

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
May 1, 2013 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The acting Chair, Harris Oswalt called the meeting to order at 3:00. Devereaux Bemis, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Robert Allen, Nick Holmes III, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, and Jim Wagoner.
Members Absent:
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Sandra Franks, and John Lawler.
2. The minutes of the previous meeting had not been posted and approval was held until they were.
3. It was moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion passed.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: John L. Lawler**
 - a. Property Address: 103 Ryan Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/8/13
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant: Melissa Rankin**
 - a. Property Address: 311 North Conception Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/9/13
 - c. Project: Install a swing set.
3. **Applicant: Harry McCarron**
 - a. Property Address: 554 Eslava Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/9/13
 - c. Project: Build a storage building per the MHDC stock plans. The construction of the storage building is allowed by lot coverage requirements and will meet setback requirements. Repair woodwork on the house and repaint the work and house to match the existing (wood to match in profile, dimension and material and paint per color scheme). The storage shed will be painted the same color as the house.
4. **Applicant: David Koen**
 - a. Property Address: 962 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/9/13
 - c. Project: Repair and replace any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the building per the existing color scheme.
5. **Applicant: George Baird with All Pro Painting and Improvement**
 - a. Property Address: 60 North Reed Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/9/13
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
6. **Applicant: Carol Miller**
 - a. Property Address: 600 Eslava Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/11/13
 - c. Project: Repair any deteriorated woodwork and detailing to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the dwelling per the submitted color scheme.
7. **Applicant: Warren Mason**
 - a. Property Address: 1005 Texas Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/10/13
 - c. Project: Repair rotten eave boards to match existing in profile and dimension.
8. **Applicant: Jennifer Lindall**

- a. Property Address: 1557 Blair Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/15/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and detail. Remove later porch screening. Paint the house per the submitted BLP color scheme: the trim will be Exmoor Hall; detailing will be Monroe Street Green; and the porch ceiling will be Selma Street Grey. Reroof the house with asphalt shingles. Repave the driveway.
- 9. Applicant: Mike Henderson Roofing**
- a. Property Address: 272 Park Terrace
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/17/13
 - c. Project: Repair the roof.
- 10. Applicant: Dennis and Cherie Hansen**
- a. Property Address: 315 Dexter Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/17/13
 - c. Project: Repaint house the existing colors. Repair / replace any rotten woodwork as necessary to match existing in profile, dimension and material.
- 11. Applicant: Wayne Strickland**
- a. Property Address: 266 Roper Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/17/13
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. The trim will be white and the body will be mauve.
- 12. Applicant: Quality Home Repair/Remodeling**
- a. Property Address: 22 South Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/12/13
 - c. Project: Replace rotten boards on the south side of building and repaint the work to match the existing.
- 13. Applicant: Miles Roofing**
- a. Property Address: 167 Roberts Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/18/13
 - c. Project: Reroof and replace rotten decking to match.
- 14. Applicant: Jerry Graham**
- a. Property Address: 309 Marine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/22/13
 - c. Project: Reroof the house. The shingles will match the existing.
- 15. Applicant: Glen Jones**
- a. Property Address: 517 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/19/13
 - c. Project: Remove rotten shutters and replace with wood shutters, either louvred or paneled per the design review guidelines. Paint Bellingrath Green or equivalent.
- 16. Applicant: Daniel Howat**
- a. Property Address: 1747 Hunter Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/22/13
 - c. Project: Install a three foot tall wooden fence enclosing the front lawn.
- 17. Applicant: Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor**
- a. Property Address: 204 Michigan Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/22/13
 - c. Project: Reinstall nine-over-one wooden windows within the side elevations (removing late replacements sashes). The windows will match the lost original windows (as documents by physical evidence and surviving examples).
- 18. Applicant: Coulson Roofing**
- a. Property Address: 251 Saint Anthony Street

- b. Date of Approval: 4/23/13
- c. Project: Reroof the house. The roofing shingles will match the existing.

19. Applicant: Deangelo Parker

- a. Property Address: 953 Savannah Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/18/13
- c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated siding to match the existing in composition, profile, and dimension. Replace the windows, when and where necessary, to match the existing in profile, dimension configuration, and material. Repair detailing to match the existing. Reroof the house (a shotgun) with either asphalt shingles or a metal roofing (either standing seam metal or 5-V crimp metal panels).

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2013-27-CA: 173 South Georgia Avenue

- a. Applicant: J. L. Meaher
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish one fire-damaged and two deteriorated ancillary buildings.
- c. Approved with a recommendation to keep the outbuilding and remove the chain link fence permanently.
Expiration date: May 1, 2014.

