applicant, was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ruzic recused himself from the discussion.

Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant and asked if there were any comments, clarifications or questions he would like to make. Mr. Rogers explained the property had been purchased a year ago. He further explained during the past year they worked diligently to find ways to rehabilitate this building. He noted outreach was made to several potential tenants such as Victory Teaching Farms, Restore Mobile, and Historic Mobile Preservation Society, as well as potential funding sources. Mr. Rogers stated the structure is in such poor condition it is unsafe. He then stated that Porchlight, LLC was working to help revitalize the South Oakleigh/ Texas Hill neighborhood.

Ms. Harden asked if the property had been listed for sale. Mr. Rogers stated the property had been offered to those previously mentioned. He explained Porchlight, LLC has bought several properties and vacant lots in the area. He further explained of those properties where buildings are extant, they are offered for

relisted and then sold with a contract that requires the new owner to rehabilitate the property within one year. He noted 1062 Texas Street was never listed for sale after purchase, but 1054 Elmira and two properties on Selma Street are under contract.

Mr. Rogers stated the property was sold by Mr. Palmer Hamilton for \$18,000 and he would be willing to sell it to someone for that price. However, he continued, the property is extremely deteriorated and a life safety issue.

Ms. Harden then inquired as to the condition of the building. Mr. Rogers explained walking into the commercial portion of the building you enter a large room where the floors are rotted. He further explained from the large room you continue up a short flight of stairs into a bedroom. He noted on the rear elevation the roof meets from the commercial and residential portion and makes a valley which has caused a source of major rot. He stated the commercial portion was in better shape than the residential portion.

Ms. Harden asked if it was feasible to remove the residential portion from the commercial and rehabilitate one of the parts. Mr. Rogers replied the option was looked into but there was concern because of the extreme deterioration of joists, sills, rafters and roof. He noted the building was a safety hazard as well as blight on the neighborhood.

Mr. Wagoner asked for the dates of the buildings. Mr. Sledge replied both the commercial and residential portion were turn of the century.

Mr. Rogers stated if the property was able to be demolished, salvaged materials would be employed on other buildings in the neighborhood.

Mr. Holmes asked if Porchlight, LLC was a non-profit. Mr. Rogers responded the organization was for profit with the goal of revitalization. He explained the current target area is 16 blocks between George, Savannah, Augusta, and Broad Streets. After that area has been improved another focus area will begin the next phase.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

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

## **FINDING OF FACT**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Wagoner moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application would impair the historic integrity of the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

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

**2018-10-CA: 204 State Street**

**Applicant:** Robert J. Isakson, Sr. of State Street Land, LLC on behalf of PAM Building Company, LLC.

**Received:** 3/12/2018

**Meeting:** 3/21/2018

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: DeTonti Square Historic District

Classification: Non-Contributing (Vacant Lot)

Zoning: T-4

Project: Relocation and Rehabilitation Related: Relocate 137 Tuscaloosa Street building to 204 State Street. Repair and replace to match existing.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

The Amelia Stewart House at 137 Tuscaloosa Street is comprised of an 1835 rear portion and 1871 front addition. The rear portion was constructed in the Federal style while the front portion is a temple form Greek Revival imitating Oakleigh.

**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. 204 State Street has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board according to the MHDC vertical files. It is currently a vacant lot. .
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Consider whether or not a structure will be relocated within the same district and in a similar context.”
  - 2. “Relocation may be more appropriate when the receiving site is in the district. Relocated buildings shall be placed in situations that do not impair the architecture of the historical character of the surround.”
  - 3. When relocating a building, maintain its general placement and orientation on the new site so as to maintain the architectural and the historical character of the streetscape and district.”

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

- 1. Deconstruct and dismantle residence at 137 Tuscaloosa Street.
  - A. Property would be carefully moved and relocated to DeTonti Square Historic District.

- B. Reassemble residence at 204 State Street. .
  - i. Building will be orientated to the street situated on an inner lot.
  - ii. Repairs will be conducted to match existing.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the relocation and rehabilitation of an existing residence at 137 Tuscaloosa Street to 204 State Street. The building is currently individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places. 137 Tuscaloosa Street has been purchased for redevelopment (parking lot.) The proposed location of lot for relocation is in the DeTonti Square Historic District. Relocating the structure to the DeTonti Square Historic District will make it possible to potentially keep its National Register status (See B-1).

With regard to the relocation, the building will be moved to a vacant lot. The residence will maintain the current rhythm and setbacks of other structures in the district (See B-2). Other examples of the Greek Revival style can be seen throughout the DeTonti Square Historic District. An existing example of the temple form, Greek Revival, raised cottage can be seen at 205 N. Conception Street.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe the relocation of the house will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the properties or district. Staff recommends approval of the application pending approval from the Consolidated Review Committee.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Jacob Nobles and Ms. Braine Johnson, representatives for the owner, were present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Wagoner stated his concern for reconstructing the house at 137 Tuscaloosa Street on 204 State Street with only a site plan. He noted anything other than reconstructing the property as it is would need to be brought back before the Board. Mr. Nobles commented the intention of the applicant was to reconstruct it as is.

Ms. Harden stated with new construction a full set of construction drawings are required. She continued by saying the relocation of an existing building also needs drawings.

Mr. Ruzic commented the application was for the placement of the building, and that after placement drawings would be necessary for permanent placement. Mr. Allen stated the Board could approve conceptually.

Mr. Noble stated the house would be moved there temporarily, but it was very likely it would become permanent.

Mr. Ruzic inquired as to the intended use of the building. Mr. Noble replied residential.



Mr. Allen asked if the Consolidated Review Committee (CRC) would be reviewing the relocation of the property. Ms. Lague replied the relocation would come before CRC if it is the permanent location. Mr. Allen confirmed setbacks would be reviewed by CRC.

Mr. Holmes stated the applicants would need to also return with a site plan consisting of site of house, driveway, and other landscape features.

Mr. Noble noted the back portion of the house is currently six feet off grade.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

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

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Ruzic 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 relocation of the house would not impair the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for conceptual approval with requiring the applicant to return with permanent plans. .

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.