

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
November 1, 2017 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Harris Oswalt, Bob Allen, John Ruzic, Catarina Echols, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone.
Members Absent: David Barr, Robert Brown, Jim Wagoner, Carolyn Hasser, and Kim Harden.
Staff Members Present: Shayla Beaco, Cartledge W. Blackwell, Bridget Daniel, and Paige Lague.
2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes for the October 18th, 2017 meeting. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.
3. Mr. Stone moved to approve the Midmonths. The motion received a second and was approved with one in opposition, Mr. Robert Allen.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: City of Mobile**
 - a. Property Address: 107 S. Royal Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/9/2017
 - c. Project: Repair stucco to match existing in composition and finish.
2. **Applicant: Maly Var**
 - a. Property Address: 12 S. Conception Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/10/2017
 - c. Project: Install hanging blade sign to be less than 20 square feet total both sides and composed of metal with painted lettering to say "Sno Dash".
3. **Applicant: Douglas Kearley on behalf of John Ruzic**
 - a. Property Address: 457 Marine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/12/2017
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replaced deteriorated woodwork, siding, and detail to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated window sashes to match the existing with regard to light configuration, muntin profile, and overall dimension. Reroof with asphalt shingles. Enclose rear NE corner not visible from the public view with materials to match the existing. Corner boards will be retained and a double French door and wood canopy above installed (See renderings)to a new rear deck. Repaint.
4. **Applicant: Douglas Kearley on behalf of John Ruzic**
 - a. Property Address: 455 Marine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/12/2017
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replaced deteriorated woodwork, siding, and detail to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated window sashes to match the existing with regard to light configuration, muntin profile, and overall dimension. Reroof with asphalt shingles. Enclose rear NE corner not visible from the public view with materials to match the existing. Corner boards will be retained and a double French door and wood canopy above installed (See renderings)to a new rear deck. Repaint.
5. **Applicant: Douglas Kearley on behalf of John Ruzic**

- a. Property Address: 459 Marine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/12/2017
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replaced deteriorated woodwork, siding, and detail to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated window sashes to match the existing with regard to light configuration, muntin profile, and overall dimension. Reroof with asphalt shingles. Enclose rear NE corner not visible from the public view with materials to match the existing. Corner boards will be retained and a double French door and wood canopy above installed (See renderings) to a new rear deck. Repaint.
- 6. Applicant: JemCo LLC**
- a. Property Address: 450 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/13/2017
 - c. Project: Repaint doors, gutters and downspouts BLP Savannah Dark Brown. Paint windows and sign areas BLP DeTonti Square Off White.
- 7. Applicant: Wendell Quimby**
- a. Property Address: 8 S. Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/13/2017
 - c. Project: Repair/replace rotten porch decking and rails, columns to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
- 8. Applicant: Andrew Martin**
- a. Property Address: 1404 Eslava Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/13/2017
 - c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood to match existing.
- 9. Applicant: Sydney Betbeze on behalf of Restore Mobile**
- a. Property Address: 462 George Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/13/2017
 - c. Project: Repaint in the following color scheme: body-techno gray; trim-creamy; deck and accent-cocoon; and porch ceiling-topsail.
- 10. Applicant: Sydney Betbeze on behalf of Restore Mobile**
- a. Property Address: 464 George Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/13/2017
 - c. Project: Repaint in the following color scheme: body-tuscan red; trim-creamy; deck-argos; accent-grizzle gray; and porch ceiling-topsail.
- 11. Applicant: Robert Maleculah**
- a. Property Address: 356 Michigan Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/16/2017
 - c. Project: Replace current porch infill with new wood windows. Repair roof when necessary to match existing. Replace deteriorated wood to match existing in dimension, profile and material. Repaint in the following Benjamin Moore color scheme: body-broadstreet beige; trim-white.
- 12. Applicant: Shay Taylor**
- a. Property Address: 306 S. Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/17/2017
 - c. Project: Repaint brick white. Paint trim gray. Repaint door navy blue.
- 13. Applicant: SBA Communications Group**
- a. Property Address: 951 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/18/2017
 - c. Project: Replace three remote units. Add six diplers stacked on existing i-beam. All work is out of public view.