2. 2013-28-CA: 301 South Georgia Avenue

- a. Applicant: John Dendy with Dendy and Associates for Jeffrey and Nancy Goodman
- b. Project: Ancillary Construction – Construct an ancillary building.
- c. Approved. Expiration date: May 1, 2014

3. 2013-29-CA: 1014 Old Shell Road

- a. Applicant: Houston Miller for Kristina M. Gates
- b. Project: Reroofing – Reroof a house with metal roofing panels.
- c. Approved: Expiration date: May 1, 2014

4. 2013-30-CA: 1501 Old Shell Road

- a. Applicant: Ben Cummings with Cummings Architecture for McGill-Toolen Catholic High School
- b. Project: Fencing – Remove and install fencing.
- c. Approved: Expiration date: May 1, 2014

5. 2013-31-CA: 106 Ryan Avenue

- a. Applicant: Ben Cummings with Cummings Architecture for Ben and Laura Cummings
- b. Project: Partial Demolition, Restoration, and Renovation – Demolish a later rear addition, restore, renovate, and add to a residential building.
- c. Approved: Expiration date: May 1, 2014

6. 2013-32-CA: 65 North Catherine Street (formerly 1551 Old Shell Road)

- a. Applicant: Harry Bishop for Dr. Philip Butera of Nephrology Associates of Mobile
- b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain lighting fixtures.
- c. Denied

7. 2013-26-CA: 101 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Tracy Bassett with Goodwyn, Mills and Cawood for the Retirement

- b. Project: Systems of Alabama
Fenestration – Replace ground level storefronts and upper story fenestration.
- c. Approved with conditions and as amended.
Expiration date: May1, 2014

8. 2013-33-CA: 457 Conti Street

- a. Applicant: Stephen Carter
- b. Project: Partial Demolition, Renovation, and New Construction – Demolish a rear wing, construct a new rear wing, and renovate the main building.
- c. Approved: Expiration date: May 1, 2014

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Form Based Code: The Board discussed the proposed form based code and concerns were raised about the impact on the ARB. Devereaux Bemis and Bob Allen will investigate.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-27-CA: 173 South Georgia Avenue
Applicant: J. L. Meaher
Received: 4/9/13
Meeting: 5/1/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing (main residence)
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition – Demolish one fire-damaged and two deteriorated ancillary buildings.

BUILDING HISTORY

This building dates from circa 1912. Built by Ethel M. Walford, the Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling features stuccoed walls and a tiled roof. An elegant entry sequence and a gracious gallery also distinguish the residence.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on October 15, 2007. At that time, the Board approved the demolition of a fire-gutted garage and the construction of a new garage. With this application, the applicant proposes the demolition of three ancillary buildings. Those structures are as follows: a fire-damaged back house; the foundation of a hot house; and a second hothouse.
- B. 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 three ancillary buildings proposed for demolition are located on a property distinguished by a contributing main residence. The back house or servant’s quarters is a board and batten structure. It was constructed contemporaneous with the main house. The two hothouses were constructed after the main house.

- 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 three outbuildings are located in the rear portion of this corner lot property (the northeast corner of South Georgia Avenue and Selma Street). Set back from the street, the buildings do not directly engage passerby. While they add to the built density of the lot, the buildings do not define the architectural integrity of the property.
 - 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.
 - 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 back house is one of numerous contemporaneous service-related dependencies surviving in the Oakleigh Garden district. Hot houses survive in greater number. Hot houses of the same design and construction as the extant example are found across the larger region.
 - 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. The owner inherited the property.
 - 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 main house is in the process of being restored and renovated.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1.
 - 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.”

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

1. Demolish a fire-damaged back house.
2. Demolish the foundation of a greenhouse.
3. Demolish a second greenhouse.
4. Remove the debris.
5. Level the site of the aforementioned buildings.
6. Plant sod.
7. Remove and reinstall fencing to facilitate the demolition.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of an ancillary building and greenhouse for the purpose of increasing the uninterrupted green space in the back yard. When reviewing demolition applications, the following criteria are taken into account: the architectural significance of the building; the physical condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the historic district; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

This property is dominated by its principle building, a grand residence influenced by the popular Spanish Colonial Revival style. Four ancillary buildings are located behind the main house. The three ancillary structures proposed for demolition (the fourth is garage constructed on the site of an older garage) are of inferior style and construction than the main residence. The back house possesses the most architectural and historical significance. Better examples of residential ancillary construction from the period in question survive. Hot houses of the same design and construction as the surviving example located on the subject property are found across the region.

The back house suffered extensive damage as a consequence of a fire that consumed an adjacent garage. As per the hothouses, one is in a bad state of structural repair and second survives only in its foundations.

When assessing the effect the proposed demolitions would have on the historic district and the streetscape, the location of the buildings needs to be taken into the account. This property is located at the northeast corner of South Georgia Avenue and Selma Street. The buildings are located to the rear of the house, which faces South Georgia Avenue, and do not directly engage Selma Street.

If granted demolition approval, the applicant would demolish the three buildings; remove the debris; level the site; and plant sod.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to present the application. However, two neighbors did request that the chain link fence not be allowed to be reinstalled following the work on the property.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Tom Karwinski noted for the record that he had worked on a design for the garage, but stated it would have no bearing on his decision. The Board attorney was asked to comment on the fence question. Mr. Lawler stated he believed the

removal of the fence is not intended to be permanent and was being done in order to the necessary work. Therefore, the Board could not require it to remain down.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tom Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued and that the Board recommends the permanent removal of the chain link fence and that the outbuilding be retained.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: May 1, 2014

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-28-CA: 301 South Georgia Avenue
Applicant: John Dendy with John Dendy and Associates Architects for Jeffrey and Nancy Goodman
Received: 4/15/13
Meeting: 5/1/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Ancillary Construction – Construct an ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Colonial Revival House dates from 1937.

