

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**May 18, 2016 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:  
**Members Present:** Catarina Echols, Robert Brown, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes III, Bradford Ladd, Robert Allen, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone,  
**Members Absent:** Kim Harden, David Barr and Harris Oswalt.  
**Staff Members Present:** Cartledge W. Blackwell, Melissa Mutert, and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Stone moved to approve the minutes for the April 20, 2015 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.

**B. MID MONTH APPROVALS:      APPROVED.**

1. **Applicant:**    Petroimage
  - a. Property Address:      1275 Springhill Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval:      4/12/2016
  - c. Project: Remove a hallmark, a canopy, and the facing of a monument sign. Install new hallmark and canopy signs and reface said monument sign. The backlit signs meet the size, material, lighting, and height requirements specified in the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts.
1. **Applicant:**    Angelica Zamudio
  - a. Property Address:      1659 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval:      4/13/2016
  - c. Project: Work approved: Remove sign out front, leave base as flower planter. Erect six foot stucco and iron fence on east side of property, with gate on south end.
2. **Applicant:**    Freedom Roofing Inc.
  - a. Property Address:      357 N. Ann Street
  - b. Date of Approval:      4/18/2016
  - c. Project: Re-roof dwelling in architectural shingles in onyx black.
3. **Applicant:**    Estes Remodeling on behalf of Lorraine Biss
  - a. Property Address:      23 Blacklawn
  - b. Date of Approval:      4/18/2016
  - c. Project: Demolish existing 16' wide by 32' deep garage. Construct 16' wide x 32' deep garage in previous footprint with 105 lapsiding to match previous, 3-tab shingles in charcoal, paneled garage door, use same paint colors- olive green with white trim.
4. **Applicant:**    Hand Quality Roofs on behalf of Woody Hannon
  - a. Property Address:      1219 Selma Street
  - b. Date of Approval:      4/18/2016
  - c. Project: Re-roof and install architectural shingles in charcoal.
5. **Applicant:**    John Dendy and Associates on behalf of Mary Ann Brabner
  - a. Property Address:      303 N. Conception Street
  - b. Date of Approval:      4/18/2016
  - c. Project: This COA amends that of March 16, 2015 and that of June 4, 2015. Demolish ancillary building in rear of property.

6. **Applicant:** Katie Upham for Trileaf
  - a. Property Address: 155 Church Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/18/2016
  - c. Project: Reinstate technological equipment.
7. **Applicant:** John Dendy Architect for John and Penny Dendy
  - a. Property Address: 161 S. Georgia Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/18/2016
  - c. Project: Remove a metal storage shed from the rear lot.
8. **Applicant:** Terminix for Homeowner
  - a. Property Address: 910 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/19/2016
  - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated siding to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.
9. **Applicant:** Terminix for Homeowner
  - a. Property Address: 309 West Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/19/2016
  - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated siding to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.
10. **Applicant:** Nick Vrakelos
  - a. Property Address: 56 LeMoyne Place
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/19/2016
  - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.
11. **Applicant:** David Hare with Consolidated Fence for the Restoration Society
  - a. Property Address: 911 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/19/2016
  - c. Project: Remove chain-link construction fencing extending the length of the north lot line. Remove and adaptively reuse pipe fencing. Install six foot aluminum fencing matching fencing installed and approved elsewhere on the property atop the existing coping wall.
12. **Applicant:** David Hare with Consolidated Fence for the Restoration Society
  - a. Property Address: 911 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/19/2016
  - c. Project: Remove chain-link construction fencing extending the length of the north lot line. Install six foot aluminum fencing matching fencing installed and approved elsewhere on the larger institutional complex.
13. **Applicant:** Southeast Roofing
  - a. Property Address: 1553 Church Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/20/2016
  - c. Project: Reroof with asphalt shingle, weathered gray color.
14. **Applicant:** Steve Stone for Matt LeMond
  - a. Property Address: 560-570 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/21/2016
  - c. Project: Install a six foot deep metal canopy in advance of each storefront unit per submitted design. Alter approved plans for No. 564 to allow for the use of wooden bulkhead facing and wooden door.
15. **Applicant:** James Torbert
  - a. Property Address: 108 N. Julia Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/21/2016
  - c. Project: Replace rotting siding with like material. Repaint with BLP color Claiborne Street Red and DeTonti off white.

