

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

March 4, 2015 – 3:00 P.M.

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

### A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, E. Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:  
**Members Present:** Bob Allen, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes (III), Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt (I), Steve Stone, Craig Roberts, and Jim Wagoner.  
**Members Absent:** Robert Brown and Kim Harden.  
**Staff Members Present:** Devereaux Bemis, Cartledge Blackwell, and Keri Coumanis.
2. Steve Stone moved to approve the minutes for the January 21, 2015 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. Jim Wagoner moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.

### B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant:** Damon Lett Roofing
  - a. Property Address: 7 North Reed Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/27/15
  - c. Project: Reroof back porch with charcoal gray shingles.
2. **Applicant: Pamela McMillan**
  - a. Property Address: 109 South Monterey Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/21/15
  - c. Project: Remove chain link fence north side of house, install 6 foot privacy fence with three gates, one on interior of property, as per documentation on file.
3. **Applicant:** Rhea Singleton
  - a. Property Address: 160 Houston Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/21/15
  - c. Project: Paint the house in one of the two following paint schemes: Body, Behr/Sherwin Williams Rooster Red; Trim, SW Classical White; Accent, Charcoal Gray; Benjamin Moore, PE – 93: 1497 (Green); Trim, Hepplewhite Ivory HC-36; Accent, Shelburne Buff 2<sup>nd</sup> Accent: Rangood Red (Devoe).
4. **Applicant: Identity Signs for Jean Lankford**
  - a. Property Address: 300 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/27/15
  - c. Project: Install a brushed metal hanging blade sign per submitted design. The total square footage of the signage amounts to 10 square feet (double-faced). The sign will be suspended in manner to meet height requirements.
5. **Applicant: Cross Property Resource**
  - a. Property Address: 114 North Ann Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/21/15
  - c. Project: Install new piers and level up others adding sills as necessary. No work to be on exterior perimeter of the building.
6. **Applicant: Pat Townsend**
  - a. Property Address: 401 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/16/15
  - c. Project: Reinstall guttering and downspouts. The installations will neither impair historical materials nor obsctural architectural details.

**7. Applicant: Dharam Pannu**

- a. Property Address: 505 Eslava Street
- b. Date of Approval: 1/28/15
- c. Project: Renew a COA issued 1/27/14 for construction of a dormer.

- 8. Applicant: Elyzabeth Wilder**
  - a. Property Address: 1004 Charleston Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/21/15
  - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace fencing posts and pickets to match the existing. Repaint per the same color.
- 9. Applicant: Vicki Parks**
  - a. Property Address: 1013 Augusta Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/28/15
  - c. Project: Remove sections of wooden fencing located masonry fence piers. Construct brick fence sections between said piers. Repair fencing.
- 10. Applicant: Melissa Glazner**
  - a. Property Address: 1658 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/13/15
  - c. Project: Remove eight fencing in the side and rear lots. Install six foot tall wooden fencing and several sections of six foot tall aluminum fencing.
- 11. Applicant: Tracy Cochran**
  - a. Property Address: 1704 New Hamilton Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/20/15
  - c. Project: Repair siding to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
- 12. Applicant: L & K Construction**
  - a. Property Address: 1664 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/3/15
  - c. Project: Reroof the flat-roofed porches fronting and to either side of the façade.
- 13. Applicant: Ann and Hastings Read**
  - a. Property Address: 1225 Selma Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/3/15
  - c. Project: Construct a small addition off an existing ancillary the building (per submitted plans). The 2010 building. The siding and roofing materials will match the existing.
- 14. Applicant: Church East Historic District**
  - a. Property Address: multiple locations within the right of way
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/3/15
  - c. Project: Remove existing historic district signage from posts located in the right of way. Install aluminum signs of a new design (approved by the neighborhood) on said poles. The sign faces will measure 18" in height and 12" in width.
- 15. Applicant: Patricia Gholson**
  - a. Property Address: 1122 Montauk Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/5/15
  - c. Project: Remove a later door. Install a period appropriate door (per submitted design). The wooden door will feature a lowered paneled section surmounted by a glazed and beveled upper section.
- 16. Applicant: Wanda Dearman**
  - a. Property Address: 20 Hannon Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/9/15
  - c. Project: Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint on the iron fence and security door. Repaint the house per the previously approved Valspar color scheme. Pave the driveway with concrete.
- 17. Applicant: Kyle Taylor**
  - a. Property Address: 357 Charles Street

- b. Date of Approval: 2/10/15
  - c. Project: Remove a cracked concrete walkway and driveway. Install a new brick paved walkway and a driveway of the same material.
- 18. Applicant: Tony Stewart**
- a. Property Address: 205 Michigan Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/10/15
  - c. Project: Replace and repaint rotten wood to match.
- 19. Applicant: John Kennedy**
- a. Property Address: 101 South Catherine Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/12/15
  - c. Project: Install interior lot privacy fencing. The fencing will take the form of six foot tall, wooden dog-eared sections.
- 20. Applicant: Mike Henderson Roofing**
- a. Property Address: 1105 Augusta Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/12/15
  - c. Project: Reroof the house to match the existing.
- 21. Applicant: T-Roy's Relief Roofing**
- a. Property Address: 57 Houston Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/13/15
  - c. Project: Install a traditional 5-V Crimp slate colored metal roofing panels on the house.
- 22. Applicant: Paul Shuler**
- a. Property Address: 63 Etheridge
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/13/15
  - c. Project: Reroof with 5 V metal crimp roof.
- 23. Applicant: Dennis Devette**
- a. Property Address: 17 North Ann Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/18/15
  - c. Project: Repair/reglaze windows to match in all respect. Repaint the trim per the submitted Benjamin Moore color - Sherwood Green.
- 24. Applicant: Scott Gonzales**
- a. Property Address: 4-8 South Emanuel Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/18/15
  - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Reroof to match the existing.
- 25. Applicant: David Naman**
- a. Property Address: 222 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/19/15
  - c. Project: Paint the building per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme: body, Spiced Silver; keystones, Softer Tan; and arches, Meadow Trail
- 26. Applicant: Peyton Harvill with the PH Company**
- a. Property Address: 101 Levert Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/23/15
  - c. Project: Reroof the house using GAF shingles.

