

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cartledge Blackwell, MHDC Assistant Director, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Harris Oswalt, Robert Allen, John Ruzic, Catarina Echols, Jim Wagoner, and Nicholas Holmes III.
Members Absent: Robert Brown, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, and David Barr.
Staff Members Present: Cartledge W. Blackwell, Florence Kessler, Bridget Daniel, and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Holmes motioned to approve the minutes from the April 19, 2017 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.
3. Mr. Wagoner inquired into the renewal of COA at 403 Conti Street which was previously issued. Mr. Blackwell explained the Certificate was issued two years prior, however the design had remained the same so the COA was renewed, an action authorized by the midmonth resolutions. Mr. Ruzic questioned if a COA was issued for three (3) feet high aluminum picket fence was within the Guidelines and if an image was provided. Mr. Blackwell replied the image provided for staff matched was within the character of the district and represented by other examples. Mr. Oswalt asked there were anymore questions, comments or concerns. Mr. Allen noted the number of days and midmonths which had transpired during the calendar year. Mr. Holmes moved to approve the COA's as granted by staff. Mr. Wagoner seconded. The motion was approved. Mr. Allen voted in opposition.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Kelly Smith**
 - a. Property Address: 1658 Laurel Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/12/2017
 - c. Project: Repaint exterior.
2. **Applicant: Mark Perea of Skyline Home Improvements Inc.**
 - a. Property Address: 1751 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/13/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof the building with architectural shingles in slate gray.
3. **Applicant: David Buchannan**
 - a. Property Address: 252 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/13/2017
 - c. Project: Install a 3' aluminum fence around the south and east perimeter sides of lot. Install a vegetative buffer on same sides. Landscape and repave lot.
4. **Applicant: Robert DeMouy of DeMouy General Contracting Inc.**
 - a. Property Address: 412 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/17/2017
 - c. Project: Replace one door to match existing. Replace three front, two sides, and five rear, wood balcony decks to match existing in profile dimension, and material. Repaint to match.

5. **Applicant: Mari Muscat**
 - a. Property Address: 56 S. Hallett Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/19/2017
 - c. Project: Remove and replace existing fencing around the back half of the house to match existing. Replace rotten back wall of garden shed in the back yard. Replace all rotten balusters on front porch railing with custom to match in profile, material and dimension. Exterior paint for entire structure including the back garden shed in approved colors. Add outer shutters to façade of home in the correct proportion to the existing windows. Replace existing concrete driveway entrance from the sidewalk to the street. Replace existing wood steps at front entrance with concrete steps finished in such a way to keep original historic character of the home.
6. **Applicant: Roger Franklin**
 - a. Property Address: 205 Marine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/20/2017
 - c. Project: Landscape front yard to include gravel path and water feature. Brick pavers will be installed from sidewalk to front door.
7. **Applicant: Elique Guerra**
 - a. Property Address: 1104 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/20/2017
 - c. Project: Construct a 6' wooden dog-eared fence.
8. **Applicant: Chris Menke**
 - a. Property Address: 208 Dexter Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/21/2017
 - c. Project: Reconstruct a balustrade using MHDC stock design and similar turned post which are period appropriate. Paint to match existing color scheme.
9. **Applicant: Duane Myers**
 - a. Property Address: 1052 New St. Francis
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/24/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof dwelling with architectural shingles in weatherwood. Replicate kneebrace located on West gable in East gable. Construct and install four perkins to surmount eaves on each gable to be spaced equidistant.
10. **Applicant: Elizabeth Rossi**
 - a. Property Address: 1157 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/24/2017
 - c. Project: Repaint Color - Hazy Purple Color. Repair and replace damaged wood siding as needed with matching existing siding, Profile, & Dimension. Reglaze Windows as necessary. Replace existing damaged Lattice skirting with square lattice, set back from face of brick piers.
11. **Applicant: Fred South of Renovations by Fred South LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 17 S. Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/24/2017
 - c. Project: Remove broke concrete tile porch deck (later) and replace with tongue and groove wood.
12. **Applicant: Tim Maness**
 - a. Property Address: 258 Michigan Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/25/2017
 - c. Project: Repaint exterior of residence in the following color scheme:
Body: Rare Grey
Trim: Ivory
Shutters, Door, Porch Deck: Pewter Green

13. Applicant: Gale Slaton

- a. Property Address: 153 Levert Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 4/25/2017
- c. Project: Install black iron handrails on either side of porch steps.