16. **Applicant:** Herbert Andrews
  - a. Property Address: 112 S. Georgia Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/22/2016
  - c. Project: Repaint to match existing and remove and replace wood siding to as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension.
17. **Applicant:** Mack Lewis
  - a. Property Address: 158 S. Jefferson Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/22/2016
  - c. Project: Replace, repair, and repaint to match existing wood cornice, ornamental trim, and stair components where necessary.
18. **Applicant:** Earl Harris Construction Co. LLC on behalf of the Pentacostal Church of God
  - a. Property Address: 306 N. Joachim Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/25/2016
  - c. Project: Rework and replace front door to match existing door in materials and profile. Replace front handrails to match existing, replace back door to match existing, and replace back porch decking.
19. **Applicant:** Susan Salter
  - a. Property Address: 106 N. Hallett Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/25/2016
  - c. Project: Repair and repaint wood windows as necessary. Replace and repaint wood to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
20. **Applicant:** John Cocke
  - a. Property Address: 1055 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/25/2016
  - c. Project: Remove front brick columns and replace with white painted wooden columns.
21. **Applicant:** H and R Construction on behalf of Danny Ricker
  - a. Property Address: 56 N. Monterey Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/26/2016
  - c. Project: Repaint to match existing under porch and as needed.
22. **Applicant:** Keith Jarvis
  - a. Property Address: 1055 Church Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/26/2016
  - c. Project: Replace rotten wood to match, and repaint white.
23. **Applicant:** Delaine Ray
  - a. Property Address: 200 George Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/27/2016
  - c. Project: Wash house, repaint to match, replace front porch balusters to match as necessary, replace step newels with new to match original.
24. **Applicant:** Margie F. Smith
  - a. Property Address: 16 N. Monterey Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/27/2016
  - c. Project: Per submitted pictures and plans install approved door and ADA accessible railing on porch which follows MHDC Design Guidelines.
25. **Applicant:** Brad Christensen on behalf o the City of Mobile
  - a. Property Address: Corner of Washington Street and Conti Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/29/2016
  - c. Project: Install 5' aluminum fence in black or dark bronze color per submitted plans on rear of lot.
26. **Applicant:** Kevin Cross
  - a. Property Address: 458 Chatham Street

- b. Date of Approval: 5/3/2016
  - c. Project: Enclose a small side porch. Corner boards will be retained and a window will be installed. The window type, construction, and proportions will match the windows on the same (South) Elevation. Siding will match the existing.
27. **Applicant:** Kevin Cross
- a. Property Address: 308 Charles Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/3/2016
  - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace windows to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.
28. **Applicant:** Restoration Society
- a. Property Address: 918 Conti Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/2/2016
  - c. Project: Install aluminum fencing matching the height and design of fencing of located on other lots within a multi parcel complex on location of temporary construction fencing.
29. **Applicant:** Ted and Julie Flotte
- a. Property Address: 1209 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/5/2016
  - c. Project: Remove a later rear door. Install a period appropriate wooden that is in keeping with the style and period of the house. Remove a deteriorated screen door fronting the aforementioned door. Install a new screen door in keeping with the style and period of the house. Repair deteriorated woodwork, moldings, details, etc... to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated scored stuccowork to match the existing. Repair/replace instances of deteriorated stonework. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme (also paint the porch ceiling a "haint" blue). Remove an metal pole pavilion from the rear of the lot.
30. **Applicant:** Mike Henderson Roof and Repair
- a. Property Address: 21 S. Monterey Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/6/2016
  - c. Project: Reroof with GAF timberline (architectural) shingles in charcoal.
31. **Applicant:** Al Tenhundfeld
- a. Property Address: 412 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/9/2016
  - c. Project: Replace doors in the rear building occupying the property. The designs of the doors (additions to a non-contributing building) will match the existing.
32. **Applicant:** Margie F. Smith
- a. Property Address: 16 N. Monterey Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/9/2016
  - c. Project: Rear addition per submitted plans with amendment of adding corner/ vertical board at point where addition starts on North and South Elevations. (Rear addition not visible from street view.) Repair front steps and paint deck and steps in medium or dark grey.