## C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2015-07-CA: 457 Conti Street**
  - a. Applicant: Stephen Carter
  - b. Project: Restoration, Partial Demolition, and Redevelopment – Restore historic fabric, demolish a later rear wing, and construct a new rear gallery.  
**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
2. **2015-08-CA: 953 Augusta Street**
  - a. Applicant: Melanie Bunting for D & D Properties, LLC
  - b. Project: Restoration – Restore a long vacant residential building.  
**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
3. **2015-09-CA: 251 Government Street**
  - a. Applicant: Walker Thrash with Thrash Development for Alabama Hotels, LLC
  - b. Project: Restoration and Rehabilitation a historic downtown hostelry – Remove alterations made in the 1980s, install awnings, and install signage.  
**APPROVED IN PART AND AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
4. **2015-10-CA: 1017 Old Shell Road**
  - a. Applicant: Restore Mobile
  - b. Project: Reroofing and partial demolition –Reroof the residence, demolish later side/rear infill & an addition, and restore a side/rear porch.  
**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
5. **2015-11-CA: 1650 Dauphin Street**
  - a. Applicant: Joe Byrne for Tim and Marian Clarke
  - b. Project: Painting – Paint a non-contributing brick residence.  
**WITHDRAWN IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
6. **2015-12-CA: 8 South Conception Street**
  - a. Applicant: Carlos Gant for Thelma and Joia Juzang
  - b. Project: Commercial Infill Construction -Reconstruct a storefront and rebuild an inner lot building.  
**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

## D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion

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

**2015-07-CA:** 457 Conti Street  
**Applicant:** Stephen Carter  
**Received:** 2/10/15  
**Meeting:** 3/4/15

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Church Street East  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: T5-1  
Project: Restoration, Partial Demolition, and Redevelopment – Restore historic fabric, demolish a later rear wing, and construct a new rear gallery.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

MHDC Files contain erroneous material which dates this building to the 1960s. The building is in fact the remaining first floor of what was originally a two-story brick townhouse dating from the mid 19<sup>th</sup> Century.

**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 May 1, 2013. At that time, the Board approved an earlier redevelopment proposal calling for the restoration of historic fabric, demolition of the rear wing, and construction of a large two-story addition. The applicant has since changed the nature of the proposed redevelopment (from residential to entertainment) and consequently reduced the size and design of the addition.
- B-1. The 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. While this building is listed as a non-contributing structure dating from past half century, it is in fact the ground floor of a multi-story 19<sup>th</sup>-Century townhouse. The area proposed for demolition constitutes a later rear addition which was previously approved for removal.

- 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 historic portion of this building (front gable roofed section) contributes to the architectural character, built density, cultural ambience, and rhythmic sequencing of the surrounding district. Located at a picturesque and intact section of Conti Street, the historic portion of the building would remain intact and be restored. Only the rear addition would be removed.
- 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 either being reproduced or procured. Bricks would be salvaged for reuse on the property.
- 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 front portion of the subject building constitutes the lower floor of brick town house constructed during the mid 19<sup>th</sup> Century. The rear addition dates from a later period. Said addition was previously approved for demolition. Rear additions are found behind numerous houses of the same period.
- 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 the demolition of the rear portion of the building is allowed and the construction of the new wing approved, the addition will take the form of an enclosed volume fronted by porches on two elevations.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
  - 1. The property is not up for sale. The owner proposes the adaptive reuse of the building.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
  - 1. After considering residential redevelopment, the owner applicant has decided to adaptively reuse the building as an entertainment venue.
- 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. Not applicable.
- x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
  - 1. Not given.
- 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; and
  - 1. Application submitted.
- xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
  - 1. See the 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.”
- B-2. 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. “The exterior of a building helps define its style, quality, and period. Bricks and mortar should match the original color, finish (strike), and thickness.”
  2. “The type, size, and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original windows should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
  3. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible with the existing.”
  4. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
  5. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy 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 integrity of the property and its environment.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. When and where necessary, repoint joints using the appropriate mortar.
2. Sand, clean, and repaint cast ironwork.
3. Paint and reinstall cast iron porch railings.
4. Obtain and install a railing section of railing (one was stolen) to match the original examples (See C-2 & C-3.).
5. Reroof the front porch with metal roofing panels and detailing to match the existing.
6. Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.
7. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated wooden windows to match the existing as per light configuration, material, construction, and framing.
8. Remove a later replacement window from the West Elevation’s garret.
9. Replace the aforementioned window with a wooden window matching the traditional windows located below as per light configuration and construction.
10. Infill a rear window. The infill will take the form of brick laid in a bond to match the existing. Said bricks will be salvaged from the existing rear addition. The mortar will be of an appropriate composition. Sills and lintels will remain.
11. Demolish a later rear addition.
12. Construct a new rear addition.
  - a. The addition will take the form of an L-shaped porch and an enclosed volume.
  - b. Said addition will extend the length of the South (rear) Elevation as well as the rear portion of the East (a side) Elevation.
  - c. The enclosed space will be constructed out of brick matching those employed on the body of the building. Said bricks will be salvaged.
  - d. The West Elevation of the proposed addition will take the form of parapet wall and a hipped roof metal porch. The parapet wall will be of a lower height than the stepped end of the main building’s parapet wall.
  - e. Concrete steps featuring an iron railing will be located off of the West Elevation.