14. Applicant: Duane Myers

- a. Property Address: 1052 New St. Francis
- b. Date of Approval: 4/25/2017
- c. Project: Reroof dwelling with architectural shingles in wetherwood. Replicate kneebrace located on West gable in East gable. Construct and install four perlines to surmount eaves on each gable to be spaced equidistant.

15. Applicant: Julianne McBay

- a. Property Address: 105 S. Ann Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/25/2017
- c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood to match existing in dimension, profile and material where only necessary. Repaint to match existing.

16. Applicant: Atlantic Coast Conservancy

- a. Property Address: 403 Conti Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/25/2017
- c. Project: This COA updates that on 9/16/15. Construct a gallery, install iron gates, and change front doors.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2017-22-CA: 252 West Street

- a. Applicant: Andrew Dooley of Andrew Dooley Design Associates on behalf of Vivian Dooley
- b. Project: Addition– Construct a rear addition to a contributing single family residence.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2017-23-CA: 69 S. Ann Street

- a. Applicant: Joey Pittman
- b. Project: New Construction – Construct a single family residence.

APPROVED AS AMEMNDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2017-21-CA: 8 LeMoyne Place

- a. Applicant: David Daughenbaugh with the City of Mobile
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish an extremely deteriorated single family residence.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion – Rules and Regulations

- a. Mr. Blackwell noted that the Board would be discussing Rules and Regulations at the next meeting of the Architectural Review Board. Said meeting will take places on June 7th, 2017.
- b. Hardcopies of Mobile’s Historic District’s Design Review Guidelines were given to each Board member.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-22-CA: 252 West Street

Applicant: Andrew Dooley of Andrew Dooley Design Associates on behalf of Vivian Dooley

Received: 5/1/2017

Meeting: 5/17/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: R-1

Project: Addition- Construct a rear addition to a single family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Mobile firm of Holmes and Hutchisson (Nicholas H. Holmes, I, and C. L. Hutchisson, I) was responsible for the design of this 20th Century Picturesque dwelling. Completed in 1930, the house features fine Arts and Crafts informed detailing within and without stuccoed walls.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review calls for the construction of an addition off the rear elevation. Said addition is largely outside of the public view.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material and/or character of the property, neighborhood and environment.”
 - 2. “Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.”
 - 3. “Design the building components (roof, foundation, doors and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
 - 4. “Maintain the relationship of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building.”
 - 5. “Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color and/or wall plane.”
 - 6. “Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.”
 - 7. “Size, place and space a window for an addition to be in character with the original historic building.”
 - 8. “Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.”

9. “Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze boards, moldings or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.”
10. “Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.”

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

1. Construct a 9’6” x 21’7” rear addition.
 - a. A framed lattice foundation will be employed.
 - b. The addition’s walls will be clad in cedar lap siding.
 - c. Corbels and rafter tails will match those found on the main residence.
 - d. Hipped and shed roofs will surmount the addition.
 - e. Roof forms will be sheathed in architectural shingles that will match those employed on the main residence.
 - f. South (side) Elevation
 1. A pair of pilasters will differentiate the new addition from the existing dwelling.
 2. A repurposed steel casement window will be centrally located and feature a fixed vertical board shutter to one side.
 3. Another pair of pilasters will punctuate the westernmost portion.
 - g. North (side) Elevation
 1. A repurposed steel casement window will be centered on the eastern portion of the elevation.
 2. An umbrage featuring a square section porch post will inform the western portion of the elevation.
 - h. West (rear) Elevation
 1. The northern portion will feature a shed roof surmounted by rafter tails.
 2. A wooden columnar post will inform the northernmost end.
 3. A rear entrance will be accessed by a flight of wooden steps.
 4. The aforementioned entrance will employ a repurposed single paned glazed French door and flanked by a repurposed steel casement window to one side of the same.
 5. The southern portion will be surmounted by a hipped roof.
 6. Two pairs of 8” pilasters will flank a multi-light aluminum clad casement windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a rear addition onto a contributing residential building. The changes informing this scope of work are minimally visible from the public view on account of the size of the lot, situation of the dwelling on the lot, elevation of the proposed changes, and composition of the house. More specifically to the placement or location of the proposed work, the Design Review Guidelines state that additions should be situated either on the rear or to the side of existing fabric whenever possible. The proposed addition would be located to the rear of the dwelling (See B-2.).