## **B. APPLICATIONS**

- 1. 2016-14-CA: Block bound by St. Joseph Street (E), St. Louis Street (S), North Conception Street (W) and St. Anthony Street (N).**
  - a. Applicant: Hartman-Cox Architects on behalf of General Service Administration, PBS Design and Construction Division
  - b. Project: New construction – Construct a United States Federal Courthouse.  
**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 2. 2016-15-CA: 30 Hannon Avenue**
  - a. Applicant: Marshall Angus McLeod
  - b. Project: Reroofing - Reroof a residential building with metal roofing panels.  
**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 3. 2016-16-CA: 260 N. Jackson Street**
  - a. Applicant: James Hughes on behalf of Destiny Properties II
  - b. Project: Renovation - Renovate a non-contributing building into multi-unit town house development.  
**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

## **D. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Discussion

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

**2016-14-CA:** Block bound by St. Joseph Street (E), St. Louis Street (S), North Conception Street (W) and St. Anthony Street (N).  
**Applicant:** Hartman-Cox Architects on behalf of General Service Administration, PBS Design and Construction Division  
**Received:** 4/28/2016  
**Meeting:** 5/18/2016

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Detonti Square  
Classification: Non-Contributing Vacant Lot within an undeveloped urban block  
Zoning: T-4 and T-5.1  
Project: New Construction – Construct a United States Federal Courthouse.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This property is currently a vacant block of which portions are located within the Detonti Square Historic District.

**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 institutional building, namely a United States Federal Courthouse. Said infill would be located on a currently vacant lot located partially in the Downtown Business Improvement District (BID) and the DeTonti Historic District.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part (in reference to institutional buildings):
  - 1. “New construction should respect the historic character of the neighborhood.”
  - 2. “Institutional buildings often serve as recognizable focal points and landmarks of communities. Whether it is Mobile’s modern Government Plaza, Barton Academy, or Government Street Presbyterian Church, these institutional buildings act as nodes within communities.”
  - 3. “Design a new institutional building or group of buildings to be compatible with the surrounding district, but differentiate it properly.”

4. “Place an institutional building more flexibly than the pattern seen in surrounding historic structures.”
5. “Where buildings are set back, use the additional setback area for a landscaped open space, public gathering area and/or pedestrian entry element.”
6. “If the massing and scale of an institutional building is significantly larger than surrounding structures, set it back from the street to prevent a looming presence. This is particularly important for an institutional structure in a residential context. “
7. “Orient the primary entrance to an institutional building toward the public street. A secondary entrance may be provided from a parking area or another service location as needed.”
8. “Screen a surface parking lot from the public right-of-way wherever possible.”

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

1. Construct a Federal Courthouse complex informed by traditional civic and institutional design.
2. The security dictated site plan is inspired by historical ecclesiastical, governmental, and educational examples found in Mobile.
  - A. The elevation setbacks (from the right of way) are as follows:
    - i. The East Elevation (principle façade) is setback variously 62’ 6” to 51’ 8” from St. Joseph Street.
    - ii. The South Elevation (a side) is setback variously 50’ 4’ to 47’ 2” from St. Louis Street.
    - iii. The West Elevation (rear) is setback 99’ to 94’ from North Conception Street.
    - iv. The North Elevation (a side) is setback 56’ to 44’ 8” from Saint Anthony Street.
  - B. A two part fence will enclose the site.
    - i. A 3’ tall coping wall will comprise the lower portion of the fence.
    - ii. A six foot picketed metal fence set atop the aforementioned coping wall will comprise the upper portion of the fence.
  - C. The North or St. Louis Street block front will be punctured by two curbcuts. The vehicular gates will be of the same design as the picketed fence sections.
  - D. Upper-story plantings, lower-story plantings, ground-level plantings, and sod will be planted in the landscape expanses located to the South, West, and East of the Building.
  - E. Additional plantings will inform the right of way.
  - F. A plaza will front the East or St. Joseph Street façade.
  - G. The City sidewalk will be reinstated around the whole of the property.
    - i. Granite curbing will be employed around the whole of the site.
    - ii. The St. Joseph Street expanse of the sidewalk will feature a boarder of flagstone so to match the flagstone boarders found on other portions of St. Joseph Street. set against the aforementioned. The remaining street expanse do not feature flagstone.
3. The design of the multi-story building Federal Courthouse is informed by the classical tradition – a tripartite layering of a base, body, and top (here a monitor shielding mechanical devices). Additional proportionally elements, devices, and details will inform the design of this contemporary essay in Beaux Arts design.
  - A. The buildings ground floor will be faced with granite (gray in color).
  - B. Site parking (staff and court), security, etc... will be located within/obscured by the ground floor.
  - C. The first through fifth floors will be faced with Alabama limestone.
  - D. The limestone will be articulated as traditional blocks of stone. 3/8” mortared stone joints will secure/set off the limestone blocks/panels.
  - E. The stepped back attic will be constructed of finished concrete.

