

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**March 2<sup>nd</sup> 2016 – 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:** Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, Catarina Echols, David Barr, and Robert Allen  
**Members Absent:** Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes III, and Robert Brown.  
**Staff Members Present:** Cartledge W. Blackwell, Melissa Mutert, and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Allen noted the minutes being incorrect for application 2016-05-CA, and application 2016-06-CA for the minutes of the February 17, 2016 meeting. The decision was made to vote on these minutes at the next meeting once the correct changes had been performed by staff and reviewed by the ARB.
3. Mr. Barr moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED**

1. **Applicant:** Joe Pomeroy
  - a. Property Address: 1214 Selma Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/10/16
  - c. Project: Re-roof with architectural shingles, weatherwood. Remove old double hung window and replace with new wood window to match.
2. **Applicant:** Phillip Johnson
  - a. Property Address: 300 McDonald Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/10/16
  - c. Project: Raise height of picket fence on north side to five feet.
3. **Applicant:** Rob Wallace
  - a. Property Address: 1558 Blair Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/10/2016
  - c. Project: Re-roof the dwelling. Infill a side elevation window (not visible from the public view) and face said location with wall surfacing to match the surrounding.
4. **Applicant:** Roy & Debra Isbell
  - a. Property Address: 910 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/10/2016
  - c. Project: Redo an existing driveway. Broken bricks and concrete will be removed. Old Mobile bricks will be installed.
5. **Applicant:** Patrick Arensberg
  - a. Property Address: 1563 Fearnway
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/10/2016
  - c. Project: Construct rear bathroom to per submitted plans.
6. **Applicant:** Matt Graham
  - a. Property Address: 605 St. Francis Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/11/2016
  - c. Project: Install iron gate and fencing (6 feet).
7. **Applicant:** Jonathan Gillig
  - a. Property Address: 22 South Reed Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/14/2016

- c. Project: Construct a single garage per submitted plans. The building will be so located as to meet setback requirements.
- 8. Applicant:** Chris Johnson
- a. Property Address: 101 Houston Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/15/2016
  - c. Project: Re-roof with 30 year shingle, gray.
- 9. Applicant:** Melissa Mutert
- a. Property Address: 254 Dexter Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/15/2016
  - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace porch board and siding to match existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the same color scheme.
- 10. Applicant:** Josh Breland
- a. Property Address: 23 South Reed Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/16/2016
  - c. Project: Demolish a building (demolition approval was issued on 15 July 2015).
- 11. Applicant:** Cleo Brown
- a. Property Address: 1111 Texas Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/17/2016
  - c. Project: Remove old brick fence, replace/repair siding on house to match original in profile and design.
- 12. Applicant:** Forrest Raley
- a. Property Address: 1556 Blair Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/17/2016
  - c. Project: Retouch paint to match existing.
- 13. Applicant:** Melanie Bunting
- a. Property Address: 18 Semmes Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/18/2016
  - c. Project: Install period appropriate door and paint body of home in approved colors. The body of the house being “Needlepoint Navy” and the trim being “Extra White”.
- 14. Applicant:** Wayne Askew Contracting for Jeff Gibson
- a. Property Address: 208 S. Dearborn Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/22/2016
  - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.
- 15. Applicant:** Karen Graves
- a. Property Address: 300 Marine Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/22/2016
  - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the house per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme: body, Neutral Ground; Urban Putty, trim; Foggy Day, porch day; St. Bart’s, accents; and Byte Blue, porch ceiling. Repair and extend a fence per the submitted site plan.

## C. APPLICATIONS

### 1. 2016-08-CA: 114 St. Emanuel Street

- a. Applicant: the Very Reverend Beverly Gibson on behalf of Christ Church Cathedral
- b. Project: Restoration- Reconstruct a historic steeple  
Approved. Certified Record Attached.

### 2. 2016-09-CA: 105 Parker Street

- a. Applicant: Maxey J. Roberts
- b. Project: Demolition of deteriorated dwelling.  
Denied. Certified Record Attached.

### 3. 2016-10-CA: 8 LeMoyné Place

- a. Applicant: Edwin Curran for estate of Eloyd Murphy
- b. Project: Demolition of deteriorated dwelling.  
Withdrawn. Certified Record Attached.

## D. OTHER BUSINESS

### 1. Discussion.

- a. Last revision to the Historic District Guidelines was sent for completion on March 1, 2016. The guidelines will be voted for approval in either April or May.
- b. The MHDC Preservation Leadership Series begins March 8<sup>th</sup>. This is a five part series with two lectures, and three site visits.
- c. Mr. Stone suggested adding a list to the MHDC website of buildings available for purchase on the six month track to receiving a demolition Certificate of Appropriateness.