- f. Five cast iron circular section post will defined the South (rear) Elevation's four bay porch.
- g. A continuous flight of brick paved steps will extend the length of the addition's South and East Elevations.
- h. Three glazed and paneled aluminum clad wood doors will afford ingress to and egress from the porch from the addition's South Elevation. A continuous header course will surmount the doors.
- i. Three glazed and paneled aluminum clad wood doors will afford ingress to and egress from the porch from the addition's East Elevation. A continuous header course will surmount the doors.
- j. Four circular section cast iron columns will define the porch's East Elevation (same design as C-12-a).
- k. A metal roof whose panels will match those surmounting the front porch will sheath the rear porch.
- l. Roofing shingles matching those employed on the body of the building will sheath the enclosed portion of the addition's roof.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

In addition to the conservation and restoration of historic fabric, this application involves the demolition of a later rear wing and the construction of a new rear addition. The Board previously approved the demolition on the subject area. Said approval also included the construction of a larger addition that was two-stories. The application up for review takes the form of a single-story addition that involves less intervention into surviving historic fabric.

With regard to the conservation and restoration of historic fabric, this project will address brickwork, windows, ironwork, and woodwork. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, interventions involving bricks and mortar will pay attention to the original color, finish (strike), and thickness (See B-1.). Appropriate mortar mixtures will be employed. Where windows cannot be repaired, they will be replaced with replications matching the originals as per type, size, dividing lights, framing, material, and construction (See B-2.). One later nonconforming window will placed with a window matching the historic windows (See B-3.). In keeping the Design Review Guidelines, the front porch will be repaired to reflect the period. Particular attention will be paid to the railings, posts, roof pitch, and roofing materials (See B-4.). A missing section of railing will be replicated to match the existing sections (which are currently in storage).

As per the proposed addition, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy 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 integrity of the property and its environment. None of the historic interiors survive. All salvageable bricks from the existing (later addition) will be cleaned and repurposed so as to conserve historic fabric and engender a sense of patina. A downward step in the proposed addition's parapet wall will serve to differentiate the old and new fabric, while the design's attention to proportion, material will allow for compatibility of scale and treatment.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-5), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historic character of the historic district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Stephen Carter was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Stone informed his fellow Board members that he was the architect of record for application up for review. He recused himself from the discussion and departed the room (for the whole of the period of the Board's discussion).

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative and thanked him for further refining his adaptive reuse of the subject property. He asked Mr. Carter if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Carter added that he and his wife were excited about the project. He complimented the work of his architect and thanked the Board for their time.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions which to ask Mr. Carter. No questions 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. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/4/16**

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

**2015-08-CA: 953 Augusta Street**  
**Applicant: Melanie Bunting for D & D Properties, LLC**  
**Received: 2/10/15**  
**Meeting: 3/4/15**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Restoration – Restore a long vacant residential building.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This wood frame dwelling dates circa 1852. Featuring a full-length gallery, a passageless interior (no center hall), two front entrances, and an all encompassing gable roof, the house possesses the vestigial form and plan of an early “Creole Cottage.”

**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 new owner proposes the removal of later asbestos tile siding and its replacement with wooden siding, as well as in kind repair and replacement of existing features.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. With regard to the foundations, “Bricks and mortar should match the original color, finish (strike), and thickness.”
  - 2. “The exterior of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension, and material.”
  - 3. “The type, size, and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
  - 4. Roofing “materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
- C. Scope of Work (as described in the application submitted and photographs provided):
  - 1. Remove later tile siding.
  - 2. Install wooden siding matching the profile and dimension of surviving sections of original wooden siding.
  - 3. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
  - 4. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork and elements to match the existing as per profile, dimension, design, and material.

5. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated windows to match the existing as per light configuration, construction, material, and framing.
6. Repoint foundations piers using the appropriate mortar.
7. Reroof the rear portion of the building using architectural shingles. Said shingles will match the color of the shingles sheathing the front portion of the dwelling.
8. Level the building and stabilize walls.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the restoration of a highly significant contributing residence. Long unoccupied, this textbook example of the plan and form of a “Creole Cottage” (and its perpetuation well into the 19<sup>th</sup>-Century) is one of the finest extant examples of that typology remaining in Mobile. The house is one of the oldest buildings in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

With regard to the exterior volume, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that the exterior of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, the replacement of exterior woodwork and detailing (when required) will match the original in profile, dimension, and material (See B-2.). The non historic wall tiles sheathing the exterior will be removed. Traditional wooden siding matching surviving clapboards will be installed. Where historic windows cannot be repaired, replacements matching the type, size, dividing lights, and framing of the existing will be constructed and installed (See B-3.). Foundation piers will be repaired using an appropriate mortar (See B-1.). The Roofing materials will be appropriate to the form and pitch and color of the building, as well as match the color of the existing shingles (See B-5.).

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Melanie Bunting 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 Ms. Bunting if she had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Ms. Bunting responded by saying that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Roberts thanked Ms. Bunting for purchasing the long vacant dwelling.

Mr. Roberts addressed Staff. He asked why the application was appearing before the Board. Mr. Blackwell and Mr. Bemis explained that on account of the extent of the work required and proposed the application was not approved on midmonth level. Mr. Blackwell noted the removal of the tile siding and the reapplication of wooden siding.

Mr. Allen thanked Ms. Bunting. He added that since he lived on the same block as the subject property, he was particularly pleased with the proposal.