- F. Fenestration will be recessed within traditional flat arch reveals.
- G. Double and tripartite “Davisean” windows will be employed.
- H. Painted cast aluminum window aprons/fields featuring judicial iconography will be located between and unite windows of first-second stories and the third-fourth stories.
- I. Cornices will be located between the second and third stories and the fourth and fifth stories.
- J. East Elevation or Principle Façade (facing St. Joseph Street).
  - i. The East Elevation will be setback behind landscaped and hardsurfaced plaza.
  - ii. A low coping wall fronting rectilinear landscape islands ringed by handicapped accessible ramps will be locate to either side of ramped steps.
  - iii. Cast iron lampstands with molded bases, shaped shafts, and circular globes will rest atop ramped antipodia or cheeks of the stairs.
  - iv. A recessed hexastyle (six column) en-antis (between ante or engaged piers) portico will comprise the central component of the first and second stories.
  - v. The fluted Greek Doric Columns will front a finished aluminum framed expanse of glazed entrances and panels.
  - vi. Advanced terminal bays of tripartite glazed windows will be located to either side of the Façade’s two-story entrance.
  - vii. The terminal bays of the body of the façade’s third and fourth stories will feature pairings of Davisean window.
  - viii. The central portion of the third and floor stories will be a sweeping concave bay of a single windows separated by pilasters and united by aprons featuring iconographic devices.
  - ix. The fifth-story attic will be of the same design as the third and fourth stories.
- K. South Elevation facing St. Louis Street)
  - i. Louvered ventilation panels will punctuate the ground floor.
  - ii. The granite panels of the ground floor will be horizontal in nature.
  - iii. The second and third stories will be defined by pilasters.
  - iv. The easternmost and westernmost bays of the first through the six-stories will be located slightly in advance of the intervening bays.
  - v. Tripartite groupings of Davisean windows will comprise the fenestration of the aforementioned stories.
  - vi. Pairs of Davisean windows will comprise the fenestration of the third and fourth-stories.
  - vii. The fifth-story attic will adopt the same fenestration as the third and fourth-stories.
  - viii. The setback monitor will be puncture by three louvered bays.
- L. West Elevation (facing North Conception Street).
  - ix. Four vehicular entrances will punctuate the ground floor.
  - x. The granite panels of the ground-floor will be horizontal in nature.
  - xi. The second and third stories will be defined by pilasters.
  - xii. Tripartite groupings of Davisean windows will comprise the fenestration of the aforementioned stories.
  - xiii. Pairs of Davisean windows will comprise the fenestration of the third and fourth stories.
  - xiv. The fifth-story attic will adopt the same fenestration as the third and fourth-stories.
  - xv. The setback monitor will be puncture by three louvered bays.
- M. North Elevation (facing St. Anthony Street).
  - xvi. Louvered ventilation panels will punctuate the ground floor.
  - xvii. The granite panels of the ground floor will be horizontal in nature.



