

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

March 3, 2010 – 3:00 P.M.

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Jim Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Gertrude Baker, Kim Hardin, Bill James, Tom Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Jim Wagoner.
Members Absent: Carlos Gant, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and Keri Coumanis.
2. Mr. Wagoner held over approval of the minutes for the February 17, 2010 meeting to the next meeting.
3. Mr. Ladd moved to approve the midmonth COAs granted by Staff.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Luke Fondren**
 - a. Property Address: 63 North Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/2/10
 - c. Project: Replace the siding to match the existing in profile dimension and material. Reopen the door on the west elevation. Repaint per existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant: Frank Kruse**
 - a. Property Address: 215 South Cedar Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/8/10
 - c. Project: Install a crushed limestone gravel driveway and parking area per submitted plan. The drive will extend 118' along the north side of the house. The backyard parking area will measure 45' by 30' feet.
3. **Applicant: Richard Cane for Gulf Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 953 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/9/10
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with architectural shingles that will match the existing in profile, dimension, color, and material.
4. **Applicant: Christopher Hollingsworth**
 - a. Property Address: 14 Macy Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/9/10
 - c. Project: Replace the 4' wooden gate that extends between the house the neighbor's 6' fence that extends along the north property line. Remove the 4" section of wire fence that extends along the west lot. Extend the existing 6' wooden privacy fence along this rear interior lot line. The fence will continue along the south lot line where it will replace an existing chain link fence. Replace the wooden gates that extend across the drive. The fence meets all setback requirements.
5. **Applicant: Joe Pomeroy**
 - a. Property Address: 1006 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/10/10
 - c. Project: Reroof apartment house with Timberline Architectural Shingles, driftwood in color.
6. **Applicant: John Thomas with T.C.M. Remodelers Inc.**
 - a. Property Address: 260 South Broad Street

- b. Date of Approval: 2/11/10
 - c. Project: Repair and replace siding to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
- 7. Applicant: Justin Bennett and Bobi Pate**
- a. Property Address: 1457 Monroe Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/12/10
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten wooden siding to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Reinstall the operable wooden shutters. Repair, replace, and extend the spindled front porch balustrade. Replacement work will match the existing. Repair and replace roofing shingles to match the existing. Repair foundation piers to match the existing. Repair and replacement any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Paint the house per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme. The body will be Underseas. The trim will be Eggwhite. The porch, piers, and lattice will be Jasper. The front and back doors will be Fireweed.
- 8. Applicant: Suzanne Montgomery**
- a. Property Address: 1105 Augusta Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/11/10
 - c. Project: Repaint trim a cream color. Replace rotten soffit to match existing.
- 9. Applicant: Raphael Nichols**
- a. Property Address: 19 South Julia Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/17/10
 - c. Project: Repair foundation piers. The work is to match existing in profile, dimension, and material.
- 10. Applicant: the Mobile Archdiocese**
- a. Property Address: 400 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/17/10
 - c. Project: Replace the fascia board to match the existing. Paint the porch's woodwork and iron work to match the existing. Repair and replace windows to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint where necessary.
- 11. Applicant: Jason Brown with Certified Roofing and Restoration**
- a. Property Address: 501 Eslava Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/18/10
 - c. Project: Reroof the house. The reroofing will match the existing in profile, dimension, material, and color.
- 12. Applicant: Anne and Hastings Read**
- a. Property Address: 1225 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/19/10
 - c. Project: Renew a COA of 9/25/06 authorizing the building of "a teahouse in the back yard; build a screen porch and raised walkway at the rear and west side. Reroof with slate grey Timberline; add egress rated skylight at rear and west side for existing bedroom with new windows. Add dormer for bathroom. All work is per the submitted plans approved and in the offices of the MHDC."
- 13. Applicant: Cooner Roofing**
- a. Property Address: 1408 Blacklawn
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/19/10
 - c. Project: Reroof with three tab shingles.
- 14. Applicant: June Stennis**
- a. Property Address: 662 Spring Hill Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/19/10
 - c. Project: Install 18" x 20" vinyl sign to window, per submitted sketch.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2010-22-CA: 251 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Gregory L. Dickinson for the Radisson Admiral Semmes Hotel
- b. Project: Fencing Approval - Remove a non-conforming chainlink fence. Install a 4' high aluminum fence.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2010-23-CA: 311 McDonald Avenue