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. With this application, the applicants propose the construction of an ancillary building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “An ancillary structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines for applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Construct an ancillary building.
 - a. The building will be located to the rear of the property’s principle dwelling.
 - b. The building will measure 17’ 4” by 22’ in plan.
 - c. The building will rest atop a raised foundation.
 - d. Boxed, framed, and recessed lattice skirting will front and extend around the raised foundation.
 - e. Square sections wooden posts featuring columnar-like bases and capitals and matching pilasters will demarcate the building’s four elevations.
 - f. A hipped roof sheathed with asphalt shingles matching those employed on the house will surmount the building.
 - g. North and south-facing gables will be centered on the hipped roof.
 - h. The North Elevation’s three bays will be faced with wooden siding.

- i. The East Elevation's two open bays feature both vertical and horizontal framing that will secure lattice panels. The horizontal framing will be located at an upper rail-like level.
 - j. Wooden steps will access the building.
2. A patio will be located between the ancillary building and the main house.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. What is the surface of the proposed patio?

STAFF ANALYSIS

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that the appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines as applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building (See B-1). Building setbacks and lot coverage requirements are also taken into account.

The principle building on this property is Colonial Revival in style. The design of the proposed ancillary building takes visual and proportional inspiration from the main residence. Wooden siding and roofing shingles will match those found on the principle dwelling. Roof forms, proportional dimensions, and decorative elements echo those of the main house.

The applicant's representative and Staff have discussed setback and lot coverage requirements with Urban Development. The proposed new construction poses neither setback nor coverage issues.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

John Dendy, architect, and Nancy Goodman, owner were present to discuss the application. Mr. Dendy stated the patio would be an interlocking sandstone paver.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Tom Karwinski suggested that the piers should be more visible with a heavier treatment or through the use of brick.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig 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

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts, 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: May 1, 2014

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-29-CA: 1014 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Houston Miller for Kristina M. Gates
Received: 4/15/13
Meeting: 5/1/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Reroofing – Reroof the house with metal roofing panels.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Arts and Crafts inspired bungalow dates from 1923. The gabled roofed dwelling features a full length front gallery.

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 March 12, 1998. At that time the Old Dauphin Way Review Board approved alterations to the front porch. With this application, the applicant proposes the installation of a metal roof.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Materials should be appropriate to the form and the pitch and the color.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted materials):
 - 1. Remove the existing roof.
 - 2. Install 5-V crimp metal roofing panels. The panels will be gray in color.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of a metal roof. Applications for metal roofs are reviewed on a case by case basis. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s state that a roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Materials should be appropriate to the form, pitch, and color of the roof (See B-1).

The body of this Arts and Crafts informed bungalow is surmounted by a cruciform roof structure. One gable roof surmounts the body of the house. This gable is parallel with the street. A second gable roof, one perpendicular to the street, extends over the front porch.

The roof pitch is not steep.

The color of the proposed roofing panels is historically appropriate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Ordinarily, Staff would not recommend the approval of metal roof on a bungalow. On account of the stylistic simplicity of the building and the configuration of the roof, Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts, 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: May 1, 2014

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-30-CA: 1501 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Ben Cummings with Cummings Architecture for McGill-Toolen Catholic High School
Received: 4/4/13
Meeting: 5/1/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fencing – Remove and install fencing.

BUILDING HISTORY

A number of excellent buildings comprise the campus of McGill-Toolen Catholic High School. The Administration Building, with its large setback and expansive façade, adopts the so-called “institutional Versailles’ approach to site planning and building treatment. The “Versailles Approach,” was a popular design method for organizing school and corporate complexes. It was used throughout the 1950s and 1960s. Designed by architect John Carey, the Administration building is one of several dozen buildings the architect designed for the then Diocese of Alabama from the 1920s-1960s.

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 portion of the McGill-Toolen campus last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on October 21, 2009. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a new Student Center. With this application, the school proposes the removal of chain link fencing located along Catherine Street and the installation of aluminum fencing matching that found elsewhere on the campus.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. Fencing “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and material should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Remove chain link fencing.
 - 2. Install a six foot high aluminum fencing of the same design as that installed and approved on other parts of the campus.
 - 3. The fencing will be located atop the location of the aforementioned fencing and will extend along the western side of the building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application involves the installation of fencing. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that fencing should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and material should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.

The proposed aluminum fencing is of the same design as existing fencing found elsewhere on the McGill-Toolen Campus. Most recently approved for installation on either side of North Lafayette Street (at 1454 Dauphin Street and 1413 Old Shell Road), this same fencing would replace the existing chain link that extends along the western portion of the subject property. Adjacent to North Catherine Street, the proposed fencing would not only match fencing installed on other properties of the campus, but also remove non-conforming fencing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ben Cummings was present to discuss the application. He explained that there would be two sliding vehicular gates and one swinging pedestrian gates.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. The Board clarified the type of gates and noted the removal of the inappropriate chain link fence.