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

**2016-08-CA:** 114 St. Emanuel Street  
**Applicant:** the Very Reverend Beverly Gibson on behalf of Christ Church Cathedral  
**Received:** CRC- 2/5/2016; CRC Approval 2/18/2016; ARB-2/18/2016  
**Meeting:** 3/2/16

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Church Street East  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: T-5.2  
Project: Restoration- Reconstruct a historic steeple

**BUILDING HISTORY**

The cornerstone of the Christ Cathedral Church was laid in 1835, however building did not ensue until 1838. The edifice was dedicated in 1840 by Leonidas Polk, Bishop of the Dioceses of Louisiana and Alabama. It was designed by architect Cary Butt and built by James Barnes in the Greek Revival style. Butt and Barnes had previously been involved in such noted Greek Revival landmarks as the Marine Hospital, Government Street Presbyterian Church, and Barton Academy, among other works. The steeple of the church fell through the roof due to a hurricane in 1906 and was never rebuilt. In lieu of the steeple, a cross was erected. The bell of the steeple is now housed on the front church steps. Christ Cathedral Church is one of the most notable Greek Revival buildings in Mobile. It, along with Government Street Presbyterian Church, is a fine example of the “distyle-in antis” plan which locates columns in the front of the building between projecting walls of a 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 last appeared before the Architectural Review Board in 2009. At that time, the Board approved the installation of upright devices that showcase the sanctuary’s impressive series of stained glass windows. The application up for review, the first phase of comprehensive master plan, calls for the reconstruction of the building’s steeple.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. From the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, “Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted plans and other materials):**
  - 1. The steeple will replicate the parts, proportions, levels, and finishes of the lost original.
  - 2. The reconstruction is based on exacting scale reproductions of the lost steeple. Reconstruction was facilitated by period photographs, HABS drawings, and current day technology.

3. The steeple will be composed of five vertical sequences: a two-part platform; two pilastrade defined and fenestrated punctuated intermediate zones; an octagonal lantern; and copper dome.
4. The reconstruction will be constructed of a primary inner structural steel tube; secondary structural aluminum angle framework.
5. The height from finished ridge to top of dome 53'-9" which will replicate the original structure.
6. Construct upper and lower level half-square pilasters that shall be 16" wide and 8" deep.
7. Apply two coats of decorative vinyl finish to half-round and half-square pilasters to match cupola.
8. Including in project is ornamentation including decorative rings at entablature; 15" diameter x 1" projection; and decorative crestings with smooth facets at centers and at corners. Ornamentation will also be given applied vinyl finish to match cupola.
9. The clad structural framework in .032" aluminum will possess a baked Kynar finish.
10. Across made from 3" square aluminum (span of cross arm 2'-2" wide; 11'-8" high; two coats applied vinyl finish) will surmount the whole.
11. Construct Lower level pilasters which will be 18" in diameter x 11'-6" in height, half-round, with fluted shafts and Doric capitals and bases.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the reconstruction of a steeple atop Christ Church Cathedral, a highly significant contributing institutional building in the Church Street East Historic District. With regard to restorations of lost elements/constructs, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that the replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence (See B-1.). Christ Church Cathedral is the centerpiece of one of the most documented historic campuses in Mobile. Every building of the multi-building block encompassing ensemble has benefitted from surveys, artistic renderings, and archival documentation.

In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the project was informed by close scrutiny of documentary, physical, and pictorial evidence. Exploration and confirmation of existing conditions within and without the building took place. The original building contract & specifications were examined. Period renderings and early photographs depicting the building prior to the loss of the steeple were studied, as were measured drawings by the Historic American Building Survey (HABS).

Documentary sources, physical evidence, and pictorial sources were utilized in conjunction with present day digital technology to determine the exacting scale and massing of the original steeple. The proposed construction method and material selection have been employed in the reconstruction of the steeple at Trinity Church on Dauphin Street. The color and texture of the wall surfaces of the varying stages of the reconstructed steeple will match the original faux stone appearance of the original steeple and present day body of the sanctuary.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-1), Staff believes the new design for reconstruction matches the original in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. The applicants completed provided documentation of the original design by way of written and pictorial evidence. Staff recommends approval of the application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

The Very Reverend Beverly Gibson on behalf of Christ Cathedral church was present to discuss the application. Dean Gibson explained that this project was first undertaken 10 years ago, but because of new technology the church is to feasibly afford and reconstruct a matching steeple in visual design.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the Dean Gibson and asked her if she had any clarifications to address or questions to ask. The Dean spoke to the Cathedral's master plan and her enthusiasm over the project.