- xviii. The second and third-stories will be defined by pilasters.
- xix. The easternmost and westernmost bays of the first through the six stories will be located slightly in advance of the intervening bays.
- xx. Tripartite groupings of Davisean windows will comprise the fenestration of the aforementioned stories.
- xxi. Pairs of Davisean windows will comprise the fenestration of the third and fourth stories.
- xxii. The fifth-story will adopt the same fenestration as the third and fourth stories.
- xxiii. The setback monitor will be punctured by four louvered bays.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the construction of new Federal Courthouse. Over a decade ago, the General Services Administration (GSA) proposed and received approval for the construction of a Postmodernist building that would have occupied two city block compound. The project was postponed and scaled down in size for reason of budgetary and security requirements. The proposed project calls for the construction a building that will occupy only one block. Said block is bound by St. Joseph Street, St. Louis Street, North Conception Street, and St. Anthony Street. The new proposal, one that has involved almost 18 months of planning, takes into the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts which state new construction should respect the character of the historic district (See B-1.). One lot within the parcel is located in the DeTonti Square Historic District. When reviewing the applications for new residential construction, the following criteria are taken into account: placement, mass, scale, building elements, and materials. As the subject application is of an institutional variety further considerations are taken into account.

Placement refers to the situation of a building on a given lot and by consequence its orientation to the street. As the proposed building is only structure to be construction on this an interior city block that was ravaged by Urban Renewal, setbacks between buildings is not applicable in this instance. The site plan calls for setbacks in all directions. Advanced setbacks typify traditional institutional design which often served as recognizable focal points and landmarks of communities (See B-2.). The recessed setbacks of the centrally located building informing the site plan take design inspiration from such notable extant historic structures in the vicinity such as Barton Academy, Government Street Presbyterian Church, Christ Church Cathedral (Episcopal), the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception, Old City Hospital, and Marine Hospital. As the aforementioned structures indicate there is precedent for a flexibility to the pattern (placement) for institutional buildings in Mobile's architecture of the civic/institutional variety (See B-4.). The Design Review Guidelines go to state that where buildings are setback, projects should use the additional setback area for a landscaped open space, public gathering area and/or pedestrian entry element (See B-5.). Here again, precedent exists in the form of the plaza that informed Mobile's 1916 Post office. Designed by James Knox Taylor, architect of the United States Treasury, the aforementioned building formerly stood on the site occupied by Corps of Engineers Building. The 1916 Post Office featured a plaza, coping walls, staircases, and other elements which are employed in the proposed Eastern frontage along St. Joseph Street - the visual and function entrance and primary façade of the larger complex. Said orientation of the principle entrance to the major street and discreet relegation of secondary service entrances to screened (in various ways) locations to secondary streets addresses parking concerns in part and service concerns in full (See B-7.). The proposed Fencing enclosures assist in negotiating the advanced setbacks in their achievement of a historically informed institutional site plan. In addition to the coping wall located in advance of the shielded handicap access ramps that inform and nuance the principle setback along St. Joseph Street, perimeter fencing screening which would take the form of aluminum fence atop a coping wall will inform the remainder of the site. Notable historic extant examples include Barton Academy, Christ Church Cathedral (Episcopal), Cathedral of the Immaculate

Conception, and Marine Hospital. The FBI complex can also be cited. Bienville Square was once enclosed in a similar fashion.

Massing – the relationship between the geometric parts comprising a building – and Scale – the proportional relationship between buildings – inform all types of new construction. The Courthouse lot is located in historical landscape populated by major buildings spanning multiple historic epochs and which don a medley of architectural styles. The massing and scale of the surrounding built landscape vary. The Waterman and Merchants National Bank Buildings, two highly highly important skyscrapers, are located two blocks to the South along St. Joseph Street. The multi-story Corps of Engineers Building and Campbell Courthouse are situated one block closer to the site in same southerly direction. Three and two-story buildings are located the East. Two and three-story townhouses are located to the North of the property, while one-story and two-story commercial building are located to the East. Just as the placement of the building is responsive to requisite security measure and observation of historical precedent, the setback placement assists in negotiating massing and scale of both significantly lower and taller buildings (See B-6.). With regard to massing, the traditional horizontal tripartite layering of a base (ground floor), body (main floor), and top (here a monitor) is employed. The East-facing plaza, portico, and advanced wings serve to break of the mass of that principle façade. Advances of bays and recesses of the same elevation inform all elevations. Pilasters, entablatures, and other devices serve to break up the building both horizontally and vertically.