Mr. Allen raised concern about the discrepancy between the scope of work as outlined on the application and in the Staff Report. Mr. Blackwell explained that in general Staff Reports are more comprehensive and take into account the whole of the work proposed. For benefit of the project as a whole and with the approval of the applicant, he explained that the Staff Report is generally more comprehensive. Mr. Allen said he wanted them to match. He added that the more in-depth nature of the Staff Report is for the benefit of the building (conservation), public record, and the applicant (permitting).

Mr. Blackwell asked Ms. Bunting is she was in agreement with scope of work as articulated in the Staff Report. Ms. Bunting answered yes. She explained that she works closely with and is in regular contact with both Mr. Bemis and Mr. Blackwell.

Mr. Allen cited the window description as instance which he was uncomfortable. He said that the Staff Report state the windows would be replaced to match. Mr. Allen queried to match what.

Mr. Wagoner spoke highly of Ms. Bunting proven track record.

Ms. Bunting was asked if she was amenable to amending her application to reflect full agreement with the Staff Report. Ms. Bunting answered yes.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to the applicant. No further questions ensued.

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

#### **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to not the correlation of the Staff Report and the application.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

#### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/4/16**

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

**2015-09-CA: 251 Government Street**  
**Applicant: Walker Thrash with Thrash Development for Alabama Hotels, LLC**  
**Received: 2/9/15**  
**Meeting: 3/4/15**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Church Street East  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: T5-2  
Project: Restoration and Rehabilitation a historic downtown hostelry – Remove alterations made in the 1980s, install awnings, and install signage.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

Dating from 1940, the twelve-story Admiral Semmes Hotel represents a blending Art Deco, Colonial Revival, and more local traditions. This notable feature of Mobile’s skyline was built over a fifteen month period at a cost of one million dollars. Both the architect, Andrew Fraser, and contracting firm, W. S. Bellows Construction Company, were based out of Galveston, Texas. The building was extensively remodeled in the 1980s.

**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 21, 2010. At that time, the Board approved a plan calling for improvements to southwest corner of the compound. The site has since changed hands. A sympathetic new owner is in the process of restoring and rehabilitated the building. Extensive and much needed interior rehabilitation and redecoration is ongoing. With this application, the new owner proposes the exterior restoration and renovation of the building. The scope of work involves the removal of 1980s alterations to ground floor fenestration, the installation of awnings, and the installation of a new signage package.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, and the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.”
  - 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.”
  - 3. “The size and replacement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”

4. "The form and shape of the porch (gallery) and its roof should maintain their historic appearance."
  5. "Lighting can be an important element in historic districts. Therefore, where lighting impacts the exterior of the building or of the district in which the building is located, it shall be reviewed for appropriateness as any other element."
  6. "Awnings will be reviewed on case by case basis."
  7. "Signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of the building."
  8. "The overall design of all signage including mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property."
  9. "The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs."
  10. "The structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building."
  11. "The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet."
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Remove and replace ground floor awnings installed during the 1980s renovation of the building.
  2. Remove ground floor fenestration located on the North and the Northeast portion of the East Elevations. Said fenestration dates from the 1980s.
  3. Install steel (chocolate color when painted) windows with transoms that recapture the treatment of the original storefront and design aesthetic.
  4. Install new canvas awnings suspended from the soffits of the bays defining the North and East Galleries.
  5. Install lighting under the balconies.
  6. Remove and replace damaged tiles located outside and between ground floor entrances.
  7. Install upper level window awnings on the North and South Elevations. Said canvas awnings would be secured to building in such a manner as to not cause damage to historic fabric.
  8. Remove existing signage.
  9. Install new signage.
    - a. Install two (2) steel framed aluminum signs on the existing floodlight posts attached to the North and East Galleries
      - i. The two signs will measure 2' in width by 10' in height.
      - ii. The total square footage of both signs will amount to 80 square feet.
    - b. Install a wall sign South Elevation's utility shaft.
      - i. The wall sign will measure 3' 8" in width and 85' in height.
      - ii. The sign's total square footage will amount to 156" square feet.
      - iii. The aluminum sign will feature back lit LED illumination.
    - c. Install two wall signs at the northeast corner of the building.
      - i. The signs will measure 1' 3" in width by 6' in height.
      - ii. The total square footage of the two signs will amount to 15.6 square feet.
      - iii. The aluminum signs will feature back-lit illumination.
  10. Install new flag poles at the four corners of the building.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the restoration and rehabilitation of one of Mobile's three extant historic hostelrys (other two being the LeClede and Battle House Hotels). Part of larger campaign to revitalize the downtown landmark, the exterior scope of work involves the removal of non-historic interventions introduced in the 1980s (ground floor fenestration) and the introduction of reversible interventions (signage, awnings, and lighting) that will respectively recapture historic integrity and introduce sympathetic contemporary flair to the complex. The whole of the exterior scope of work has been subject to review by staff of the Alabama Historical Commission for purposes of the pursuance of federal historic tax credits. None of the interventions up for review were considered to be detrimental to the architectural or the historical character of the building.

The ground floor fenestration has been altered on several occasions. The current wood framed and fixed windows with surmounting glass block transoms date from the 1980s. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the size and placement of the replacement windows are compatible with the general character of the building (See B- 3.). The overall design and materials of said windows is substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence (See B-1.).

Awnings are reviewed on a case by case basis (See B-6.). The awnings proposed for removal date from the 1980s renovations. The awnings obscure architectural expanses, elements, and details that inform the design and experience of the building. The removal of the existing ground floor awnings would highlight the original design intent and enliven the streetscape. New awnings would be installed from soffits located between the bays of galleries located on the building's North and East Elevations. In addition to be reversible in nature, these interventions would not obscure character defining architectural fabric (See B-2.). The form and shape of the galleries would remain the same (See B-4.).