Mr. Roberts asked if the bell was going to be placed in the steeple. Dean Gibson replied that an electronic bell simulating system will be installed.

Mr. Ladd asked about the timeline of reconstruction. Dean Gibson stated completion of the steeple would take approximately 120 days from end of design phase. Currently, the design phase is 2-3 weeks out.

Mr. Ladd addressed the audience and asked if there was anyone who wished to speak either for against the application. Upon hearing no response, he 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.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/2/2017**

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

**2016-09-CA: 105 Parker Street**  
**Applicant:** Maxey J. Roberts  
**Received:** ARB- 2/16/2016  
**Meeting:** 3/2/2016

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Demolition of building.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This Bungalow (Craftsman) type dwelling that dates to circa 1920. The Craftsman typology was the most prevalent in the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The hipped roof in this case, lacks the exposed rafters that were so dominant for the Craftsman style, but a common variation seen in vernacular houses. Wood clapboard siding is used on the façade and was the most dominant material used for exterior cladding of this period style. One story vernacular buildings like 105 Parker Street are often referred to as a subtype of Arts & Crafts informed Craftsman style called “bungalow”.

**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 has not previously appeared before the Architectural Review Board.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, 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 house dates circa 1920. The building is listed as a conditional contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way National Register Historic District. An example of bungalow, or vernacular form of the Craftsman style.
    - ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;

1. The dwelling contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and historical character of the surrounding Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
  - iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
    1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced. The exterior members are rotten and deteriorated. Exterior and interior walls are deteriorated. Windows and doors are rotten and broken.
  - 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. Bungalow (Craftsman style) dwellings are located within all of Mobile's seven locally designated National Register Historic Districts. Old Dauphin Way, Lienkauf, Oakleigh, and Midtown contain a large number of this uniquely American residential typology. Examples are found across the United States.
  - 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 debris would be removed, lot would be leveled, and remaining yard maintained. It is the intention of the applicant to sell the vacant lot.
  - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
    1. The applicants did not purchase the property. It is part of an estate.
  - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
    1. The property has stood vacant since 2000.
  - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
    1. The property has not been listed for sale.
  - ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
    1. N.A.
  - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
    1. N.A.
  - xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
    1. Application submitted.
  - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the Board.
    1. See submitted materials.
    2. This property has been declared a public nuisance in accordance with the Nuisance Abatement Act of the city of Mobile.
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 materials and communications):
1. Demolish a residential building
  2. Remove debris from the property.
  3. Clear the site formerly occupied by the demolished dwelling.
  4. Plant sod on the site.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application concerns the demolition of a contributing residential building. 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.

105 Parker Street is a conditional contributing building located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The dwelling is a fine example of the Bungalow (Craftsman) residential typology. This uniquely American typology came into being in the 1900s and remained a popular housing choice into the 1930s. Examples of this building type are found within and without Mobile's National Register and locally designated historic districts. Several additional examples are found on Parker Street itself. Examples of the typology are found across the United States.

This building is in an extremely advanced state of disrepair. Conditions extend far beyond cosmetic concerns. The exterior members are rotten and deteriorated. Windows and doors are rotten and broken. This property has been declared a public nuisance in accordance with the Nuisance Abatement Act of the city of Mobile. Per application, the property has been allowed a demolition permit due to public nuisance declaration, pending approval by the Architectural Review Board.

The house contributes to the built density, rhythmic sequencing, historic character, and physical experience of Parker Street. The dwelling sits beside a vacant corner lot.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be removed, the site would be leveled, and the lot would be sold. A buyer would be obligated to redevelop the site in manner fully in keeping with Mobile's Historic District Guidelines.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application would impair the architectural and the historical character of the building, compound, and district, but recommends approval of the demolition on account extremely advanced state of the disrepair.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Ms. Maxey J. Roberts was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Roberts welcomed the applicant. He asked Ms. Roberts if she had any clarifications to address or questions to ask. Mrs. Roberts explained that the house was built by her grandmother, then resided in by her mother, and later her uncle. She further elaborated that the floor joists, roof joists, and windows are in extremely deteriorated conditions. Mrs. Roberts also noted that the home had been broken into and vandalized.

