

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
May 6, 2015 – 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: Bob Allen, Catarina Echols, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes, III, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswald, I, and Steve Stone
Members Absent: Robert Brown, Kim Harden, Craig Roberts, and Jim Wagoner
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cartledge Blackwell, and Keri Coumanis.
2. Mr. Oswald moved to approve the minutes for the A meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. Mr. Oswald 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:** Brad Graves for Ellen J. Sheffield
 - a. Property Address: 58 Lee Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/9/15
 - c. Project: Install a clear glass storm door over the side entrance.
2. **Applicant: Dannae Howe**
 - a. Property Address: 250 Rapier Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/8/15
 - c. Project: Construct a three foot tall wooden fence that will enclose the front lawn. The fencing sections will be of a scalloped design. Construct an overthrough over the front walk's pedestrian gate. The fencing will be painted white.
3. **Applicant:** Teague Construction Systems, Inc.
 - a. Property Address: 355 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/7/15
 - c. Project: Reroof rear of building (former carriage section) using 30 year, Timberline, gray shingles.
4. **Applicant:** Kiel Home Renovations
 - a. Property Address: 1357 Breamwood Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/9/15
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Replace glass in a picture window. Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repair and if necessary replace porch posts.
5. **Applicant:** Image Designs for Greer's
 - a. Property Address: 851 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/13/15
 - c. Project: Install a sign. The wooden sign will measure eleven feet in length and five feet in height.
6. **Applicant: Corinna Murray**
 - a. Property Address: 1012 Caroline Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/6/15
 - c. Project: Paint the house white with dark green trim and foundation.
7. **Applicant: Jose Attar**
 - a. Property Address: 1200 Government Street

- b. Date of Approval: 4/10/15
- c. Project: Re-approval interior lot fencing (28 June 2010). Paint the house per the BLP color scheme: body, Beyond Pale (off white); trim, white; and shutters, Hunter Green (existing). When and where necessary, repair/replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.

8. Applicant: Transit Group, LLC

- a. Property Address: 1557 Church Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/9/15
- c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted Behr color scheme: main color, Barley Field; trim, Moon Valley; accents, Osprey.

9. Applicant: Shahid Abbasi

- a. Property Address: 1101 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/15/15
- c. Project: Install a wood composition sign. The sign will be affixed to the front façade (faux mansard roof). Said single-faced sign will measure 8' in length and 4' in height. The sign will feature the name of the business establishment.

10. Applicant: Patricia Gholson

- a. Property Address: 1122 Montauk Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 4/16/15
- c. Project: Remove a later door. Install a period appropriate door (per submitted design). The wooden door will feature a paneled lower section and surmounting glazed and beveled upper section. Remove later filler from below the transom. Repair woodwork and decking to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.

11. Applicant: Tracy Cochran

- a. Property Address: 1004 New Hamilton Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/20/15
- c. Project: Install interior lot fencing. The decorative steel picket fencing will measure six feet in height and will be installed per submitted plan.

12. Applicant: Jeremy Carter

- a. Property Address: 122 Ryan Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 4/21/15
- c. Project: Repair/reinstall a pedestrian walk with the existing pavers. Remove and reinstall an existing vehicular curbcut. The paving will be either bluestone, concrete, or pavers.

13. Applicant: Corinna Luce

- a. Property Address: 104 Levert Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 4/21/15
- c. Project: Remove fencing along a rear lot line. Install new wooden interior lot privacy fencing along the rear lot line. Said fencing will be six feet in height.

14. Applicant: Kenbow Roofing

- a. Property Address: 1254 Selma Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/24/15
- c. Project: Reroof with 25 year three tap shingle, charcoal gray.

15. Applicant: Jeff Mizell

- a. Property Address: 1555 Monterey Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/20/15
- c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles, charcoal in color; replace rotten wood as necessary to match.

16. Applicant: Virginia Ollhoft

- a. Property Address: 1704 McGill Ave
- b. Date of Approval: 4/23/15
- c. Project: Repair porch: redo structure shortening porch to concrete wall removing overhang. Repairs otherwise to match the existing in profile, dimension and materials. Repair window sills on front, first floor to match existing.