In addition to the aforementioned removal and installation of awnings, the galleries would also be impacted by the installation of lighting. The Design Review Guidelines state that lighting can be an important element in historic districts. Therefore, where lighting impacts the exterior of the building or of the district in which the building is located, it shall be reviewed for appropriateness as any other element (See B-5.). Existing lighting installed on the underside of the gallery's decking and structure would be removed. New lighting highlighting the entrance would be installed. Similar in effect to the spotlighting of windows at Christ Church Cathedral and Government Street Presbyterian Church, two of Mobile's most historically and architecturally significant landmarks, the proposed lighting would be focused on specific locations (the two entrances) and would not adversely impact the historic character of the surrounding district. Entrance lighting is employed on numerous institutional, cultural, and commercial establishments located in and beyond the downtown. It is particularly appropriate for hotels of the period and style of the Admiral Semmes, a building that from the date of its construction was brilliantly illuminated. Not only reversible in nature, the lighting would recapture original design intent and experiential impact (See B-2.).

This Admiral Semmes features a three-part layering of vertical components. Above the ground floor/mezzanine base there is located a two-part shaft (an upper two-story penthouse zone above an undifferentiated over a lower unarticulated stacking of floors) which is crowned by parapet wall. Retractable awnings are proposed for windows located on North (façade/entrance) and South Elevations intermediate shaft. Reversible in nature, neither the installation nor the operation of the awnings would damage historic fabric (See B-2.). Said additions would also serve to relieve wall expanses.

This application involves the installation of five signs. The signs are as follows: two wall signs located at the northeast corner building; two signs affixed to existing poles extending from galleries located on the



North and East Elevations; and an upper building sign located on the South (rear) Elevation. Review of signage to be located within Mobile's historic districts involves consideration of the following: location, installation, material, lighting, and size. All of the proposed signs would be located on expanses or in locations where they would not obscure architectural features or details (See B-7.). Installation of said signs would not damage historic fabric. The sign designs and materials (aluminum) are appropriate for the period and style of the building (See B-8 and B-10.). Back-lit illumination is allowed by the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts.

While the location, installation, materials and lighting of the proposed signs meet the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the total square footage of the signage proposal exceeds the sixty-four square foot allotment allowed by said regulation (See B-11.). Variances have been granted for proposals calling for the installation of signs located large buildings and complexes such as the Admiral Semmes. Said variances took into account the size of the building and the neighboring structures surrounding it (See B-9.).

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-10), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or this historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Pending the issuance of a variance for the signage, Staff recommends approval of this application.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Walker Thrash 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. Thrash if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Thrash answered no.

Mr. Wagoner asked Staff and the applicant if an earlier redevelopment project had been shelved. Mr. Thrash, Mr. Bemis, and Mr. Blackwell spoke to Mr. Wagoner's query.

Mr. Ladd broached the subject of the fencing enclosing the undeveloped lot behind the property. Mr. Thrash explained that while he was amenable to removing the fencing, he would like to leave it in place for the remainder of the revitalization campaign. He added that Thrash Development only had a two year lease on the lot in question. Mr. Ladd and Mr. Roberts provided institutional background and context surrounding the fencing.

Mr. Roberts noted the extent of the application. He mentioned that the Retirement Systems of Alabama generally provides individual proposals. Mr. Bemis and Mr. Blackwell explained that Mr. Thrash was adopting a different approach.

Mr. Roberts expressed his concern regarding the lack of specificity in regarding the proposed awnings. After seeing an old postcard image of the awnings, he stated that he was necessarily opposed to them, but wanted more information. He hesitated over the proposed color. Mr. Thrash explained when he and his design team were investigating how to rebrand the building they looked to the building's past and period. He allowed the proposed color, a yellow, is the hue of the Admiral Semmes Azeala. He stated that the

color is found in other locations in the Hotel. Mr. Thrash added that he was not married to the color. Mr. Roberts requested more information. Mr. Blackwell pointed out the proposed railings were reversible features and had been vetted by the Alabama Historical Commission.

Mr. Roberts broached the subject of signage. Mr. Bemis provided the exact figure of the signage. Ms. Echols voiced concern about the large sign proposed for the South Elevation. Mr. Thrash addressed Ms. Echols concerns. Mr. Roberts requested more exacting renderings of the signage. Mr. Thrash explained that he had submitted additional imagery regarding the proposed signage on Monday, March 2<sup>nd</sup>. At Mr. Stone's request, Mr. Blackwell reviewed the more detailed imagery of signage. Mr. Blackwell reiterated the review of the Alabama Historical Commission.

Discussion turned to the lighting of the entrances and the number of flag poles.

Mr. Ladd asked 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.

No further Board discussion ensued.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Steve Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that only one flag pole would employed on the rooftop and that awnings (upper story and ground floor) would be subject to further review.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. Approval of the signage would be conditional on approval by the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/4/16**

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

**2015-10-CA: 1017 Old Shell Road**  
**Applicant: Restore Mobile**  
**Received: 2/18/15**  
**Meeting: 3/4/15**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Reroofing and partial demolition –Reroof the residence, demolish later side/rear infill and an addition, and restore a side/rear porch.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to materials located in this address’s property file, the core of this residence dates circa 1859. An overlay in the 1901 City of Mobile Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps depicts rear additions and alterations that expanded the house’s footprint. The house was remodeled in the 1920s. Other changes ensued.