Façade elements such as those mentioned in the preceding paragraph (porticos, bays, columns, pilasters, and entablatures) do more than impact massing and scale. The sources for elements and constructions employed represent an artful examination and understanding of almost two centuries of classical design in Mobile. Particular notable references include the following: in antis portico such as that ennobled the 1916 Post Office; use of the Doric Order observed at the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception; two-part fence treatment seen on numerous institutional buildings; the Davisean window construction that existed at the Government Street Hotel and next door at the Campbell Courthouse; ornamental metal aprons inspired by the Campbell Courthouse; the employ of an elevated ground floor of numerous local institutional buildings past & present; other components that speak to the past, yet do so in way that represents a vital expression of a contemporary classical impulse. Like Mobile's 1850s Customs House and her 1916 Post Office, the construction of the proposed design will bestow upon the City a major example of Government Classicism representative of its period, yet participant in the continuity of the classical tradition.

As mentioned previously, the proposal approved over a decade ago called for the creation of a megalithic two-block complex that would have closed Conception Street and thereby disrupted the historic street grid. The reduction of the site plan preserves the grid. Further considerations that respect the historic integrity of the neighboring historic context have ensued sense the publication of the initial drawings. Prime among the considerations ranks the location of curbcuts. All curbcuts were relocated to St. Louis Street so as to negate the impact on the DeTonti Square Historic District. The outmost attention has been extended to the screening of parking (See B-8.) as well as other vehicular incursions.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-8), Staff does not believe this application for a new institutional construction will impair either the architectural or historical character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Lee Becker, architect with Hartman-Cox, was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Holmes recused himself in advance of the Board discussion.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Ladd welcomed Mr. Becker and complimented the design. He asked Mr. Becker if he had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address.

Mr. Becker introduced his himself and his colleagues from Hartman-Cox along with fellow representatives from the General Services Administration and Yates Construction.

Mr. Roberts expressed his concerns regarding the height and the treatment of the rooftop monitor. Mr. Becker clarified the treatment (precast stone to simulate the marble below), setback (to negotiate the height), height (reasons and experience of) for the Board. He explained the structure is pre-cast concrete cast to simulate limestone panels. He went on to discuss the setback so the penthouse is a 1:1 ratio so that at street level a pedestrian will be unable to view the penthouse. Mr. Lee further elaborated on the design of the penthouse structure by informing the audience of its re-entrant corners on all sides. He stated the penthouse did not house all mechanical, but also planned for courtrooms in the center of the floor with other spaces surrounding it.

Mr. Ladd complimented the design.

Mr. Stone also complimented the design. He asked if there was any supplemental rendering of a streetscape on the Conception Street (West elevation). Mr. Becker explained that a 3' nominally high fence is usually kept close to the existing oak trees, the tree elevations are between 9'-10' in height, and a layer of screening is behind a wall that conceals the trash.

No further discussion ensued among the assembled Board members.

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

## **FINDING OF FACT**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as 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 passed unanimously.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: May 20, 2017**

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

**2016-15-CA:** 30 Hannon Avenue  
**Applicant:** Marshall Angus McLeod  
**Received:** 5/2/16  
**Meeting:** 5/18/16

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Reroofing – Reroof a residence using metal roofing panels

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This dwelling dates circa 1920. The popular “Craftsman” expression informing the building was one of the most pervasive architectural expressions of the Arts & Crafts Movement of the early 20<sup>th</sup> Century America. Like notable Craftsman houses of the time, 30 Hannon Avenue possess massive columns, a deep porch under one roof, and an emphasis on the horizontal lines.

**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 installation of metal roofing panels. Unless proposed for industrial buildings, certain building constructions (cast iron galleries), shotguns, and other built situations that traditionally featured metal roofs, metal roofing panels are reviewed on a case by case basis.
- 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. Original or historic roof forms, materials and details should be maintained.”
  - 2. “If installing a new metal roof, apply and detail it in a manner that is compatible with the historic character of the roof, period and style.
    - a. Use standing seam metal, metal shingles, or 5-V Crimp.
    - b. Use metal with a matte, non-reflective finish.
    - c. Install the roof to have low profile seams.
    - d. Finish roof edges in a similar fashion to those seen traditionally.”

- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans and other materials):
1. Replace shingles with metal roofing panels.
    - a. The metal roofing panels will be standing seam.
    - b. The color of the panels will be “Sand White.”