17. Applicant: Amy and Wayne Butler

- a. Property Address: 15 Macy Place
- b. Date of Approval: 4/28/15
- c. Project: Repaint the house.

18. Applicant: Thomas Roofing

- a. Property Address: 1208 Selma Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/23/15
- c. Project: Reroof house using GAF Timberline HD, 30 year roof, Birchwood in color. Repair the dormer as needed matching the existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint repairs to match existing. Redeck the entire house or as needed.

19. Applicant: Witherington Construction

- a. Property Address: 918 Conti Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/24/15
- c. Project: Remove existing privacy fence, place temporary construction fence for 45 days.

20. Applicant: Charles & Debra Bollinger

- a. Property Address: 75 South Ann Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/27/15
- c. Project: Install 6 foot wood, dog eared, privacy fence per the submitted site plan.

21. Applicant: Michael Berson

- a. Property Address: 68 North Monterey Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/22/15
- c. Project: Replace ninety foot section of six foot privacy fence and replace.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2015-22-CA: 1008 Texas Street

- a. Applicant: Devereaux Bemis for Restore Mobile
- b. Project: Follow Up from an Earlier Approval – Finalize plans from a previous approval calling for the relocation of a historic building. Complete the restoration/renovation of said structure.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. MHDC Office Procedure

Mr. Blackwell informed the Board of the nature and working methods of the MHDC's professional staff.

2. 1208 Selma Street

Mr. Blackwell explained to the Board the reason and nature of 1208 Selma Street's appearance before them. He told the Board that the property was appearing before them for

life/safety related concerns. It was an emergency agenda item. Mr. Blackwell circulated photographs and presented a PowerPoint presentation focusing on two chimney stacks. He explained that the supporting shafts of these internal end chimney had been removed. While roof work was being conducted, Mr. Blackwell stated it was discovered that stacks were simply resting atop the roof deck. Mr. David Legett, the property owner, circulated additional imagery. Mr. Ladd asked if he was correct in understanding that the stacks were just resting on the roof. Mr. Legett answered yes. Mr. Ladd and Mr. Holmes concurred that project was common sense. The chimney stacks should be removed. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. No further Board discussion ensued. Mr. Oswalt moved to approve the facts as discussed at the meeting and illustrated in the photographs. The Board unanimously agreed to accept said facts. Mr. Oswalt moved that the application as presented and discussed does not impair the architectural or historical character of the building or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The Board was unanimous in its approval of the application.

3. Historic District Guidelines

Mr. Bemis apprised the Board of dates, meetings, and procedures informing the development Mobile's new Historic District Guidelines.

4. "Gotcha" Clause

Mr. Bemis addressed the Board. He opened his remarks by reminding the Board that they are a quasi judicial body. He stated that since the 1990s Staff has provided applicants with agendas in advance of Board meetings. These emails are emailed to applicants and/or representatives, as well as being posted on the MHDC's website and emailed to interested parties. Mr. Bemis spoke to Board of instituting the use of holdovers when new evidence is presented after a given agenda is posted. Mr. Bemis said that he was instructing Mr. Blackwell to include wording in the correspondence sent to applicants notifying them to that effect. Mr. Holmes raised concerns. He stated that the process already has some arduous components and that submission of evidence after the issuance of staff report invariably stem from applications having a negative staff recommendation. Mr. Holmes told the Board and Mr. Bemis that the Board of Zoning Adjustment, Planning Commission, and other boards allow for the submission of evidence and review of the same after the distribution of reports. He said that applicants have the right to respond. Mr. Bemis said that a ruling should be based on all the facts and if all the facts are not at hand an application should be heldover. Mr. Ladd stated that he believed the Board already operates under a good working method with regard to the review of additional material when said literature is provided. He said if the Board can discuss new material and if necessary holdover, but an application should not immediately be heldover without consideration or discussion. Mr. Bemis said that agendas go out no later than a week prior to meeting so additional submittals should be submitted no later than the Monday prior to the meeting. Mr. Ladd said that while he understood Mr. Bemis' concerns, he had considerable reservations over the proposed course of action. He stated he joined the Board so to change its reputation. He said that the Board should function to work with not against residents and stakeholders in Mobile's historic districts. Mr. Allan noted that additional evidence often makes little difference because the Board reviews the application, references the guidelines, and visits the site. Mr. Holmes reiterated his reservations. He voiced concerns against the proposal noting that it would make permitting even more difficult. Mr. Holmes said that it was against the administration's objects by adding one more hurdle. Ms. Coumanis stated that Staff does need the ability to respond to evidence submitted. She said that the applications impacted would be relatively few and that staff