**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, 2014. At that time, the Board approved the reconfiguration of the house’s roof structure. The property reappears before the Board with an application calling for a less invasive roofing intervention and the removal of porch and a later rear addition obscuring a historic porch.
- B-1. The 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. The main part of this building is listed as contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The body and more important additions would remain in place and be restored. The spaces proposed for demolition - porch infill and a side/rear addition which minimally impact the public view – are not of the same architectural caliber as the main

- house. Said addition obscures largely intact and architecturally significant features and constructions.
- 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 historic portion of this building (front portion) contributes to the architectural character, built density, cultural ambience, and rhythmic sequencing of the surrounding district. The porch infill and later addition proposed for demolition are not only minimally visible, but also obscure character defining spaces and elements.
  - 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 and procured. Bricks would be salvaged for reuse on the property.
  - 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 principle portion and more significant additions that comprise this dwelling will be restored. Only later and less architecturally significant alterations would be demolished.
  - 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 the demolition of the porch infill and southeast corner addition are allowed, an earlier footprint of the house will re-attained and a historic elevation reconstructed.
  - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
    1. The property acquired the property in 2014. The property is soon to be restored and placed on the market.
  - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
    1. See the aforementioned response.
  - 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 at the present time. Following the restoration, the property will be listed on the open market.
  - 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. Not applicable.
  - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
    1. Not given.
  - 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; and
    1. Application submitted.
  - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
    1. See the 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.”
- B-2. 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. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate the form and pitch and color.”
  2. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attentions should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking posts/columns, proportions, and decorative details.”
  3. “Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, and pictorial evidence.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Reroof the house with architectural shingles (gray in color).
  2. Reconfigure the roof over the northeast corner of the house’s front wrap around front porch. Reroof said area with flat lock metal panels.
  3. Demolish a later southeast corner addition.
  4. Restore an original porch located behind the aforementioned addition.
    - a. Repair foundation piers (if necessary) using an appropriate mortar.
    - b. Repair and replace deteriorated structural and decorative components when and where necessary. Replications of skirt boards, porch decking, balustrades (bottom rails, pickets, top rails), porch posts, architrave, freeze, eave, and cornice will match the existing. Features on the front porch will serve as guide.
    - c. Reroof the porch low-pitched hipped roof. The porch will be sheathed with flat lock metal roofing panels.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the reroofing of the house, the slight alteration to a porch roof, the demolition of later alterations (porch infill and side/rear addition), and the restoration of a porch.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that original roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained (See B-1.). The side gallery is an early addition to the house. The most significant damage to impact the house stems from the extremely low pitch of said gallery. The proposed reconfiguration of the gallery roof would result in a slightly more elevated pitch that would better shed water and leaves from the roof structure. The proposed intervention would allow for the preservation of the larger roof form, a measure not taken afforded by the earlier approval. The form and materials of the roof and metal panels are appropriate to the building and the period (See B-1.). The architectural shingles proposed for the main roof structures are also in keeping with the building and present day roofing solutions.

When reviewing demolition applications of either the wholesale or partial varieties, four principle concerns are taken into account: architectural significance; physical condition; impact on the streetscape; and nature of proposed redevelopment. The porch infill and the later rear addition are not only minimally visible from the public view, but also obscure historic and character defining spaces. While repairable, these later alterations detract from the house’s historic integrity. Removal of the infill and demolition of the addition would allow for the restoration of the house’s L-shaped side/rear gallery. Porches are a defining regional ingredient of Mobile’s residential architecture (See B-2.). The restoration of the porch is substantiated by documentary, physical, and pictorial evidence (See B-3.).

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Devereaux Bemis and Keri Coumanis were present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd thanked Restore Mobile's representatives. He asked if 1017 Old Shell Road was the sixth project which the group had undertaken on Old Shell Road. Mr. Bemis answered yes. Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Bemis and Ms. Coumanis if they had any questions to ask, comments to make, or questions to ask.

Ms. Coumanis further explained the reasons motivating the application. Mr. Stone asked for clarification regarding the color of the metal roofing. Mr. Bemis addressed Mr. Stone's query. Mr. Bemis stated that after roofing the building, the property would be put up for sale.

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/4/16**

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

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

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

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

**BUILDING HISTORY**

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

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

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

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

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

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

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

**Withdrawn prior to the meeting and rescheduled for the 18 March 2015 meeting.**



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

**2015-12-CA: 8 South Conception Street**  
**Applicant: Carlos Gant for Joia Juzang and Thelma Juzang**  
**Received: 2/6/15**  
**Meeting: 3/4/15**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: T5-2  
Project: Reconstruct a storefront and rebuild an inner lot building.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to materials found within this property’s MHDC file, the previous storefront dated circa 1905. The building possibly encompassed earlier 19<sup>th</sup> Century fabric. Judging by the bricks removed from the façade, the building was older than previously dated.

**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 August 22, 2002. At that time, the Board approved removal and replacement of the existing storefront. On June 9, 2014, Staff issued a midmonth approval authorizing the in kind repair and/or replacement of deteriorated features. The work for exceeded the scope of work. The entire façade was removed. A stop work order was issued and multiple notices of violation were issued. The applicants scheduled and appeared before an interdepartmental predevelopment meeting. The application submitted for review calls for the construction of a new storefront.
- B. The New Commercial Construction Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples.”
  - 2. “Traditionally, commercial structures were constructed on the front property line with some type of storefront or display along the front. New commercial construction should be placed on the lot so that the setback approximates those of nearby historic buildings. New buildings should not be placed too far forward or behind the traditional “façade line”, a visual line created by the fonts of the building along a street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the façade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape.”
  - 3. “New construction should be placed on the lot so that the setback approximates nearby historic buildings.”