Mr. Ladd expressed several citizens in the community would have interest in repairing dwellings such as Mrs. Robert's. He said that based on a conversation with Mr. Blackwell, City Staff could refer interested parties to her. Mr. Stone then questioned if it would be feasible to holdover this application for six months until it had been listed on the MLS system for that length of time, per MHDC guidelines.

Upon Mr. Blackwell's request, Ms. Mutert then explained how the property applied within the **Nuisance Abatement Program**. She stated that the property was not declared a "Nuisance" yet because the notice did not come from the City Council.

Mr. Blackwell suggested listing the property for six months and seeing if it generated any interest, at the liking of Mrs. Roberts. Mrs. Roberts only concern was that she did not want to be in violation of any city ordinance. Per the recommendation of the Board and Ms. Mutert, Staff agreed to contact David Daughenbaugh with Property Maintenance notifying him of the six month stay of tickets for the 105 Parker Street. Mr. Ladd noted Mrs. Roberts should be copied on this correspondence.

Mr. Ladd addressed the audience and asked if there was anyone who wished to speak either for against the application. Upon hearing no response, he 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 amended by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued until the property has been listed for six months on MLS.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: N/A**



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

**2015-44-CA: 8 Lemoyne Place**  
**Applicant: Edwin Curran for the Estate of Eloyd Murphy**  
**Received: 2/1/16**  
**Meeting: On schedule for 2/17/16; Held at request of applicant for meeting 3/2/2016;**  
**APPLICATION WITHDRAWN ON 3/2/16 PER APPLICANT**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Demolition – Demolish a single-family residence which is an extremely advanced state of decay.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This classically detailed foursquare type dwelling dates circa 1910.

**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**

- C. This last was last scheduled to appear before the Architectural Review Board on February 17, 2016. The application was heldover. Previously, the property most recently appeared before the Board on December 2, 2015. At that time, the Board denied an application calling for the demolition of the building. The dwelling situated on the property, one which has been on the City’s Nuisance List for a number of years, is in extremely advanced state of structural decay. If granted demolition approval, the derelict house would be demolished, the site would be cleared, grass would be planted, and the property would be listed for sale.
- D. 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:
  - 2. *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:
    - v. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
      - 1. This house dates circa 1910. The building is listed as a contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way National Register Historic District. A grandly

proportioned dwelling of the American Foursquare typology it is among the finest and oldest houses located on LeMoyne Place.

- vi. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
    - 1. The dwelling contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and historical character of the surrounding Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
  - vii. 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. Most of the exterior surface materials and elements would have to be replaced. The interior structure is even more periled condition. The roof has collapsed.
  - viii. 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. Foursquare dwellings are located within all of Mobile's seven locally designated National Register Historic Districts. Old Dauphin Way contains a large number of this uniquely American residential typology. Examples are found across the United States.
  - 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 debris would be removed, the lot would be leveled, and sod would be planted.
  - vii. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
    - 1. The applicants did not purchase the property. It is part of an estate.
  - viii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
    - 1. The property has stood vacant for -
  - ix. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
    - 2. The property has been listed for sale.
  - 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. N.A.
  - 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. Application submitted.
  - 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 materials and communications):
5. Demolish a contributing residence.
  6. Remove debris from the property.
  7. Clear the site formerly occupied by the demolished dwelling.
  8. Plant grass.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application concerns the demolition of a contributing residential building. 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.

8 LeMoyne Place is a contributing building located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The dwelling is a fine example of the American Foursquare residential typology. This uniquely American typology came into being in the 1890s and remained a popular housing choice into the 1920s. Examples of this building type are found within and without Mobile's National Register and locally designated historic districts. Several additional examples are found on LeMoyne Street itself. Some of Mobile's most notable instances of the typology line Dauphin Street. Examples of the typology are found across the United States.

This building is in an extremely advanced state of disrepair. Conditions extend far beyond cosmetic concerns. Sills are rotten and the roof structure has collapsed.

The house contributes to the built density, rhythmic sequencing, historic character, physical experience of LeMoyne Place. An inner block dwelling in an intact expanse of a block, the building is only viewed from head on or an oblique angle.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be carefully removed, the site would be leveled, sod would be planted, and the lot would be sold. Work would be done a firm contracted by the City. A buyer would be obligated to redevelop the site in manner fully in keeping with Mobile's Historic District Guidelines.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application would impair the architectural and the historical character of the building, compound, and district, but recommends approval of the demolition on account extremely advanced state of the disrepair.