could identify them in advance and inform the applicants. Mr. Holmes reiterated that the City Council, Board of Zoning Adjustment, and Planning Commission do not follow such a practice as that being discussed. Mr. Bemis addressed Mr. Holmes by saying that he has often heard the staff of Urban Development ask for holdovers on account of new evidence. Discussion of several applications ensued. Mr. Ladd said that if he received a negative review he would react with evidence supporting his case. He logically noted that others do and would continue to do likewise. Mr. Bemis said that wording would be placed in correspondence to applicants. Mr. Ladd said that the Board would review it prior to its placement in said correspondence.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-22-CA: 1008 Texas Street
Applicant: Devereaux Bemis for Restore Mobile
Received: 4/9/15
Meeting: 5/6/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Follow Up from an Earlier Approval – Finalize plans from a previous approval calling for the relocation of a historic building. Complete the restoration/renovation of said structure.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to Mobile’s Sanborn Maps of 1904, a single-story shotgun with wing occupied the presently vacant lot. The building was until a few weeks ago the rear (western) portion of 460 Chatham Street. The gable roofed frame dwelling dates from the second half of the 19th Century.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on May 7, 2014. At that time, the Board approved the relocation of the building from 460 Chatham Street to the subject lot. With this application, Restore Mobile follows up on the initial approval with elevation renderings and floor plans illustrating how the relocated building will be restored/renovated.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
 1. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
 2. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
 3. “Foundation screening should be recessed from the front of the foundation piers. Lattice, if used, should be hung below the skirtboard or siding, between the piers and framed with trim.”
 4. “Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and period of a building. Replacement doors should reflect the age and period of the structure.”
 5. “The size and placement for new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
 6. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location, and materials be compatible with the property.”
 7. “Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted plans):**
 1. Reconstruct a front gallery on building’s façade (South Elevation – previously the inner face of the building as engaged to the front portion of 460 Chatham Street).
 - a. The reconstructed three bay porch will measure 29’ in length and 10’ in depth.
 - b. The porch will be constructed to conform to the location and outline of the original porch as indicated by “ghost marks” and fenestration types. The porch form is further informed by the porch fronting 500 Charles Street (SW corner of Charles and Texas Streets).
 - c. Brick-veneered foundation piers will support the porch.
 - d. Boxed and recessed wooden lattice foundation skirting will extend between the foundation piers.
 - e. Continuous skirting (fronting the porch deck sub structure) will extend around the porch.
 - f. The porch deck will be laid with tongue-and-groove porch decking.
 - g. Chamfered porch posts will define the porch bays.
 - h. A picketed wooden railing will extend between the porch posts.