The Design Review Guidelines state that additions and their components should be compatible with those of the building, property, and environs (See B 1 & 3.). Compatibility can be achieved in many ways. While proposed addition’s foundation would be differentiated in composition (latticed as opposed to stucco watertable), it would compatible in terms of its elevation. Said addition would thus “read” as a later, albeit sensitive, intervention to historic fabric (See B-6.). Existing windows would be repurposed

and new windows would match in light configuration and profile (See B-7). New windows and old windows would be so placed as to harmonize with the main dwelling in terms of solid-to-void ratio(s), as well as within the new construction (See B-4.). In a manner similar to the foundation treatment, the addition's lap siding would serve to differentiate the new from the original dwelling (See B-5), but in respectful manner. Additionally, siding similar to that proposed for the new construction is employed on the second-story's dormers so there would exist yet another material similarity between that which is old and that which new. Upper level ornamentation and details such as fascias and rafters would match that found elsewhere on the house (See B-8.). As to the overall roof forms, hipped and shed roofs are both found on the main residence. (See B 9 & 10.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-10.), Staff does not believe this application would impair either the architectural or historical character of the building or district. Staff recommends the approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Andrew Dooley, the owner's representative, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. John Ruzic recused himself from discussion.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Dooley and asked him as the applicant's representative if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Dooley stated that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full, but went on to mention original documentation depicting a sleeping porch off the rear of the residence. Mr. Dooley stated that he extended the hip roof off the rear and made the addition look like an enclosed sun porch.

It was noted that Mr. Holmes' grandfather designed the house.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Dooley.

Mr. Allen asked Mr. Dooley the reasoning of having a fixed partial shutter on the proposed addition's South elevation. Mr. Dooley responded that the window is a repurposed window from the original structure, and his intention was for the south elevation to possess matching windows. He further explained that since the window is located off center on the addition, a period appropriate shutter was utilized to convey symmetry, as well as further the feel of a sleeping porch. Mr. Allen listened to Mr. Dooley's account and noted that while no other devices like the subject shutter were found on the building, the component would be minimally visible.

Mr. Wagoner asked for clarification on the composition of the windows of the proposed addition. Mr. Dooley noted that existing steel windows would be repurposed as the dominant fenestration type and (on the rear elevation) a new aluminum clad window with narrow sight lines and simulated divided lights would be employed. The latter would be painted bronzes to mimic the existing. Mr. Wagoner asked for further interpretation of the "simulated divided light" window. Mr. Dooley and Mr. Blackwell further explained that the window to have a dimensioned inner and outer grill with spacer in between.

Mr. Oswalt asked Mr. Blackwell if staff had received any feedback on the project. Mr. Blackwell stated staff had received comments from two constituents on why the addition was in wood and not stucco to match the existing house. Those concerns were addressed when aforementioned constituents were told original documented plans had called for a sleeping porch off the rear elevation. No other questions ensued from the Board.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Holmes moved that, based upon the facts as written 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 18, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-23-CA: 69 S. Ann Street

Applicant: Joey Pittman

Received: 4/28/17

Meeting: 5/17/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way

Classification: Non-Contributing

Zoning: R-1

Project: New Construction – Construct a single family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

A residential building once stood on this currently empty lot.

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 June 18, 2008. At that time, the Board approved a request for the construction of a single family residence.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Maintain alignment of front setbacks.”
 - 2. “Maintain the rhythm of buildings and side yards.”
 - 3. “Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
 - 4. “Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
 - 5. “Design piers, a foundation, and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.”
 - 6. “Size foundations and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings.”
 - 7. “Use building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.”
 - 8. “Design building elements on exterior buildings walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements often include but are not limited to: balconies, chimneys, and dormers.”
 - 9. “Use exterior building materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.”
 - 10. “Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic windows.”
 - 11. “Use traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.”

12. "Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.
13. "Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings."
14. "Where a rhythm of porches exists on a street or block, design a porch that continues this historic rhythm."
15. "When using artificial materials, use a blind or shutter unit that has a thickness, weight and design similar to wood."
16. "Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings."