FINDING OF FACT

Tom Karwinski moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending fact

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tom Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts, 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: May 1, 2014

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-31-CA: 106 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: Ben and Laura Cummings
Received: 4/15/13
Meeting: 5/1/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: ~~Oakleigh~~ Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Restoration and Renovation – Restore, renovate, demolish a portion, and enlarge a residential building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This single-story residence dates from 1922. As initially constructed, the house constituted an Arts and Crafts bungalow. During the middle third of the 20th Century the house was partially remodeled and received an icing of Colonial Revival details. Several additions and alterations were made. Porches were enclosed and the main entrance was altered.

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/applicants propose the restoration and renovation of the principle dwelling.
- 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. This contributing property is located within the Ashland Place Historic District. A much modified Arts and Crafts bungalow distinguishes the property. Only a later rear addition is proposed for demolition.
 - 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 house is a contributing building. The later side-rear addition that is proposed for demolition is not of the same architectural quality as the main house and does not engage the street.
- 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.
- 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 addition is one of many later contemporaneous rear extensions that were added to houses in and beyond the historic districts.
- 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. The archaeological record that would be affected by the proposed addition has already been disturbed by earlier interventions.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The property is in the process of being acquired by the applicants.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. The applicants have considered nothing other than restoring and renovating the house for residential use.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. The property is in process of being acquired by the applicant.
- 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 Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:

1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize 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.”

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 porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
4. “The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with general character of the building.”
5. “The removal of historic materials and alteration of the features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.”
6. “Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.”
7. “Original or historic roof forms should be maintained.”
8. Fencing “should complement the building and not detract from it.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. West Elevation (Façade).
 - a. Remove the later columns and roof structure surmounting the existing porch stoop.
 - b. Construct antepodia-like cheeks to either side of the front steps. The cheeks will feature a concrete cap. An upper cheek will be constructed atop the existing stoop.
 - c. Construct a new front porch entrance atop the existing stoop.
 - i. The existing stoop will be heightened by way of an upper cheek (see C-1-a).
 - ii. Two pairs of square section columnar supports will support the porches shed roof. The beam treatment and moldings will match those found elsewhere on the building.
 - iii. The pitch of the shed will continue the downward pitch of the existing roof slop. The composite roofing shingles will match those to be installed on the body of the house.
 - d. Remove the existing front door.
 - e. Install a new front door. The Arts and Crafts-inspired door will feature a large central glass panel with narrower glazed surrounding lights.
 - f. Remove the windows that infill the enclosed southwest corner’s screened porch. Said windows will be salvaged and reused elsewhere on the house.
 - g. Install a modified wheatsheath wooden balustrade in the re-opened porch bays. Wood framing will extend between the balustrade’s top rail and the soffit of the porch bay. Metal porch screening will be installed behind the railing.
 - h. Construct wooden awnings over the window and screened porch bays flanking the front entrance.
 - i. The awnings will be supported by brackets matching those found elsewhere on the dwelling.
 - ii. The awnings will use metal roofing panels.
 - i. Remove the section of wall infilling the façade’s north oriented porch. If possible, salvage and reuse the wooden sash windows located therein.
 - j. Install an aluminum storefront window system in the aforementioned reclaimed bay.

2. North Elevation
 - a. Remove the sections of wall infilling the porch's North Elevation. If possible, salvage and reuse the window wooden sash windows located therein.
 - b. Install aluminum storefront windows in the aforementioned bays.
 - c. Remove a pair of sash windows.
 - d. Replace the aforementioned window units with a wooden casement type window pairing.
 - e. The North Elevation of the proposed rear addition will be constructed and detailed as follows:
 - i. The addition will rest atop a foundation matching that supporting the main house.
 - ii. The siding will match that sheathing body of the house with respect to profile and dimension.
 - iii. Wooden brackets, rafter tails, and louvered vent will match those found on the body of the house.
 - iv. The addition will take the form of a (from west to east) hyphen-like connector abutting a gabled and shed roof block.
 - v. Salvaged casement will be employed in the hyphen. Beaded board siding will extend in a dado-like manner beneath the aforementioned windows.
 - vi. Two six-over-six wooden windows will be located beneath the additions north-south oriented gable. Wooden awnings matching those installed on the façade will extend over the aforementioned windows.
3. East Elevation
 - a. Salvage and reuse wooden windows, rafters, and brackets.
 - b. Remove a few remaining sections of slate roofing shingles. Install composite roofing shingles matching those proposed to be installed elsewhere on the house.
 - c. Remove, and if possible salvage, the wooden window and door infilling the north-facing porch.
 - d. Install aluminum storefront units matching those installed elsewhere on the reconfigured former porch (See the Scope of Work for the North Elevation for mention of the porch).
 - e. Remove the porch's east-facing steps.
 - f. Construct a new flight of steps.
 - g. The East Elevation of the addition outlined in (C-2-c) will not feature fenestration.
 - h. Remove a rear chimney stack. The chimney stack rises up through the roof and does not engage an exterior wall.
 - i. A south-facing later addition will be demolished.
 - j. A new south-facing addition will be constructed.
 - i. The addition will take the form of a shed roofed extension of the existing roof.
 - ii. The roof pitch will continue uninterrupted.
 - iii. The foundation treatment will match the existing.
 - iv. The siding will match the existing in profile and dimension.
 - v. Brackets will match the existing.
 - vi. The roofing shingles will match that sheathing the body of the house.
4. South Elevation
 - a. The new center gable roofed portion of the rear addition will feature two six-over-six wooden sash windows. Wooden awnings matching those to be constructed elsewhere on the house extend over the windows.