4. “Building mass is established by the arrangement of and proportion of geometric components. Similarity of massing helps to create a rhythm along a street, which is one of the most appealing aspects of historic districts. Therefore, new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby buildings.”
5. “The size of a building is determined by its dimensions – height, width, and depth – which also dictate square footage. Scale refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings – large, medium, small. Buildings which are similar in massing may be very different in scale. To preserve continuity of a historic district, new commercial construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.”
6. “Often, commercial roofs of metal, rubber, or asphalt, either hipped or gabled or flat, were concealed behind some sort type of parapet wall above the cornice. New commercial construction may consider, where appropriate, roof shapes and pitches similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings. The use of parapet walls may contribute to the compatibility of new commercial structures within the historic districts.”
7. “New construction should use the façade elements of nearby historic buildings.”
8. “Each façade has three main components – base (storefront), shaft (upper stories) and capital (cornice). Where appropriate, new construction should utilize these three elements. A storefront is further divided into four elements: bulkhead, display windows, main entrance and transoms. Where appropriate, these components may be included in new retail construction.
9. “Materials and ornamentation are important characteristics of a building. A range of decorative motifs can be seen in the historic districts. Both materials and ornamentation are important in creating continuity within the districts. New commercial construction should take these elements into consideration.”
10. “The choice of materials and ornamentation is a good way for a new building to exert its own identity. By using historic examples as a point of departure, it is possible for new construction to use new materials and ornamentation and still fit into the historic district.”
11. “Historic buildings feature a variety of materials for roofs, foundations, wall cladding, and architectural details. In new buildings, exterior materials – both traditional and modern - should closely resemble surrounding historic examples. Buildings in Mobile’s historic districts vary in age and architectural styles, dictating the materials to be used for new construction. Traditional materials which are not present in nearby historic buildings or building in the area that contains only Victorian-era frame houses, a brick ranch-style house would be conspicuous and disrupt the area’s visual continuity. Modern materials which have the same textural qualities and character as materials of nearby historic buildings may be acceptable.”
12. “The degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon new historic buildings. Although new buildings should use decorative trim, window casings, and other building materials similar to nearby historic buildings, the degree of ornamentation should not exceed that characteristic of the area. Profile and dimensions of new material should be consistent with examples in the district.”
13. “The type, size, and dividing lights of windows, and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the character of a building and compatibility with adjacent structures. Traditionally designed window openings are recessed on masonry buildings. New construction should follow this method as opposed to designing window openings that are flush with the wall.”

- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Construct a new commercial storefront on the location of the demolished storefront.
    - a. The storefront will occupy the length of length 18' façade line.
    - b. The façade will measure 29' 8" in height (that is to the top of the stepped parapet).
    - c. The façade will be constructed of bricks. The bricks will be salvaged from the site. If additional bricks are required, they will match those salvaged from the earlier façade.
    - d. The brick walls will be feature a running bond pattern/construction.
    - e. Following the example of the earlier façade, the two-story building's ground floor will feature a lower-story storefront, while the upper-story will feature a more traditional bay sequence.
    - f. The ground floor will feature a recessed entry like that of the earlier façade.
    - g. The new recessed entry will be rectilinear in form as opposed to the splayed of the preceding storefront entry.
    - h. The bay to the south of the recessed entry will be faced with a brick veneer and feature a single door. Said door will provide direct access to the building's upper-story.
    - i. The bay to the north of the recessed entry will feature an aluminum storefront. Said storefront will extend around the subject portion of the recessed entrance.
    - j. A framed stacked bond panel will be located above the storefront and extend the length of the façade.
    - k. The three bay upper-story will feature either two-six-over-six wooden or aluminum clad wooden windows matching the configuration of the original windows.
    - l. A glazed and door with surmounting transom will occupy the upper-story's central bay.
    - m. A framed and stacked bond panel matching the one over the lower-story storefront will be located above the upper-story fenestration.
    - n. The parapet wall will be stepped in form, as was the case with the earlier façade. A precast concrete coping will surmount the parapet.
    - o. Bronze colored scuppers and downspouts will bookend the façade.
    - p. A three bay cast iron gallery will front the façade.
    - q. The gallery's four cast iron supporting posts will be circular in shape and feature molded bases and capitals.
    - r. The gallery's upper-story railings will be take the form of a traditional design featuring classical motifs (frets, rinceaus), s & c scrolls, lattices, and stylized motifs.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the construction of a new commercial storefront on the location of an earlier storefront. The aforementioned older construction was demolished in September of 2014. Said demolition was issued without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness or the pulling of a building permit. A predevelopment was held so to inform the owners of the multiple concerns and processes informing the reconstruction of the façade. Prior to the predevelopment meeting, the applicants submitted two renderings of a proposed façade. Neither rendering was executed to scale. The plans up for review include the first façade design that met submission requirements.

The Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile's Historic District state that the goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples (See B-1.). Design concerns include: location (setback); massing; scale, façade elements; and materials. The proposed façade is informed by three design sources: the height and components of the lost building; the proportions and relationships to the adjoining buildings; and the materials and elements of nearby infill construction.

In accord with the New Commercial construction Guidelines, the southern half of the façade' ground floor (and the whole of the floor above) adopts the traditional on the sidewalk setback that characterizes nearby and historic commercial construction (See B 2-3.). Staff recommends that the applicants advance the northern half of the façade to align with southern half or employ a treatment on the latter's entry wall that is more in concert with design of the below.