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

1. Construct a single family residence.
 - a. The house will be set back 40' from the inner edge of the sidewalk.
 - b. The raised slab foundation will measure two (2) feet in height.
 - c. The aforementioned foundation will feature simulate brick piers spaced at equidistant intervals between brick-faced fields.
 - d. The walls will be clad be clad with hardiboard siding.
 - e. The windows will be aluminum clad wood in construction multi-light (six-over-six OR one-over-one) in configuration.
 - f. Walls will be painted SW6183 "Conservative Gray".
 - g. Trim will be painted SW7006 "Extra White".
 - h. Composite louvered shutters will be painted SW7749 "Laurel Woods". A continuous entablature (described in the drawings as a frieze) will extend around the whole of the building.
 - i. A fascia with attendant mouldings will extend around the house.
 - j. Hipped roofs will surmount the building.
 - k. Architectural shingles in the color "weatherwood" will sheath the hipped roofs.
 - l. West (Façade/North Ann Street) Elevation
 - i. A five bay porch will extend the length of the façade.
 - ii. The porch will be 7'0" in depth.
 - iii. A flight of brick steps will access the central bay of the five bay porch.
 - iv. Six square section boxed columnar porch pier will define the porch bays.
 - v. Four fenestrated bays will define the façade.
 - vi. A six paneled wooden door stained Mahogany with surmounting transom will be centrally located as the main entrance.
 - vii. Two equidistant windows will flank the main entrance. Said windows will either be six-over-six or one-over-one in configuration.
 - viii. A gabled roof dormer will be centered on the façade's roof.
 - ix. The hardiboard clapboard sided dormer will feature a pair of multi-light windows.
 - m. South (a ide) Elevation
 - i. The end bay of the porch bay will define the westernmost portion of the South elevation.
 - ii. A six-over-six or one-over-one window adjacent to a double window of the same configuration will distinguish the middle portion of the elevation.
 - iii. A one bay porch defined by a square columnar post will be located east of the aforementioned windows.
 - iv. A pair of one-light configured fiberglass doors will access the porch from the residence.

- v. A two car vehicular door will punctuate the recessed garage portion of the South elevation.
- vi. A metal roll up door will be located within the garage door bay.
- n. East (rear) Elevation
 - i. A one bay porch featuring a square columnar post will inform the southernmost portion.
 - ii. Said bay will feature a pairing of one-light configured double doors.
 - iii. The remainder of the elevation will project forward.
 - iv. The southernmost portion will feature a door which will enter the garage.
- o. North (a side) Elevation
 - i. The end bay of the front porch will define the westernmost portion.
 - ii. Beginning 12'4" from the Northwest corner, the siding will extend from the wall plane by 2'0" in depth and 8'11" in length.
 - iii. will be surmounted by a shed roof.
 - iv. A six-over-six or one-over-one window will be adjacent to the aforementioned.
 - v. The remainder of the North elevation will be informed by will feature a rectangular window, followed by two six-over-six or one-over-one windows.
- 2. Install hardscaping.
 - a. Repair or remove and reconstruct an existing curbcut.
 - b. Instate a ten foot wide concrete driveway that will access the garage located to the rear of the property.
- 3. Install fencing.
 - a. Construct a six (6) foot tall privacy fence.
 - b. The aforementioned fence will not advance beyond the front plane of the house.
 - c. The fencing will either face the adjoining lots or will be shadowboxed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject lot, 69 S. Ann Street, is located within the heart of Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application up for review involves construction of single family residential infill between extant historic dwellings on said property. When reviewing the applications for new residential construction, the following criteria are taken into account: placement, orientation, massing, scale, building elements, and materials.

With regard to placement, two components are taken into account – setback from the street and between buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state that new buildings should be responsive and maintain rhythms of traditional façade lines, setbacks (See B-1) and side yards (See B-2). The lot, an inner block situation, is located adjacent to/in the vicinity of contributing buildings situated to either side of it. An institutional complex stands opposite the site. In accord with Design Guidelines, the setbacks reflect the historical character of the contributing aspects of the built landscape. The proposed placement negotiates the existence of the two historic buildings located to either side, structures, which occupy two different planes, in a particularly successful fashion. Though there is a prevailing pattern of placement informing the remainder of the street, any new construction should address said situation, as well as adjustment to the northeasterly angle of the street. The proposed placement takes into account the aforementioned consideration. The side setbacks are traditional in dimension.

The Design Review Guidelines state that building mass for new construction should be in keeping with arrangement and proportion of surrounding historic residences (B-3). The proposed house adopts the form of a traditional Mobile dwelling – a porch fronted residence (An engaged garage, one not visible from the public view, will be integrated into the dwelling.). The successful massing of the residence

begins at the foundation. The two foot height of the simulated pier treatment is reflective of traditional foundation elevations (See B-5.). The massing of the structure, one informed by 10' ceilings, is compatible with the architectural context of the contributing landscape which it is amidst (See B-7.) The hipped roof form and informing slope is typical of many surrounding historic residences located in the vicinity (See B-16.).