- a. Applicant: Lucy Barr for Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Zieman
- b. Project: Demolish a later rear elevation screened porch. Construct an expanded rear screened porch.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2010-24-CA: 357 Charles Street

- a. Applicant: Eric Crooker
- b. Project: Extensive Repair/Replacement, Modifications, and Addition - Place siding over two doors. Install a new front door. Remove the concrete steps accessing the front porch. Construct wooden steps to access the front porch. Remove the steps and foundation piers that accessed the side wing's demolished porch. Demolish a rear porch and later additions. Construct a shed roofed addition off the rear elevation.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2010-25-CA: 31 South Monterey Street

- a. Applicant: Albert S. and Joyce J. Ponder
- b. Project: Replace the front door and two side windows. Construct a two story addition that will incorporate a portion of the existing rear elevation's first floor. Remove a chain link fence. Extend the existing interior lot privacy fencing around the whole of the backyard.

HELDOVER.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Guidelines
- 2. Discussion

Mr. Roberts reminded his fellow board members of an invitation to view one of his recent projects, a single family residence in Spring Hill. He distributed a map with accompanying directions. The Board and Staff thanked Mr. Roberts for the invitation. The open house occurred after the meeting.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-22-CA: 251 Government Street
Applicant: Gregory L. Dickinson for the Radisson Admiral Semmes Hotel
Received: 1/29/10
Meeting: 3/3/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Fencing Approval – Remove a nonconforming chain link fence. Install a 4' high aluminum fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

The twelve-story, brick veneered Admiral Semmes Manor Hotel opened in 1940. The building is currently part of the Radisson hotel chain.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on April 15, 2009. At that time, the Board approved external refurbishments and landscaping installations for the Government and Joachim Street entrances. The Hotel’s representative returns to the Board with an application to remove a nonconforming chain link fence. On June 5, 2008, Staff issued a six month Certificate of Appropriateness that authorized the temporary installation of the fence. The fence was to have been removed after the six month period of approval. On March 18, 2010, the Admiral Semmes submitted a request to retain the fence on a permanent basis. The Board denied the application. The Admiral Semmes’ representative now presents a proposal which calls for replacing the chain link fence with a 4’ aluminum fence.
- B. The Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. Fences “should complement the building not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face the public view. All variances required by the Board of Adjustment must be obtained prior to issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):
 - 1. Remove the existing 6’ high chain link fence that extends along the east side to the property’s southeast corner parking lot.

2. Install a 4' high aluminum fence that will extend along the eastern and southern expanses of the parking lot.
 - a. The fencing will abut the sidewalk.
 - b. The fence will be painted black.
 - c. The fence will extend 83' along the eastern side of the parking lot.
 - d. The fence will extend 96' along the southern side of the parking lot.
 - e. The sections of fencing along the southern side of the parking lot will be removable.
 - f. Two double gates will be located on the southern side of the parking lot.

Clarifications

1. Regarding the double gates, will each pair be 8' or 16' in length?
2. Will the fence terminate at the southeast corner of the parking garage?

STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposed aluminum fence will replace a non-conforming chain link fence. The fence meets the height, design, and material standards established by the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. While the fence complies with the Guidelines, given the prominent location, Staff recommends the use of a peripheral landscaping along the eastern lot line.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1) of the Staff Report, Staff does not believe the proposed fence impairs the architectural or historical character of the district. Pending the above clarifications and the use of landscaping along the eastern property line, Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Gregory L. Dickinson was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Dickinson if he had any comments to add or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Dickinson explained the difference between the two expanses of fencing. He said that the section of fencing extending along the parking lot's eastern lot line would be fixed in place, while the section of fencing extending along the southern lot line would be removable. Mr. Karwinski made two comments. He told the applicant that a landscaping plan should have been submitted with the application. Secondly, he said a removable fence for the purpose of the carnival season was not appropriate for the prominent site or the District. Mr. Karwinski added that landscaping should be installed along the parking lot's southern property line as well as the eastern lot line.