- i. A flight of wooden steps with railings matching those enclosing the porch will afford access to the umbrage.
 - j. The porch's shallow hipped roof will be sheathed with metal roofing panels.
2. Re-expose fenestration on the facade.
 - a. The three fenestrated bays will be located in the location of original fenestration.
 - b. The two window bays will be cased to match intact windows on the side elevations. Said windows will feature two-over-two light wooden sashes.
 - c. The middle door bay will feature a wooden four panel door with a surmounting transom (glazed).
3. Re-expose a window opening on the West (side) Elevation. The two-over-two wooden window will be cased so to match the existing windows.
4. Reconvert an existing door bay back into a window a window bay on the West Elevation. The two-over-two wooden window will be cased so to match the existing windows.
5. (Re)Expose/Install two-over-two wooden windows on the Rear (North) Elevation.
6. Fenestrate a later and re-exposed addition located on the Rear Elevation.
 - a. The re-exposed addition will feature siding matching that found on the body of the house.
 - b. A gable roof set perpendicular to the house will surmount the re-exposed rear portion of the house.
 - c. The Side (East and West) Elevations will feature two-over-two wooden windows matching those found on the body of the house.
 - d. The Rear Elevation will take the form of a tripartite fenestrated sequence – a double glazed and paneled wooden door will be flanked floor level two-over-two windows of the same height as said door. Two light transoms will surmount each fenestrated bay.
 - e. A bracketed overhand will extend over the deck accessed by the aforementioned fenestration. Said overhang will be sheathed with metal roofing panels.
 - f. A wooden deck measuring 11' in length and 5' in depth will be centered off of the re-exposed rear addition.
 - g. A picketed railing will enclose the sides of the deck.
 - h. A picketed railing of the same design as the deck's will flank the full-length flight of steps accessing said construction.
7. Install hardsurfacing.
 - a. A splayed concrete pedestrian walkway will serve as a path from the sidewalk to the reconstructed front gallery.
 - b. A 105' deep by 8' wide concrete drive will extend from the inner edge of the sidewalk connecting to an existing curbcut.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the restoration/renovation of a relocated residence. The dwelling was formerly engaged to the rear portion of the main block of a residence situated at nearby 460 Chatham Street. The scope of work involves the reconstruction of a porch, the re-exposing/alteration/installation of fenestration, the construction of a rear addition, and the installation of paving.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that the replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence (See B-7.). Ghost marks outlining lost massing and constructional fabric indicating the location of the porch deck and roof informed/determined the proposed design. A nearby porch located at 500 Charles Street served as additional visual reference for related design aspects. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts particular attention was be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details (See B-1.). The reinstallation of fenestration on the front, rear, and side elevations was similarly informed by physical and material evidence (See B-7.). The

size and placement of the fenestration matches the original units (See B-5.). The door type is appropriate for the style and period of the dwelling (See B-4.).

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards go on to state new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment (See B-2.). The relocation of the building and re-exposure of has revealed two cabinets. The infill between the cabinets will be reconstructed. The addition will take the form of a gable roof construction set between said cabinets. On account of the inset (from the side walls) nature of the addition, the orientation of the roof structure, and the lower height the roof, the rear addition is differentiated from the body of the main dwelling. Window types, proportional observations, and siding type served to unite the old and new work. Decks are common constructions off rear elevations.

Foundation screening on dwelling, porch, and addition shall be properly constructed and installed so to meet the Design Review Guidelines (See B-3.).

With regard to the larger site, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that modern paving materials are acceptable, but it is important that the design, location, and materials be compatible with the property (See B-6.). Side driveways and front pedestrian walks typify the Oakleigh Garden Districts. The location, configuration, and materials of both the vehicular and pedestrian installations are in keeping with the property and the streetscape.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-7), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tilmon Brown was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed Mr. Brown. He asked Mr. Brown, as Restore Mobile's representative, if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Brown clarified his relationship with Restore Mobile. He stated that he was not president of Restore Mobile, but he went on to mention that he sits on the construction committee. Mr. Brown informed the Board that while the building might look like a wreck at present, it would soon look great. He reiterated the Staff Report and presentation by reminding the Board that the building had been disengaged from the rear portion of the main house located at 460 Chatham Street, a dwelling just one block west from the subject property, and relocated to the property upon which it now stands. Mr. Brown noted that the main block of 460 Chatham Street would soon be restored. He mentioned that Restore Mobile was also responsible for the exterior restoration of 458 Chatham Street, as well as infill residential construction on three lots located on the southwest corner of Texas and Chatham Streets.

Mr. Ladd complimented Restore Mobile's efforts. He asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask or comments to make.

Mr. Allen asked for clarification regarding fenestration. Mr. Blackwell addressed Mr. Allen's concern.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application.

When queried, David Legett from the audience voiced his support of the project.

Upon hearing no further response Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

Mr. Bemis disclosed his involvement with Restore Mobile.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Oswalt 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. Oswalt 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: 5/6/16