Scale refers to a building's size in relationship to other buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction state that new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings (See B-4.). As mentioned in the preceding paragraph addressing massing, the elevation of the foundations, height of the ceilings, and pitch of the roof combine to form a whole that would be compatible with surrounding architectural landscape.

With regard to building components, the symmetrically composed porch-fronted residence takes as its inspiration one of Mobile most pervasive housing typologies – the coastal cottage. A full-length gallery originally graced the contributing dwelling to the east of the North of subject building. A bungalow further to the South of proposed dwelling also features a full lengthy gallery. The gallery and dormer distinguishing the façade are compatible with immediate and larger residential architectural vocabulary of the district (See B-8.). As referenced to in the review of the proposed building's placement, the front gallery's placement negotiates altering placements of umbrages located to either side of it (See B-14.). The scale of the proposed residence is in keeping with nearby and adjacent porches (See B-13.).

As per building elements and characteristics, the façade in particular employs a solid-to-void relationship that responds to traditional fenestration patterns (See B-10.). While the absence of a regularized rhythm does not impair the side elevations, additional fenestration (blind or faux would be accessible) would improve the appearance and experience of those portions of the building. Of the two window light configurations, Staff recommends the use of the six-over-six constructions. Regardless of the light configuration, the windows casings are simply trimmed as is the prevailing pattern in the subject architectural context (See B-11.). More robust treatments of fenestration on façade, namely the transom, and shutters, is so handled in proportion and dimension so as to be respective of traditional employments of said elements (See 12 & 16.).

In accord with the Design Guidelines for New Construction, the building materials, while of the present day, blend with those employed in the past and in immediate surroundings (See B-9). Hardiboard siding and aluminum clad windows are approved for new construction within Mobile's Historic Districts.

CLARIFICATIONS/REQUESTS/CONSIDERATIONS

1. Would the applicant be amenable to changing the fiberglass door to an approved material such as metal?
2. Will the aforementioned door be paneled?
3. Will a front walkway be employed?
4. What would be the composition of the aforementioned if constructed?
5. Consider employing additional faux or blind fenestration on the side elevations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-17), Staff does not believe this application would impair the historic district. Pending the preceding clarifications, requests, and considerations, Staff recommends the approval. Staff prefers the employment of six-over-six windows and notes the beneficial nature of blind fenestration on side elevations.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Pittman, the property owner, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Pittman and asked him if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Pittman stated Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full, but continued by asking the Board to consider one-over-one windows. He noted that while understood the staff recommendation, multi-pane configurations drove cost up. Mr. Pittman further explained several one-over-one light configurations could be seen in the vicinity. He concluded by saying that he appreciated the design and tradition of the six-over-six windows and would follow the Board's ruling.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Pittman.

Mr. Oswalt inquired as to whether the applicant had considered raising the foundation from two (2) feet in height to three (3). Mr. Pittman answered yes. He allowed that Mr. Blackwell at an initial pre-development meeting made such a recommendation. At the aforementioned stage in the design process, the foundation height was twelve (12) inches. Since the initial review, the foundation had already been increased from to 24". He explained raising the slab would be a substantial cost.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if Mr. Pittman had considered sidelights to compliment the front door. Mr. Pittman stated the original design possessed sidelights but ultimately there was not enough space for the feature and shutters on the door. Mr. Allen questioned the appropriateness of shutters on front door and suggested sidelights to be more appropriate. Ms. Echols asked Mr. Pittman if the shutters were functioning to which he replied no. Mr. Pittman explained that if he added sidelights there would not be enough space. Making not to the blank expanses of wall to either side of the doorway, Mr. Allen asked why not. Mr. Holmes and Mr. Pittman referred to the plan for rationale.