Mr. James asked if all the components of the south lot line fence, the fence posts and the sectional panels, would be removable. Mr. Dickinson said that only the fencing panels would be removable. Mr. Karwinski said the whole application should be held over for the submission of a landscape plan. Ms. Baker and Mr. Ladd said that they believed the application should be approved as proposed, but with the condition of Staff approval of a landscape plan. Mr. Karwinski reiterated his concern regarding the appropriateness of removable sections of fencing. He said the fencing panels would be removed for only a few weeks. Mr. Wagoner noted that fence panels would be removed on occasions other than Mardi Gras.

Mr. Bemis asked Mr. Dickinson how the fence tops would be treated. Mr. Dickinson was told that finials needed to cap the fence's pickets, and he agreed. Mr. Wagoner asked the audience if there was anyone present to speak for against the application. Upon receiving no response, he closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Baker 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 the facts to specify the use of finials as opposed to crimping the fence tops and to require the submission of a landscape plan for Staff Approval.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/3/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-23-CA: 311 McDonald Avenue
Applicant: Lucy Barr for Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Ziemann
Received: 2/17/10
Meeting: 3/3/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolish a later rear elevation screened porch. Construct an expanded rear screened porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story, brick-veneered Colonial Revival House was built between 1937 and 1938.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on September 21, 1999. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a second story addition to the existing one story rear wing, as well as the construction of the existing rear screen porch. The applicant now proposes demolishing the aforementioned screened porch and replacing it with an expanded version featuring the same design features. The proposed porch would extend the whole of the projecting rear wing’s east elevation. The total depth of the porch (East-West dimensions) would be extended 3.1’ and the total length (North-South dimensions) would be extended 8’. The treatment of the porch’s foundation piers, foundation screening, posts, railings, steps, and cornice would remain the same. The screened bays flanking the side entrance to the porch would be made even in length. The rear elevation would be changed from two to three bays. The pitch of the roof would change. The expanded porch would have minimal visibility from the public right of way.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture...Particular attention should be paid to the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details”
 - 2. “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain there historic appearance. The materials should blend with the style of the house.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):
 - 1. Demolish the existing, later rear porch.
 - 2. Construct an expanded version of the existing porch.
 - a. The L-shaped porch will measure 16’ in length along the south side of the rear wing, 20’ 6” along the east side of the rear wing, and 6’ along north elevation.

- b. Brick foundation piers will support the porch.
- c. Framed, recessed, and suspended lattice skirting will extend between the foundation piers.
- d. Wooden posts will replicate the existing.
- e. Screening will extend between the posts.
- f. Tongue-and-groove decking will cover the porch floor.
- g. Wooden railings will replicate the existing.
- h. Roofing shingles matching the existing will cover the porch's roof.
- i. South Elevation
 - 1. The porch's three bay south elevation will be comprised of a central bay occupied by a single screened door with transom flanked by two screened and railed bays.
 - 2. Wooden steps with railings matching the existing porch railings will provide ingress and egress to the porch.
- j. East Elevation
 - 1. Three screened and railed bays will comprise the porch's east elevation.
 - 2. A screened door with transom will be centered in the east elevation's northernmost bay.
- k. North Elevation
 - 1. A single screened and railed bay will comprise the porch's north elevation.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Porches are a defining feature of Mobile architecture. The proposed porch is an expanded version of the porch the Architectural Review approved on September 21, 1999. The design meets the material and design standards established by the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. While the proposed porch increases the expanse of roofing, the increase is minimal. The proposed porch, like the existing, will be minimally visible from the public right of way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Lucy Barr was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Ms. Barr if she had any comments to add or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Ms. Barr informed the Board that while she had no corrections to make she would like to further explain the application. She told the Board that due to maintenance and repair issues the applicants contacted her with regard to the proposal. Ms. Barr noted that the proposed porch's design and detailing would be the same as the existing. The size of the porch would be extended and the whole elevated to the same grade as the house. Mr. Karwinski asked Staff if the rear wing's south facing window was original. Mr. Blackwell told the Board that the second story of the rear wing dates from 1999.