- b. A wooden awning will extend over the doorway accessing the addition's hyphen-like connector.
- c. A flight of brick steps will access the aforementioned door.
- d. The steps will access a brick patio.
- e. Remove brackets and alter the existing roof located off the body of the main house.
- f. Construct second gable and connecting cricket over the aforementioned areas.
- g. Construct a wooden awning over the paired windows located beneath the aforementioned gable.
- h. Remove the windows and siding infilled the enclosed porch's South Elevation.
- i. Install the same modified wheatstheaf railing and porch screening as described in the Scope of Work for the West Elevation.
- j. A wooden awning to match those installed elsewhere on the building will extend over the reopened porch bay.
 - 2. Remove a pine tree and eucalyptus tree.
 - 3. Remove paved surfaces from the rear of the lot.
 - 4. Demolish (relocate if possible) a storage shed/play house.
 - 5. Construct a wooden fence to either side of the house.
- i. The fencing will not extend beyond the front plane of the house.
- ii. With the exception of the bay featuring a double gate, the sections of fencing will adopt the form of a downward curve.
- iii. The fencing will extend between brick piers.
- iv. Two existing brick piers will serve as guides for the construction of additional piers.
- v. The northernmost fencing will feature a pedestrian entrance.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves restoration and renovation of a contributing dwelling. The original Arts and Crafts design was modified by later alterations and additions. The proposed restoration and renovation would entail the removal of later additions and alterations, the restoration and introduction of period elements, and the construction of rear additions.

The restoration and renovation of the West Elevation (façade) calls for the following: the removal and replacement of a front entrance; the installation of new door; construction of wooden awnings; the reclamation of two infilled porches. The existing distyle configuration sheltering the front door is a later Colonial Revival alteration. While not a documented feature, the proposed design would recapture the Arts and Crafts character that defines the building's historic character and is appropriate to the period of construction (See B-2-5). The southwest corner porch was infilled at an early date (See B-2-6). The recessed exterior fenestration, surviving interior fenestration, and ceiling heights evidence the existence of the porch (See B-2-6). The windows found within the infilled porch bays would be salvaged and reused elsewhere on the house. The proposed railing and porch screening is in keeping with the style and period of the house. As per the wooden awnings, Staff believes that their placement to either side of the main entrance would detract from the rhythmic sequence of roofing forms and fenestrated bays that characterize the façade. Staff does not object to the construction of the wooden awnings on remaining elevations. The façade's north-facing porch was also infilled at a later date. The application calls for the removal of later mural and fenestrated infill (possible salvage and reuse of the later) and installation of aluminum storefront units. Not only would the storefront units allow this area to "read" as a porch, but they would also, by virtue of their manufacture and materials, differentiate old and new work.

The work on the North (side) Elevation calls for the following: the removal and replacement of porch infill; the alteration of fenestration; and the construction of an addition. The removal and the replacement of porch fenestration are addressed above. With the exception of the porch infill, only one other fenestrated bay is proposed for removal. A pair of sash windows (short kitchen variety) would be replaced by salvaged casement window. In accord with Design Review Guidelines, the size and placement of new window would be compatible with general character of the building (See B-2-4). Regarding the new construction, the proposed addition on its North and South Elevation is three part in configuration. Taking the form of a hyphen, a block, and a shed, the compartmentalization and roof structures make new work differentiated from the historic core of the building (See B-2-1). Beyond the hyphen-like bay with its beaded siding the body and rear portion of the addition would employ roof forms, siding profiles, window awnings, louvered vents, and brackets in such a ways as to engender visual and architectural continuity.

The East Elevation of the proposed addition does not feature fenestration. The face of the house is at the rear elevation and not visible from either street or the adjoining lots. Staff does not believe the absence of fenestration will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district.