Mr. Blackwell stated that the applicant was amenable to the following: installation of two faux windows with casing and faux shutters on the South elevation; construction of a brick walkway leading to the front entry from the sidewalk; clarification of the materials of doors; and installation of six-over-six windows. No other questions ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Holmes moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as amended noting the following: installation of two faux windows with casing and faux shutters on the South elevation; construction of a brick walkway leading to the front entry from the sidewalk; clarification of the materials of doors; and installation of six-over-six windows. No other questions ensued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Holmes 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 18, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-21-CA: 8 LeMoyne Place
Applicant: City of Mobile, David Daughenbaugh
Received: 4/12/17
Meeting: 5/17/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition- Demolish an extremely deteriorated single family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This classically detailed foursquare type dates circa 1910.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Historic Preservation Ordinance (Article IV, Chapter IV; Section X) 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 last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on February 17, 2016 (Note: It was scheduled to appear before the ARB on 3 May 2017, but was withdrawn from review in advance of the meeting.). At that time, the Board heldover an application calling for the demolition of the building. The dwelling situated on the property, one which has been on the City’s Nuisance List for a number of years, is in extremely advanced state of structural decay. If granted demolition approval, the derelict house would be demolished, the site would be cleared and grass would be planted.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
 - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure:
 - 1. This house dates circa 1910. The building is listed as a contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way National Register Historic District. A grandly proportioned dwelling of the American Foursquare typology it is among the finest and oldest houses located on LeMoyne Place.

- ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. The dwelling contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and historical character of the surrounding Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 - 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced. Of the exterior facings and elements, almost all those which are still in place would have to be replaced. The building's structure is an even more periled condition than the exterior cladding and detailing. The roof has collapsed.
- 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. Foursquare dwellings are located within all of Mobile's seven locally designated National Register Historic Districts. Old Dauphin Way contains a large number of this uniquely American residential typology. Examples are found across the United States. Several foursquare dwellings are found on the subject street and block.
- v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 - 1. If granted demolition approval, the house would be demolished, debris would be removed, the lot would be leveled, seed would be planted, and a lien placed on the property.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. The estate was conveyed to Miloyd Murphy, one of two heirs to an estate, in February of 2016. Ms. Murphy intended to restore the property. Plans did not materialize. Several potential purchasers considered buying and restoring the property.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. The property has stood vacant for well over a decade.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The property has been listed for sale.
- ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 - 1. N.A.
- x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. N.A.
- xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
- xii. Application submitted by the City of Mobile.
- xiii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the Board.
 - 1. Application submitted by the City of Mobile.

2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

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

1. Demolish a contributing residence.
2. Remove debris from the property.
3. Stabilize site.
4. Plant seed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the demolition of an extremely deteriorated residential building which is listed as a contributing building in the Old Dauphin Way National Register Historic District. The property has for several years been listed on the City of Mobile’s Nuisance Abatement list. The Nuisance Abatement allows for either the City to repair/secure vacant buildings which are salvageable or remove of vacant buildings that are in such an extreme state of disrepair as to pose a life safety issue.

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

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

This building is in an extremely advanced state of disrepair. Conditions extend far beyond cosmetic concerns. Sills are rotten and the roof structure has collapsed. Sizable portions of walls are in jeopardy of collapsing. The house plays host to a rodent infestation plaguing the house.

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

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

This building has lost much of its architectural and historical character on account of demolition by neglect. Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application would impair the property, but taking into account loss of architectural/history character caused by the building's physical condition, life safety concerns created for other buildings/neighboring property owners, and the design requirements for new construction, Staff does not believe the application would impair the overall historic district. Staff recommends approval of the application for reasons of the considerations cited herein.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Daughenbaugh, applicant, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. After thanking Mr. Blackwell, Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Daughenbaugh and asked him if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Daughenbaugh thanked Mr. Blackwell and introduced Mr. Gary Jackson from the Architectural and Engineering Department of the City of Mobile to the board. Mr. Daughenbaugh explained that the City was requesting to demolish the structure due to the owner's failure to maintain the building. If approved for demolition, the demolition of the aforementioned structure would ensue, the lot would be cleared of any debris, said lot would be leveled, and sod would be planted. He further explained future development plans be the responsibility of the owner. Mr. Daughenbaugh emphasized the state of complete disrepair and endangerment.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow Board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Daughenbaugh.

Mr. Wagoner commenced a series of questions relating to nuisance proceedings.

Mr. Daughenbaugh outlined the process for Mr. Wagoner and his fellow Board members. He stated that the City places a lien against the property for the amount of the demolition upon completion. Mr. Daughenbaugh further explained that the property is then placed in the city's Nuisance Abatement program. If after cycling to the end of the program and up for demolition, the property requires demolition approval if located in a locally designated historic district. Once ARB approval is received request for proposals are placed. After bids are received and accepted then the property is demolished.