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 amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/3/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-24-CA: 357 Charles Street
Applicant: Eric Crooker
Received: 2/17/10
Meeting: 3/3/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Extensive Repair/Replacement, Modifications, and Addition - Place siding over two doors. Install a new front door. Remove the concrete steps accessing the front porch. Construct wooden steps to access the front porch. Remove the steps and foundation piers that accessed the side wing's demolished porch. Demolish a rear porch and later additions. Construct a shed roofed addition off the rear elevation.

BUILDING HISTORY

This single story side hall house with a recessed wing was constructed circa 1900.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicant proposes extensive renovations that include the repair and replacement of existing features as well as the alteration of existing features and the construction of a rear addition. Alterations to existing features include the addition of moldings to the columns, the extension of a balustrade between the front porch posts, the installation of a new front door, the construction of new front steps, the infill of two doors, and the removal of the steps and foundation piers that accessed the side wing's demolished porch. As evidenced by Sanborn Maps, the side wing's porch is later addition. The porch was demolished by a previous owner. Only the foundation piers remain. The door accessing the side wing's porch was added contemporaneously with the porch. Internal evidence shows that the side wing's front elevation originally consisted of a single wing. The applicant's propose replicating the side wing's original treatment (no porch and single, centered window. The other door proposed to be infilled is located at northeast corner of the north elevation. The proposed addition would extend from the recessed side wings rear elevation thereby squaring out the house's rear elevation.
- 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...Particular attention should be paid to the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details"

2. "Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacements should reflect the age and style of the house."
3. "The removal of historic materials and the alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided."
4. "Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved."
5. "Deteriorated features shall be retained rather than replaced. Where the severity of the deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture and other visual qualities and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence."
6. "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."
7. "New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired."
8. "The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture...Particular attention should be paid to the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details"

C. Scope of Work:

1. Reroof the house using GAF architectural shingles that will be gray in color.
2. Repair rotten siding and woodwork to match the existing in profile and dimension.
3. Repair and when necessary replace the existing wooden windows to match the existing in configuration and material.
4. Extend an MHDC stock railing between the front porch's boxed columnar posts.
5. Add necking moldings to the front porch's columnar posts.
6. Remove the existing 15 light French door (front door).
7. Replace the existing front door with a three paneled and glazed door.
8. Remove the concrete steps and flanking antepodia that access the front porch.
9. Construct a flight of wooden steps featuring MHDC railings stock railings and a terminating newel posts.
10. Extend siding over the recessed side wing's plyboard covered door.
 - a. The siding will match the existing.
11. Extend siding over the north elevation's northeast corner door.
12. Remove the steps and the foundation piers that accessed the recessed side wing's demolished porch.
13. Demolish the L-shaped, shed-roofed porch/addition that extends along the rear of the side wing and the south elevation of the main house.
14. Construct an addition that will extend from the southeast corner of the rear elevation.
 - a. The 17' 5" deep by 11' 6" wide addition will square out the southeast corner of the house.
 - b. The corner post at the southeast corner of the side wing will remain in place.
 - c. A shed roof will extend over the addition.
 1. The roof shingles will match those proposed for the house.
 2. The shed roof will tie into the rear slope of the side wing's gabled roof just short of the roof's apex.
 - d. The addition will rest on brick foundation piers.
 - e. Wooden siding matching the existing will sheath the addition.