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application concerns the re-roofing a dwelling currently features shingles with metal roofing panels. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that a roof is one of the most dominant features of a building and that original materials should be maintained (See B-1.). The Design Guidelines go on to outline that if installing a metal roof, said roofing panels should be reflective of the historic character of the roof, period and style (See B-2.). Standing seam panels are the most traditional metal roofing panel treatment/construction. Said metal roofing panels are listed among the approved metal roofing options. The proposed is similar to a color approved for the Board for a version of a 5-V Crimp metal roof at 25 Blacklawn on December 2, 2016.

## **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 surrounding district. Staff recommends approval for the use of the application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Marshall Angus McLeod was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. McCleod if he had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address.

Ms. Echols and Mr. Roberts both expressed their concern that the light color selection of “sand White” for the metal roof panels did not mimic a historic shingle color.

Mr. McLeod explained the color choice was to keep the utilities more efficient. He also stated that he needs the replacement of his roof quickly, as his current roof has wood rotting under the shingles.

Mr. Holmes and Mr. Ladd suggested that actual color samples be brought to the office and viewed by the Board members.

Mr. Blackwell voiced his amenability with Mr. Holmes and Mr. Ladd’s suggestion and it was noted that Board had three (3) days to suggest a number of colors from which the applicant could choose a metal roof panel color.

No further discussion ensued among the assembled Board members.

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

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending fact that the color shall be approved by Architectural Review Board members before Certificate is issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued allowing the metal roof panels be approved by Architectural Review Board Members via email or in office.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: May 25, 2017.**

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

**2016-16-CA:** 260 N. Jackson Street  
**Applicant:** James Hughes on behalf of Destiny Properties II  
**Received:** 5/2/16  
**Meeting:** 5/18/16

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: DeTonti Square  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: T-4  
Project: Renovation - Renovate an existing two-story building into five two-story townhome complex with adjacent parking.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This two-story masonry and concrete building dates to 1964. It was built as a mixed used residential and commercial building - originally a family occupied the downstairs floor and part of the upstairs, and rented the front upstairs square footage as an office. Of particularly historical note, the building features a bomb shelter. In 2008 alterations were made to the exterior in efforts to engender architectural compatibility with surrounding historic district.

**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 2008. At that time, the Board approved the installation of windows with transoms, the removal of stairs from the second floor landing, the addition of French doors, and the continuation of the dentil detailing.
- B. 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. “Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site (site topography, character-defining site features, trees, and significant district vistas and public views) are retained.
  - 2. “Design the building components (roof, foundation, doors and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
  - 3. “Maintain the relationship of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building.”
  - 4. “Design the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure.”
  - 5. “Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the building and existing fences in the neighborhood.”



6. "Minimize the visual of parking."
7. "Locate a parking area to the rear or side of the site whenever possible."
8. "Use landscaping to screen parking."

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

1. Clean and prepare existing cement scratch coat to provide new 3/8" break reveal at 18" x 36" joint pattern on masonry.
2. Above the mid-fenestration level of the ground-story dado the stuccoed surfaces will be treated to resemble ashlar cut block.
3. Remove existing fenestration.
4. Install aluminum clad wooden doors and windows.
5. Repair and when necessary replace wooden shutters to match the existing.
6. Install new copper or aluminum downspouts .
7. West Elevation (facing North Jackson Street)
  - A. Remove later staircases.
  - B. Remove the railings of the later gallery
  - C. Install replace metal railing. Said railing will match those to be installed on the North Elevation.
8. North Elevation (a side elevation)
  - A. Remove downspouts.
  - B. Install new metal or copper downspouts.
  - C. Remove fenestration
  - D. Install fenestration.
  - E. The five units will feature aluminum clad windows and doors.
  - F. The windows will be of two different light configuration on the ground floor.
  - G. The five doors to the individual units will feature transoms.
  - H. Subtle breaks will separate the individual units at ground-story level.
  - I. The upper-story will feature smaller and larger multi-light windows.
  - J. The five upper-story doors will match those found on the ground floor.
  - K. The five Juliet balconies will feature railings like that to be installed on the façade.
  - L. Chain-like devices of a traditional sort will aid in securing the balconies
9. East Elevation (rear elevation)
  - A. Remove fenestration.
  - B. Install fenestration.
  - C. Install two of the larger multi-light variety windows to be instated on the North Elevation.
  - D. Remove a spiral flight of stairs.
10. South Elevation
  - A. Install five steel doors and five steel six light windows on the ground-story.
  - B. Install a ten multi-light windows on the upper-story
11. Construct a rooftop deck.
  - A. The rooftop structure will be located to the rear of the building.
  - B. Aluminum railings will encircle the recessed within the rooftop.
12. Enclosure and Site Related
  - A. Finish the existing wall fronting the façade (West Elevation facing North Jackson Street) in the same manner as that of the building .
  - B. Repair and if necessary replace the wooden doors punctuating the aforementioned wall to match the existing.
  - C. Repair and repaint an existing iron gate.
  - D. Enclose the northernmost portion of the property with fencing.