Mr. Wagoner stated that according to his experience and observation that in this phase of the process a lot such as the subject one would be cleared, and a lien is placed on a property. Mr. Jackson and Mr. Daughenbaugh confirmed for Mr. Wagoner that the lot is then placed on a maintenance schedule within City Maintenance. Mr. Wagoner expressed concern for interested neighborhood parties over the continued maintenance of the lot. Mr. Daughenbaugh stated City Maintenance contracts lawn services to maintain vacant lots and places liens against the property for the incurred cost.

Mr. Daughenbaugh noted that the I-Team, (Bloomberg Philanthropies' Innovation Teams program) has identified new approaches to solve issues with title clearances and state legislation would hopefully be changing in regard to this topic. Mr. Wagoner recognized the good work being completed, but was apprehensive about the amount of time it would take to implement these programs. Mr. Daughenbaugh replied that once the aforementioned legislation was in place, the City would have a shorter period which to foreclose on properties with liens.

Mr. Holmes asked for a brief history of the property and how it entered into such a bad state of disrepair. Mr. Daughenbaugh noted that in 2009 Municipal Enforcement began to cite the property for life-safety concerns. The Nuisance Abatement process began that same year. In 2016 the owner of the property passed away. At that juncture two sisters inherited the property. One sister deeded the property over to the current owner. Mr. Daughenbaugh further explained that he then restarted the Nuisance Abatement process and began notifying the pertinent party. Records were sent by certified mail, notices in the press register, and certified mail sent to owner's home address. The pertinent party took no action. After forty-five (45) days, the City Council declared the structure a public nuisance and set the stage for demolition as repair was not deemed an option.

Mr. Ruzic asked if the property owner had been in contact with any city officials. Mr. Blackwell stated numerous city staff had spoken to her in the last two year period.

Mr. Ruzic then asked if the property had been listed on MLS for a period of six months. Mr. Blackwell noted that the MLS listing is not a specific requirement of the ARB. He added that although many people have made offers on the house, others have been scared away by the extreme condition of decay affecting the property and by consequence its surroundings. Mr. Daughenbaugh stated that the owner had verbally communicated to Mr. Gary Jackson she would be interested in selling in the past.

Discussion of timing ensued. Mr. Daughenbaugh clarified that after three years a property can be deeded to someone through tax sale, after three years of payment and a statement. Mr. Wagoner noted title and nuisance issues would still remain on the property.

Mr. Allen expressed the need for notification on demolitions. Mr. Allen stated that one hundred sixty buildings (160) were scored by the recent blight survey as sub-standard and in need of demolition. Mr. Blackwell explained that interdepartmental meetings have been set for mechanizations to review those scored for demolition. He further explained that of the number mentioned most were not historic. Mr. Daughenbaugh noted when the property initially entered into the Nuisance Abatement program the City lacked the tools needed to monitor properties. He continued that the blight survey had been vital to the success of code enforcement and offered more avenues of redress than demolition alone.

Mr. Blackwell cited an example of different City departments working together to save a architecturally significant building district located in Cherokee where it took one phone call to Mr. Daughenbaugh to secure the building once seen on the list.

Mr. Daughenbaugh stated while that the blight survey scores structures on a multitude of components, there is also a committee to review the structures which provides margin.

Mr. Ruzic asked for further clarification on the Nuisance Abatement status. Mr. Daughenbaugh stated that Nuisance Abatement is an anti-blight program. For a property to be declared a nuisance it must be seen as a safety concern. The property appears before city council. Pending approval and a ten day waiting period, the property is on record as a public nuisance. Mr. Ruzic asked if the status could be reversed. Mr. Daughenbaugh replied the status could be reversed if a potential investor came in a short period of time with evidence of funding and rehabilitation plans to begin a dialogue. In the case of 8 LeMoyne Place, Mr. Daughenbaugh did not see that occurring.

Mr. Oswalt inquired into who had the rights to salvage materials. Mr. Jackson replied in the past the departments of historic and city maintenance would partner to salvage materials. Mr. Blackwell noted at this time the city no longer has its warehouse and the cost of salvaging materials would require more

expenditure. He added that contractors were reluctant to add salvage into bids for reason of generally not being authorized to sell materials for reasons of contracts.

No further questions ensued from the Board.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Holmes moved that, based upon the facts as written by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district and the building, but for reason of the extreme deterioration of the building and life-safety issues posed that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: May 18, 2018