- f. South Elevation
 - 1. The south elevation will feature a reused three-over-one wooden window and a wooden true-divided-light six-over-six window to match the existing.
 - 2. The end bay of shed roof porch will terminate the eastern side of the south elevation.
 - 3. A flight of wooden steps flanked by MHDC railings and terminated in boxed newel posts will provide access to and from the porch.
- g. East Elevation
 - 1. A three bay porch measuring 20' in width and 8' in depth will extend off the rear elevation.
 - 2. The porch will rest on brick piers.
 - 3. Four wooden columnar posts matching the front porch posts will support the porch's shed roof.
 - 4. A MHDC stock railing will extend between the porch railings.
- 15. Install a three paneled and glazed wooden door between the east elevation's southeast corner post and six-over-six window.
- 16. Remove the door accessing the northeast bay of the north elevation.
- 17. Install a six-over-six true-divided-light wooden window in the space currently occupied by the north elevation's door.

Clarifications

- 1. What type decking will cover the porch floor?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves extensive repairs, alterations, and an addition. The in-kind replacement and basic repair of existing features will stabilize and rehabilitate the deteriorated structure. Alterations to the façade such as the construction of wooden front porch steps, the installation of necking on the front porch's columnar posts, and the installation of a MHDC stock balustrade between the posts will recapture lost historical integrity and engender additional period appropriateness. Similarly, the replacement of the north elevation's door with a six-over-six window will not impair the integrity of the house. The door is located at the corner of the house farthest from the street. The true-divided-light, six-over-six window will match those found elsewhere on the house.

The recessed wing's porch was demolished by the previous owner. Only the foundation piers and steps remain. While a significant feature illustrating the evolution of the building, the porch was a later addition. The proposed restoration of the recessed side wing's original plan and fenestration would not alter the integrity of the house.

With regard to the demolition of the rear porch and the construction of the addition, Staff does not object to demolition of this portion of the house. The porch, which has been infilled and expanded on several occasions, is in an extremely deteriorated state of repair. That said and as proposed, the addition's roof engages the body of the house in a manner inappropriate to the form of this particular house. While the proposed addition's shed roof would stop just before the apex of the recessed side wing's gable, the resulting expanse of siding would possess none of the senses of recession and distinction afforded by the house's roofing configuration.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of all in-kind repair and replacement work. The proposed in-kind replacements do not impair the architectural or historical character of the house or the district.

Staff recommends approval of the substitution of a window for a door on the north elevation, the construction of new front steps, the installation of necking on the front porch columnar posts, and the installation of a MHDC stock balustrade. These alterations will not impair the architectural or historical character of the house or the district.

Staff recommends approval of the restoration of the recessed side wing's original plan and elevation. Staff believes the removal of the demolished porch's foundation piers and steps and the reconfiguration of the façade's fenestration pattern will not impair the architectural or historical character of the house and the district.

Based on B (6-7), Staff believes that the addition impairs the architectural and historical integrity of the house and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of the proposed addition.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Eric Crooker and Paul Davis were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Crooker if he had any comments to add or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Crooker informed the Board that he realized his proposal was extensive. He said his aim was to make the house livable, while at the same time maintain the historical integrity of the property and the cohesiveness of the district. Mr. Crooker pointed out that the house had been altered on numerous occasions. He told the Board that the southeastern corner of the house, the location of the addition, is in the worst state of repair. The proposed addition would contain the utilities and a bathroom, as well as means of ingress and egress to the backyard. Mr. Crooker told the Board that he had contacted neighboring property owners with regard to the proposed scope of work. He said all were in favor of the project.

Mr. Roberts addressed the addition's roof. He asked Mr. Crooker if he had considered rotating the shed so the siding faced the rear elevation. Mr. Davis told the Board that he had considered that alternative, but the expanse of siding would only be shifted to the rear. Mr. Karwinski said that if a shed roof was used to cover the addition, the wall face should be oriented to the rear in this instance. Mr. Crooker and Mr. Davis said they were amenable to rotating the shed roof. Mr. Karwinski pointed out that there were other roofing configurations. Board members and Mr. Davis examined and discussed alternative options, ultimately coming up with a south facing gable-shed-gable configuration. Mr. Davis then exhibited a plan showing this roofing alternative. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Crooker if he was amenable to this second alternative. Mr. Crooker answered yes.