The restoration and alteration of the South Elevation entails the following: the previously discussed removal of porch infill; the alteration of a roof form; the previously discussed construction of awnings; the previously discussed construction of a rear addition; the previously discussed removal of porch infill; the demolition of later side/rear addition; and the construction of new side rear wing. The removal of porch infill, the construction of a railing, the installation of screening, and the construction of awnings have been discussed. With regard to the proposed roof alterations, the Design Review Guidelines state that historic roof forms should be maintained (See B-2-7). Lower in pitch than the surrounding roof forms, the shed-roof proposed for alteration does not face the street. Alterations to non-character defining roof forms have been approved by the Board on numerous occasions. The proposed gable-cricketer-gable configuration is in keeping with period and would facilitate the construction of the new side addition. The construction of the aforementioned addition would entail the demolition of a later sleeping porch-like addition. When reviewing demolitions, the following criteria are taken into account: the architectural significance of the building; the physical condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the historic district; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment. The sleeping porch side-rear addition is neither of the same quality design, nor construction as the main house. Minimally visible from the public view, the addition does not engage the streetscape (See B-1). The proposed new side/rear wing would take the form of a shed roofed extension of the houses east-west gable. The roof pitch would continue downward over the addition. Salvaged windows would be employed. The foundation treatment, siding profiles, and rafter treatment would match those found on the body of the house. The fenestration of previously mentioned rear wing matches that employed elsewhere on the addition.

With regard to the proposed fencing, the design, location, height, and materials of the sections meets the standards outlined in the Design Review Guidelines. The fence complements the design of the house (SeeB-2-8). Additional fence posts will match the existing.

Two trees will be removed. Neither the pine tree nor the eucalyptus tree is considered heritage trees. Later paving will be removed.

A storage shed/play house is proposed for either relocation to another site or demolition. The aforementioned ancillary building is not a character defining component of this property (See B-1).

REQUESTS/CLARIFICATIONS

1. Provide a rendering of the proposed treatment of the north-facing porch's East Elevation.
2. What type material will pave the proposed courtyard?

3. What type of metal roofing will be used to roof the wooden awnings?
4. What is the color of the proposed storefront units proposed for the north-facing porch?
5. Why is the rear chimney stack being removed?

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application as a whole will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. With the exception of the construction of awnings on the West Elevation's, Staff recommends approval of this application upon receipt of the aforementioned clarifications.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ben Cummings was present to discuss the application. He explained an alteration to the awning roof material from the metal to a board and batten Hardiplank type material. The Cummings felt the awnings were necessary for protection from rain since they were opening the right bay as a screened porch. He stated there was evidence of a metal bracket for an awning on the left side of the house. The storefront bays will be a dark bronze. The chimney will be removed in order to remove the fireplace in the kitchen to provide more room. The patio will be concrete with a brick border.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. It was suggested that the fan light over the door be removed.

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 fact that the roof material of the awnings would be the board and batten synthetic wood and the name of the district be corrected to Ashland Place.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Steve Stone 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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: May 1, 2014

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-32-CA: 65 North Catherine Street
Applicant: Harry Bishop for Dr. Philip Butera of Nephrology Associates of Mobile
Received: 4/15/13
Meeting: 5/1/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-1
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain lighting fixtures.

BUILDING HISTORY

This non-contributing building was constructed in 2012.

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 May 2, 2012. At that time, the Board approved the installation of signage.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Proposed lighting should be designed to avoid invading surrounding areas.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted materials):
 - 1. Retain lighting fixtures.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the retention of unauthorized lighting. The Design Review Guidelines state that proposed lighting should be designed to avoid invading surrounding areas (B-1). The application appears before the Board as a result of a 311 related complaint.

Seven lighting fixtures were installed to the west (rear) and south (side) of this building. The total number of fixtures is seven. Four of the fixtures are of a more traditional design. Three of the fixtures are more contemporary in appearance.

Neither design impairs the historic integrity of the surrounding district; however due to the complaints of surrounding property owners, Staff suggests that the applicants consider removing and relocating more traditional light fixture (whose light has caused concern) and install the more modern down lights.

In order to minimize light spill over, Urban Development recommends the use of light diffusing shields located within the four traditional conical globe lights as a means of mitigating the spread of light onto adjacent residential properties.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural and the historical character of the surrounding district. Pending the use of light diffusing shields, Staff recommends approval on this application. In addition to or as an alternative to the diffuser, Staff suggests the applicant relocate the traditional fixtures to other areas of the property and install down light fixtures in their locations.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Harry Bishop was present to discuss the application. He explained that he had a light meter reading done on the property and the it was ½ of one foot candle. He asked for a specification on how much light was allowed.

Megan Jorns, a neighbor, spoke about how bright the light was and that it impossible for them to enjoy their back yard with the bright lights. She also stated she believes that a commercial enterprise in a residential neighborhood required special scrutiny.

Byron Jorns, a neighbor and civil engineer, stated he had worked on numerous commercial projects and lighting spillover did not have to be a problem. He suggested a reduction in lighting and planting of vegetation that would eventually obscure the problems. He also showed to photographs: one was of the light at night; the other was of his own rather prominent shadow on his home.