Massing and scale help to establish the rhythm and relationships between buildings and the components informing their design. The scale of the proposed building takes into account the massing of adjacent and nearby historic building (See B-5.). The width of the façade was predetermined. Heights breakdowns have been observed. While the massing of the individual elements and sequences of proposed façade are informed by the earlier building and adjacent buildings (See B-4.), additional clarification is required as per treatments of the certain components. Further information regarding the nature of the recessed panels located above the ground level and upper story fenestration as well as additional dimensions of fenestrated units will better inform the review of the proposal.

The Design Guidelines for New Construction Guidelines note that traditional commercial facades have three main components – base (storefront), shaft (upper stories) and capital (cornice). The Guidelines go on to state that where appropriate, new construction should utilize these three elements (See B 7). Storefronts are further divided into four elements: bulkhead, display windows, main entrance and transoms (See B-8.). As mentioned to in the preceding paragraphs, the ground floor storefront features multiple components. The plan features a recessed entrance. Unlike the earlier building's entrance, the form is not canted and features a secondary doorway providing access to the upper story. The southern portion of the storefront is enclosed and the northern portion is glazed. Staff recommends that a continuous transom should be employed on both sides of the main entrance as a means of unifying these ground floor areas. Clarifications are required as to the design of the secondary door located with the southern half of the storefront and the materials and finish of the bulkhead extending around the main entrance and the southern portion of the storefront. In addition to previously mentioned want of clarification regarding recessed and framed bands of brick surmounting upper and lower story fenestration, Staff requests that clarification be provided as per the dimensions of the three fenestrated units overlooking the proposed gallery. The widths and heights of the units should be the same, as well as reflect the proportions and dimensions of fenestration on adjacent buildings (See B-13.). The proposed gallery, a construction that will recapture the experience of an earlier generation of streetscape, is a negotiation of the height of the older building (one which did not feature a gallery) and traditional balcony design. See the following paragraph for additional discussion on said gallery.

The New Construction Guidelines state that materials and ornamentation are important characteristics of a building. A range of decorative motifs can be seen in the historic districts. Both materials and ornamentation are important in creating continuity within the districts. New commercial construction should take these elements into consideration (See B-9.). The aforementioned direction allowed choice of materials and ornamentation is a good way for a new building to exert its own identity (See B-10.). The façade of the earlier building featured a stucco-faced brick treatment. Following the example of several nearby infill projects, the façade of the proposed building would be faced with salvaged brick. The proportional negotiations of façade, which are informed by a simultaneous dialogue with the earlier building and the adjacent building, would allow the building "to read" as new construction. While the

traditional pattern of the balustrade is in keeping with the historic character of the district, Staff encourages the applicants to consider the use of a less ornament more streamlined design as means of further highlighting the reality of the building's new construction (See B-12.).

## **CLARIFICATIONS**

1. Provide designs and dimensions for the ground floor's doors.
2. Clarify the dimensions and treatment of the ground floor's metal storefront.
3. Specify the material of the ground floor's bulkhead.
4. Clarify the design of the ground floor's principle entrance.
5. Clarify the dimensions and the construction of the upper story fenestration.
6. Provide a design of the door accessing the balcony.
7. Clarify the treatment of the framed and recessed brick bands located the ground and upper story fenestration.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-13), Staff does not believe the application impairs in concept form the New Commercial Construction Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. Pending the aforementioned clarifications, introduction of continuities between the southern and northern portions of the ground floor, the possible advance of the northern portion of the ground floor storefront, and the issuance of possible variances, Staff recommends approval of this application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Joia Juzang and Carlos Gant were 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 Ms. Juzang and Mr. Gant if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Gant addressed the clarifications outlined in the Staff Report. He stated that the principle entrance to the ground floor commercial area would feature the door that previously occupied said space. Mr. Gant noted that the door had been salvaged. He also stated that salvaged four-over-four window sashes would be reinstalled on the second story and that the windows would be installed in new casings. Mr. Gant provided a more detailed image of door accessing the proposed gallery. He circulated a design for a simplified gallery treatment. Mr. Gant stated the ground floor entrance accessing the upper story residential space would work in concert with the aluminum storefront and salvaged door. He said that the applicant was amenable to continuing the transom over the remainder of the ground floor's fenestrated bays.

Mr. Ladd thanked Mr. Gant. He asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions for the applicant and her representative.

Mr. Holmes broached the subject of the recessed northern portion of the ground floor storefront. Mr. Gant explained the reasons behind the recess. He cited structural concerns (provision of additional supports for the balcony) as well as the cant of the earlier recessed entry. He explained that the applicant was amenable to advancing the wall.

Mr. Gant provided clarification as to the treatment and articulation of the bricked panels proposed for location above the upper and lower story fenestration. He also stated that more than enough bricks had been salvaged to employ in the brick veneer wall.

Mr. Holmes inquired as the possible use of a lintel over the upper story fenestration. Mr. Gant explained that lintels had been considered, but on account of the recessed panel they had not been employed.

Ms. Coumanis raised concerns regarding the Downtown Development District (DDD) Code, particularly with regard to the balcony and the light pole. Ms. Coumanis spoke to the intent of the DDD Code. She asked Mr. Gant if he was aware of the regulations. Mr. Gant answered yes. Discussion ensued. Mr. Blackwell stated that a predevelopment meeting had been held.

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. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note the following: advance of the northern portion of the ground floor storefront; use of windows salvaged from the earlier building on the upper story; continuation of the ground floor transom across the remainder of said floor's fenestration; reuse of the earlier door at the principle ground floor entrance; use of a door (accessing the stairs) of compatible design to the aforementioned at the door accessing the ground floor; use of a simplified railing on the gallery (all per submitted designs and/or discussion).

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/4/16**