Mr. Crooker raised one final question. He told the Board that the house has extensive termite damage. He said that that the windows were in an extreme state of deterioration due, in part, to termite infestation. Mr. Crooker asked the Board and Staff if the replacement windows could be two-over-two true-divided-light windows. Ms. Coumanis and Mr. Bemis pointed out that the original windows were six-over-six windows. The replacements should replicate the originals. Ms. Coumanis added that she could provide Mr. Crooker with names of craftsmen who repair and replicate deteriorated window sashes.

Mr. Wagoner asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak for or against the application. Vance Smith, a neighbor, voiced his concerns as to the treatment of the foundations and the rear elevations. The Board and Staff addressed Mr. Smith's questions.

Mr. Karwinski raised one final concern. He said that he did not believe the proposed treatment of the front porch posts and balustrade was appropriate to the style of the house. Ms. Coumanis told Mr. Karwinski that the Staff files contained documentation of the porch posts and balustrade. As shown by the photograph, the porch posts originally featured necking. While the proposed railing was not identical to the one pictured in Staff files, the original had since been removed and the proposed constituted an improvement over the existing replacement.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending fact 14 c to allow a gable-shed-hip roof configuration.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/3/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-25-CA: 31 South Monterey Street
Applicant: Albert S. and Joyce J. Ponder
Received: 1/21/10
Meeting: 3/3/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace windows. Replace the front door and two side windows. Construct a rear two story addition that will incorporate portions of the existing rear elevation's first floor. Remove a chain link fence. Extend the existing interior lot privacy fencing around the whole of the backyard.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Arts and Crafts-influenced American four square was constructed in 1914.

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 applicants' proposal calls for the replacement of the original front door, the replacement of two side windows (South Elevation), the construction of a rear addition, and the extension of the existing rear lot privacy fence. A six or five paneled door would replace the original single paneled and glazed door. The fixed pane stair landing window and paired southeast corner windows on the south elevation would be replaced by a wooden true-divided-light nine-over-one windows. The two story rear addition, which would not be demarcated by corner posts, would extend the whole of the width of the house. Three separate additions currently extend from the rear elevation. The southeast corner addition would be demolished. The central and northern portions would be refaced. The existing hipped roof would be extended over the proposed addition. A dormer matching the façade's attic dormer would surmount the roof face. The applicants are developing a plan for a two-tiered deck with stair which would extend off the proposed addition. The deck proposal will appear before the Board at a later date. The existing chain link fence that extends around the eastern and northern property lines would be removed. The existing 8' wooden fence enclosing the remainder of the backyard would be extended to replace the chain link fence.
- B. The Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:

1. "Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacements should reflect the age and style of the house."
2. "The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing."
3. "Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building."
4. "The removal of historic materials and the alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided."
5. "Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved."
6. "Deteriorated features shall be retained rather than replaced. Where the severity of the deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture and other visual qualities and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence."
7. "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."
8. "New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired."
9. "The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture...Particular attention should be paid to the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details"
10. "The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with the style of the building."
11. Fences "should complement the building not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face the public view. All variances required by the Board of Adjustment must be obtained prior to issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness."

C. Scope of Work:

1. Remove the façade's original single paneled and glazed door.
2. Replace the original door with a six or a five paneled wooden door.
3. Remove the single glazed stair landing window and the paired southeast corner windows from the south elevation.
4. Replace the windows with single unit true-divided-light nine-over-one windows.
5. Demolish the rear elevation's single bayed southeast corner addition
6. Demolish the rear elevations second story balcony.
7. Remove the corner posts from the northeast and southeast corners of the house.
8. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The rear addition will measure 26' in width and 9' in depth.
 - b. The addition will encompass and extend to the south of the existing central and northern portions of the rear elevation.
 1. The existing siding from these two sections of the rear elevation will be replaced to match existing in profile, dimension, and material.