George Swann presented several other pictures and felt the down lights contained the light better than the acorn fixtures. He suggested that an engineer be consulted.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. To a statement made by the applicant, Craig Roberts observed that the lighting was obviously a problem or the neighbors would not have complained. Jim Wagoner noted the height of the fixtures was excessive and were not appropriate for the neighborhood or the lamps atop the tall poles. Several members of the Board suggested the participation of a landscape architect or an engineer who understood lighting.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig 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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as presented, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be denied.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-26-CA: 101 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Tracy Bassett and Carrie Day with Goodwyn, Mills and Cawood for the Retirement Systems of Alabama
Received: initial, 3/29/13; revised, 4/22/13
Meeting: 5/1/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Fenestration – Replace ground level storefronts and upper story fenestration.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Van Antwerp Building is Mobile’s first skyscraper. The building was built between 1904 and 1906 according to the designs of George B. Rogers. The three part division of the building demarcated by the commercial ground floor mezzanine, the office stack above, and the cornice-capped (removed) utility floor is indicative of Rogers’ awareness of contemporary theories on the design of tall office buildings.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on April 17, 2013. At that time, the applicant’s representatives withdrew an application involving the replacement of fenestration. The applicant’s representatives return to the Board with additional supplemental materials that were requested at the meeting.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, The National Park Services’ Guide to Planning Successful Rehabilitation Projects, and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Deteriorated features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of the deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and where possible, materials.”
 - 2. Replacements windows on the primary, street-facing or any highly visible portions elevations that are part of the base of high-rise buildings must match the historic windows in all their details and materials.
 - 3. Replacements on the primary, street-facing or highly visible elevations of tall buildings above the base must match the historic windows in size, design and all details that can be perceived from ground level.

4. “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.”
5. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible with the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans and supplemental materials):

1. Replace the glass in the ground floor’s storefront units. The decorative iron framing and dividers will be repaired and reinstated. The framing will be painted beige in color.
2. Replace the building’s wooden windows with aluminum clad wood replacement windows. The windows will match the existing in profile and dimension. The contours of the extruded form will be replicated. The windows will be beige in color.
3. Square out the southwest corner of the building.
4. Alter fenestration on the South and West Elevations.
5. Install the mechanisms for temporary flooding proofing measures.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the replacement of windows on an early 20th Century skyscraper. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that “Deteriorated features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of the deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and where possible, materials (See B-1).

In a Guide Planning Successful Rehabilitation Projects, the National Parks Service specifically addresses the replacement of deteriorated wooden windows located on skyscrapers. Replacement windows that are part of the base of high-rise buildings must match the historic windows in all their details and materials (See B-2). Replacements on those floors above the base must match the historic windows in size, design and all details that can be perceived from ground level (See B-3). The proposed window scheme observes the National Parks Service’s policy.

The Design Review Guidelines state that original windows openings should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing. Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible with the existing (See B 2-3). The proposed ground floor and mezzanine/storefront treatment will remain the same. The historic metal frames and dividers will remain. The glass will be replaced. The proposed aluminum clad wooden windows proposed for the upper floors will match the existing in light configuration, extrusions, profile, profile, and design.

Following the discussion at the previous meeting, Staff contacted the Alabama Historical Commission (AHC) regarding this application. The AHC’s National Register Coordinator stated that the proposed alterations to the fenestration would not result in either a change in historical status or a delisting provided the new windows match exactly the existing windows per the NPS regulations.

The window locations on the street-facing North and East Elevations will remain the same. Fenestration changes will occur on the South and West Elevations. Alterations are a consequence to the squaring out of the building’s and the reworking of the interior layout. The Elevation and plan drawings are schematic on account the working nature of the plans. Staff realizes the location of the fenestration might change.

The emergency water preventing devices will only be in place during instances of extreme inclement weather. They will not engage the building neither will there be any alterations to the building to accommodate the barriers.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tracy Bassett was present to discuss the application. He explained the flood protection is angled to the building and that when needed stainless steel tubes would be placed on the sidewalk and connected to the building to create a temporary coffer dam. These will only be at the doors and only during hurricanes. The anchoring system with engineered connectors will be the only visible portion of the system. The storefront appliqué will be retained and restored with the glass to be installed from the interior if possible. Otherwise the appliqué will be removed and reinstalled.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. During the Board discussion, Mr. Karwinski asked to see the detailed drawings of the current and proposed windows. The subject of the fire escapes came up and during the discussion the owner's representatives stated they would like to remove them. Several Board members agreed that they were not integral to the historic character of the building and the applicant asked to amend the request to include removal of the fire escapes.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig 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 include the removal of the fire escapes.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig 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 upon the submission of drawings showing the current windows and the proposed.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: May 1, 2014

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-33-CA: 457 Conti Street
Applicant: Stephen Carter
Received: 4/12/13
Meeting: 5/1/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Restoration, Renovation, Partial Demolition, and New Construction.
Conflict of Interest Steve Stone as the architect on the project recused himself and left the room.

BUILDING HISTORY

This building dates from 1960. Resembling a one-story side hall with wing house, the building was constructed using salvaged 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 has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicant proposes the demolition of the building’s rear wing and the construction of a new rear wing.
- 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. This building is a non-contributing structure located within the Church Street East Historic District.
 - ii. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. Traditional in style and constructed of salvaged materials, the front portion of the building adds to the built density and visual appearance of the historic district. The front portion of the building is not proposed for demolition. The rear portion, which is proposed for demolition, does not impact the streetscape.

- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 - 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced and procured.
- 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. A number of tradition informed infill buildings dating from the 1950s and 1960s are located in Mobile’s easternmost historic districts. More examples are found in Mobile’s western suburbs.
- 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 wing is allowed and the construction of the new wing approved, the building will be converted to residential use. Construction of the present rear addition already disturbed the archaeological record of the rear portion of the property.
- 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 is in the process of rezoning the property for residential redevelopment. The proposed demolition is the first phase of the rehabilitation of the building and revitalization of the property.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. After considering business and other related uses, the owner applicant decided to convert the building to residential use.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The larger 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 material 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.

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 window openings 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. The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
4. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
5. “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.”
6. With regard to contributing building “new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, and architectural features to protect the historic character of the building.”
7. Fencing “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and material should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Reinstall repainted and repaired iron porch railings and fencing sections.
2. Scrape, clean, prime, and paint existing ironwork.
3. Install a new standing seam metal roof and flashing over the front porch.
4. Reroof the body of the original building with architectural shingles.
5. Clean the masonry walls. Repoint the brickwork with the appropriate type of mortar.
6. Repair, and when necessary, replace deteriorated wooden windows. The work will match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the windows and the casings.
7. Repair, and when necessary, replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing with regard to profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the woodwork.
8. Convert the West Elevation’s window bay into a door. The reconfigured bay will feature a glazed and paneled door with a surmounting transom.
9. Two six-over-six wooden windows to be constructed to either side of the aforementioned door. The windows will match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
10. Relocate and consolidate service panels to the West Elevation.
11. The main building’s slightly recessed eastern wing will receive a new flight of concrete steps and landing. Both the treads of stairs will feature a concrete caps matching the cap of the landing. An iron railing will enclose the steps and landing
12. Demolish the later building’s later rear addition.
13. Construct a new rear wing.
 - a. The new rear wing will be faced with St. Joe brick (Plantation Blend).
 - b. The wooden fenestration, trim, and detailing will be Dover White (Sherwin Williams) in color.
 - c. The addition will be two-story in height.
 - d. A double shouldered beltcourse extending around the whole of the rear addition will demarcate the transition from the first and second stories.
 - e. The building will rest atop a concrete slab foundation.
 - f. The hipped roof will be sheathed in architectural shingles. Said shingles will match those proposed for original portion of the existing building. A ridge vent will surmount the roof. A wooden architrave and cornice will extend around the addition.

- g. The height of the addition is lower than the building's principal roof.
 - h. The addition will feature aluminum clad six-over-six windows and glazed and paneled wooden doors. The windows (and doors) will feature brick lintels and concrete sills.
 - i. The rear wing's West Elevation will feature five fenestrated bays on both the first and second floor levels. The central bay of the aforementioned fenestration will be a door.
 - j. The West Elevation's second story door will be accessed by painted steel balcony. A flight of stairs featuring an intermediate landing will allow for ingress and egress from the balcony. The balcony will extend between the two doors proposed for the West Elevation (See B-8 and B-12-g). The railing will be picket in type.
 - k. The rear wing's South Elevation will feature blind window bays. The fields of the aforementioned fenestration will be filled with framed recessed brick panels.
 - l. The rear wing's East Elevation will feature two six over six windows on both the first and second floors.
 - m. The rear wing's North Elevation will feature a glazed and paneled door on the first floor and a single six-over-six window on the second floor.
14. Construct a brick wall (the brick will be the same as that proposed for the addition).
- a. The various sections of wall (See the site plan) will be six feet in height.
 - b. Portions of the wall will feature upper and lower horizontal shoulder courses and intermediate piers.
 - c. No section of the wall will extend beyond the front plan of the house.
15. Remove trees located to the west of the building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the in kind repair/replacement of existing features, the demolition of a rear wing, the construction of new wing, and the construction of a wall.

All in kind repair and replacement work on the front portion of this non-contributing building will match the existing. In accord with the design, brickwork will be repointed with an appropriate mortar (See B-2-1). Where windows cannot be repaired, they will be replaced to match the existing in type, size, and configuration (See B-2-2). Salvaged historic materials in the form of iron railings and fencing will be reinstalled on the property (See B-2-4). The street-facing roof forms will not altered (See B-2-5).

When reviewing demolition applications, the following criteria are taken into account: the architectural significance of the building; the physical condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the historic district; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment. This building is a non-contributing building dating from 1960. Only the flat-roofed rear wing is proposed for demolition. The more historically attuned street-facing portion of the building will be repaired and renovated. The rear wing does not possess architectural integrity and structural quality as the front portion of the building. The rear wing is not a good state of structural repair. Barely visible from the public view, the rear wing of this non-contributing building does not factor into the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district (See B-1).

As per the proposed rear wing and inner lot wall, the proposed design complements the design of the more historically attuned front portion of the principle building. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standard's for additions to historic buildings, this addition to a non-contributing structure is differentiated from the old and compatible with the massing, size, and architectural of the existing (See B-2-6)

Regarding the inner lot fencing, the proposed wall complements the building and does not detract from it (See B-2-7).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Stephen Carter was present to discuss the application. Mr. Carter noted that he purchased the property to keep it from being demolished.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig 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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig 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: May 1, 2014