- i. The fencing will take the form of a low coping wall surmounted by crescent-shaped expanses of picket metal posts.
- ii. Intermediate and terminal piers (spaced equidistantly) will define the expanses of fencing.
- iii. Both the aforementioned piers and coping will be constructed of brick.
- iv. The coping walls will measure -.
- v. The crescent-shaped sections of metal fencing will measure -.
- vi. The West or North Jackson Street section of the enclosure will feature one vehicular gate and one pedestrian gate.
- vii. A vehicular curbcut will be installed.
- viii. A pedestrian walk will be installed in the Right of Way.
- ix. New stucco walls will be constructed in advance of each unit's main (North-facing) entrance.
- x. Pedestrian gates dignifying and securing the aforementioned courtyards will be accessed by a passage fronted/enclosed by stuccoed walls of the same design and height as the walls enclosing the courtyards. Said wall will form the northern boundary of the parking court discussed below.
- xi. Crushed oyster shells will be installed in the parking court to the North of the building.
- xii. Plantings will be employed in advance of and behind the fencing facing North Jackson Street.
- xiii. Plantings will extend the length of Congress Street.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the renovation of a non-contributing building. According to oral tradition, physical examination, and documentary material, the building was built as a private residence, office rental, and a bomb shelter. The exterior volume was previously remodeled in recent years in a successful effort to instill a sense of connectivity to the surrounding historical architectural fabric. The proposed interventions pick up and develop further the efforts of the aforementioned design changes.

The renovation campaign focuses on fenestration and umbrages. All interventions are responsive to and respectful of the overall characteristics of the larger site (topography, character-defining site features, trees, and significant district vistas and public views) of the property and district (See B-1.). The intention is to reflect a contemporary response to and engagement that landscape and the traditions animating it. Changes to fenestration, be it removal, relocations, or additions, create a relationship of solids and voids that is compatible with historic architecture (See B-3.). The gallery additions are compatible with historic traditions (See B-2.). Said interventions are informed by the building and create a compatible design components (roof, foundation, doors and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture. The Juliet balconies on the North elevation tie into the Juliet balcony seen on the West Elevation. These balconies are not original; however, the balconies harmoniously weave into the fabric of the historic neighborhood. A roof top deck on the rear of the building to have steel post and cable rail system will be minimally visible from street view.

Additional site improvements to the lot the building sits on and the adjacent lots are proposed, namely fencing and landscaping. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts the proposed fencing and walls are designed to be compatible with the architectural style of the building and existing fencing in the neighborhood (See B-5.). Said fencing along with landscaping also serve to further minimize parking located to the side of the site (See B 6-8.).

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-4), Staff does not believe this application will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application. Mr. Blackwell noted that in a recent Consolidated Review Committee meeting the applicants may decide to wrap the cornice detail on the façade elevation of the building on the South and North elevations. Staff also noted applicants may continue the courtyard wall on the South elevation at a 6' or drop the height to 4'.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. James Hughes was present to discuss the application on behalf of Destiny Properties II.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Stone recused himself in advance of the Board discussion.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Hughes if he had any questions to ask, clarifications to address, or comments to make.

Mr. Hughes answered that Mr. Blackwell addressed the application in full.

Mr. Roberts complimented the proposal.

After additional praise from the Board, no further Board discussion ensued.

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

## **FINDING OF FACT**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: May 18, 2017**