- c. The overall addition will feature wooden siding that will match the existing.
 - 1. The siding will extend unbroken along the north and south elevations of the house.
 - d. The existing hipped roof will be extended over the addition.
 - e. The North and South Elevations will not feature fenestration.
 - f. East Elevation
 - 1. The first floor of the east elevation will feature six fenestrated bays comprised of two single one-over-one windows flanking a bank of three one-over-one windows and a door. This pattern of fenestration replicates the existing window configuration. The existing windows will be reused.
 - a. The first and second story wooden doors will utilize a design featuring three solid panels below six glazed lights.
 - 2. The second story of the east elevation will feature and reuse a paired one-over-one window unit, a door, and an eight light window.
 - 3. A bay window replicating the bay window found façade's roof will surmount the east elevation's roof face.
9. Extend the rear lot wooden privacy fence along the eastern and northern sides of the lot.
- 1. The fence measures eight feet in height. Vertical boards comprise the lower 6'. 2' of framed lattice surmounts the vertical boarding.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the replacement of original and later features, the construction of a rear addition, and the extension of an interior privacy fence. The above scope of work is the first phase of the applicants' exterior rehabilitation of the house. A proposal for a two-tiered deck/porch is forthcoming.

With regard to this application, the proposed front door replacement is not in keeping with the period and style of the house. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts clearly state original doors should be retained and preserved. If deteriorated beyond repair, the door should be replaced with an example featuring a comparable configuration of paneling and glazing.

The side windows were altered at a later date. The proposed replacement windows not only meet the design and material standards established by the Guidelines, but they also match the house's existing windows in their nine-over-one light configuration.

As proposed, the addition from and renovation of the rear elevation, does not feature corner posts. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that additions to historic structures should be differentiated from the existing so as to "read" as an addition. The use of corner posts would demarcate what is old and what is new. Additionally, the use and/or retention of corner posts would offset the addition's lack of side elevation fenestration. The proposed addition's rear elevation fenestration replicates, in part, the existing. The windows will be reused. The proposed doors are in keeping with the style and period of the house.

While the extension of the wooden fence will replace a non-conforming chain link fence, the proposed fence exceeds the height limits established by the Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1 and 6), Staff does not recommend the replacement of the original door. The replacement of the original door would impair the architectural and historical character of the house and the district. If

the door is beyond repair, Staff recommends the use a half glazed and half paneled door that replicates the design of the original door.

Based on B (2, 3, & 6), Staff recommends approval of the replacement of windows on the east elevation. The proposed windows do not impair the architectural or historical integrity of the house or the district.

Based on B (7), Staff recommends approval of the addition on the condition that the corner posts are maintained or replicated. The addition would then not impair the architectural or historical integrity of the house or the district.

While the proposed extension of the wooden fence would remove a non-conforming chain link fence, the proposed fence exceeds the height limits established the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. Based on B (11), Staff believes the proposed fence would impair the architectural and historical character of the house and the district.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Wagoner asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions or comments regarding the application. Mr. Karwinski said that the application, as proposed, was not sufficient for review. He said the design of the rear porch/deck should have been submitted as a part of the proposal. Mr. Blackwell told the Board the application was submitted in this fashion at the request of the applicants. He said that the applicants wanted to receive approval for the addition before proceeding to the design of the rear porch/deck. Mr. James agreed with Mr. Karwinski, noting that the plans and the proposal left much to conjecture. Mr. Ladd asked if it was feasible to hold over approval for the submission of a complete set of plans. Mr. Bemis asked the Board if they were objecting to the addition or its articulation. A discussion of the proposed plans ensued. Mr. Oswalt and Ms. Baker reminded the Board that they are charged to review applications as they are proposed. Mr. Bemis informed the Board that they had three options. The application could either be approved, denied, or held over. Mr. Ladd moved to hold over the application to the March 17, 2010 meeting.

The motion received a second and passed unanimously.