14. Applicant: SBA Communications Group

- a. Property Address: 351 Conti Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/18/2017
- c. Project: Replace one RRU and one TMA on southwest corner. Replace two TMA with one TMA on northwest corner. Add six diplexers stacked on existing equipment platform on east side. Replace two TMA's on eastern portion and add one RRU

15. Applicant: Bryan Weeks of Diversified Roofing Services

- a. Property Address: 52 N. Monterey Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/24/2017
- c. Project: Reroof with architectural in pewter gray.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2017-53-CA: 356 Michigan Avenue

- a. Applicant: Robert and Jeanne Maceluch
- b. Project: Ancillary Demolition – Demolish a non-contributing ancillary building.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2017-54-CA: 615 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Robert Maurin of Maurin Architecture on behalf of Wendell Quimby
- b. Project: Revisions to Previously Approved Plans – Alter the designs calling for the reconfiguration of a later storefront and courtyard.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2017-55-CA: 357 Chatham Street

- a. Applicant: Michael Rogers on behalf of Project Redline, LLC
- b. Project: New Construction – Construct a single-family residence.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion

Mr. Blackwell noted two applications were up for review for the November 15th meeting including the Campbell Courthouse located on St. Joseph Street.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-53-CA: 356 Michigan Avenue
Applicant: Robert and Jeanne Maceluch
Received: 10/12/17
Meeting: 11/1/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing main building. Non-contributing ancillary structure.
Zoning: R-1
Project: Ancillary Demolition – Demolish a non- contributing ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

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 demolition of a non-contributing ancillary building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. When reviewing applications for the demolition of buildings, the following criteria are taken into account “architectural significance, physical condition, impact on the streetscape, and nature of any proposed redevelopment.”

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

- 1. Demolish a later ancillary building.
- 2. Remove debris from the site.
- 3. Plant grass on the location of the building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

With regard to the removal of the existing ancillary building, the same criteria by which Board reviews the demolition of principle buildings are taken into account. According to the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, the considerations are as follows: architectural significance of the

building; condition of the structure; impact on the street & the district; and nature of any proposed development (See B-1.).

With regard to architectural significance, the ancillary building is not of the same architectural importance and construction quality. Based on Sanborn Maps and material composition, the building was not constructed contemporaneously with the main building. The detailing and materials cause it to not contribute to the architectural significance of the property and district.

As to condition, the building is in bad state of repair. It suffers from rising damp and roof damage.

With regard to the impact on the streetscape and district, the building is located behind the main dwelling at the very rear of the lot. While the ancillary building is visible, its impact on the streetscape is minimal. The position of the main house in relation to the adjoining house would continue to reinforce the traditional massing and placement of buildings in relations to that which is immediately experienced from the public view.

If authorized demolition approval, the later ancillary building would be demolished, debris removed, and location planted with grass.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Robert Maceluch was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Maceluch and asked if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Maceluch explained that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full.

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

No discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt 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 approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the building and the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration: November 2, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-54-CA: 615 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Robert Maurin of Maurin Architecture on behalf of Wendell Quimby
Received: 10/5/17
Meeting: 11/1/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.1
Project: Revisions to Previously Approved Plans – Alter the designs calling for the reconfiguration of a later storefront and courtyard.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to materials located within this property’s MHDC vertical file, the two-story eastern portion of the building dates circa 1870 and the later one-story western portion dates from circa 2002.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on October 18, 2017. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a gallery fronting the oldest portion of the property. The application up for review calls for modifications of previously approved plans (April 19, 2017). Said scope of work embraces a reconfiguration of a later ground floor storefront and courtyard.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Preserve the key character-defining features of a historic commercial façade.”
 - 2. “Locate a new storefront in the same plane as it was historically.”
 - 3. “Design a wall to be compatible with the architectural style of the house/building and existing walls in the district.”
 - 4. “When building a solid wall, use a finish and material that is similar in texture, mass, and durability to historic walls in the neighborhood.”
 - 5. “Visually connect the street and building.”
 - 6. “Design a sign to be compatible with the character of the building and the district.”
 - 7. “New signage is restricted to a maximum area of 64 square feet.
 - 8. “Place the sign to be compatible with those in the historic district.”
 - 9. “Use a sign material that is compatible with the materials of the building on building on which it is placed and the \district.”

- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Remove a later storefront and bulkhead from the ground floor.
 2. Install a new wooden storefront.
 - a. The storefront will be three bays in length and feature a continuous bulkhead with fenestration above (The work approved previously did not feature a bulkhead.).
 - b. The central bay will be recessed (The work approved previously was in plane with the bays to the either side.).
 - c. A glazed and panel door with flanking sidelights will be located in the recessed center bay.
 - d. The storefront will be constructed of wood (The work approved previously was constructed out of steel.).
 - e. Flanking bays (reveals included) will be comprised of bulkheads and with single framed display-like windows above.
 - f. A frieze-like zone will extend above the display windows and central entrance (The historic masonry will not be impacted other than proper repairs in terms of finish, composition, and all other particulars).
 - g. A canvas will be framed within the frieze-like zone.
 - h. The name of the business establishment will be printed on the canvas above the entrance.
 3. Redesign a courtyard area.
 - a. The walls of the enclosure will be stucco-faced.
 - b. The front wall facing the courtyard's northern (Dauphin Street) expanse will feature a planter (mobile/potted) station toward the street and built in seating to the rear.
 - c. A planting station will extend between the two aforementioned portions of the enclosure.
 - d. Pedestrian access will remain centrally located within the centermost bay.
 - e. Steel planters will be located within the courtyard's western (North Dearborn Street) expanse (The work previously approved called for an open plaza like engagement with this expanse in the right of way.).
 - f. The courtyard will be laid with "Hannover Presto Brick Traditional" pavers that will be charcoal in color.
 - g. Plant two trees within the courtyard.
 - h. Install additional planting stations in the right of way (between sidewalk and street) along property's western expanse.
 4. Paint a wall sign.
 - a. The aforementioned painted wall sign will measure 1'1" in height and 5' in length.
 - b. Stars, lines, and the name of the business establishment will comprise the design.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. Provide the dimensions of the signage above the central entrance.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calling for the revision to previously approved plans entails alterations to a later storefront and courtyard. New signage will also be added.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that key character-defining features of a historic commercial façade should be preserved (See B-1.). The portion of the existing ground floor storefront proposed for alteration does not comprise original fabric. As with the previous application, the only original portion, a stair entrance comprised of a door and a transom, will remain in place. The previously approved design called for a set of three double French doors. The proposed alteration maintains a traditional three bay sequence, but employs a bulkhead-display window-frieze sequence instead of a tripartite door sequence. Both treatments are appropriate to the period and style of the building. Recessed central entrances were commonly employed on buildings during the latter half of the 19th Century and half of the 20th Century. The new storefront would still occupy the historically appropriate wall plane (See B-2.).

With regard to the courtyard, the western or Dauphin Street oriented portion of the proposed enclosure largely maintains the design of that which was previously approved. Instead of fixed bench off the sidewalk, there is now proposed the installation of independent planters. In design, height, and material, the wall remains compatible with the style of the building and the district (See B 3-4.). The pedestrian access afforded by the proposed wall from Dauphin Street remains the same. The preceding courtyard did not provide access to the enclosure from Dauphin Street. The axially attuned entry from the principle thoroughfare visually connects the later recessed rear addition to the street (See B-5.). Whereas the previously approved plans called for a plaza-like space along the enclosure's western expanse (that oriented to North Dearborn Street), there is now proposed the installation of planters. The proposed planters would provide a sense of enclosure. Their rhythmic sequence would also provide regularity. The nature of the installation would constitute sense of definition, albeit of a reversible variety if need so arose. Additional planters would be instated in the Right of Way. A Non-Utility Right of Way usage agreement is being pursued by the applicant via the Department of Engineering's Right of Way division.

As to signage, the Design Review Guidelines state that new signage should be so designed as to be compatible the character of the building and the district (See B-6.). Two signs are proposed. Traditional wall and painted wall signs comprise the two signs. The size, placement, and composition of both signs is compliant with the Design Review Guidelines (See B 7-9.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-9), Staff does not believe that this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of the application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Robert Maurin was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Maurin and asked if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Maurin explained that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full.

Upon being asked, Mr. Maurin clarified for Mr. Roberts that the painted wall sign would be illuminated by a light shining across the courtyard.

Mr. Maurin then clarified for Mr. Stone the location of the molding surrounding the door entrance on the floor plans.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow Board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Maurin. No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt 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, as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration: November 2nd, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-55-CA: 357 Chatham Street
Applicant: Michael Rogers of Rogers and Willard on behalf of Project Redline, LLC
Received: 10/16/17
Meeting: 1/11/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a single family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to the 1904 Sanborn Map, no structure stood on the subject property. MHDC property files record the existence of a substation for Alabama Power in 1989. The substation was removed through the efforts of the Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund.

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

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

C. Scope of Work:

1. Construct a single family residence.
 - a. The house will be setback so as to negotiate the setback of the neighboring house at 359 Chatham Street
 - b. The CMU pier foundation will measure at least 1'9" in height.
 - c. The aforementioned foundation will be stucco-faced piers spaced at equidistant intervals with framed lattice panels set between.
 - d. A continuous 1' skirt board will extend around the house.
 - e. The walls will be clad with 6" hardiplank siding.
 - f. The ceiling heights will be 9'5".
 - g. The windows will be aluminum clad wood in construction and multi-light in configuration, either three-over-one or six-over one except on the rear elevation.
 - h. The dominant roof will be a gable in construction.
 - i. Exposed rafter tails and brackets will be employed.
 - j. Secondary roofs will also be gable in construction.
 - k. Architectural GAF shingles will sheath the roof.
 - l. West Elevation (Façade)
 - i. The West Elevation will feature enclosed and open (porch) spaces.
 - ii. A single bay porch will advance from the southernmost portion of the portion of the façade.
 - iii. The porch will be 15'0" in length and gable roof in form.
 - iv. A flight of wooden composite steps will access the central bay of the porch.
 - v. Brackets will be employed along the rakes and at the apex of the aforementioned gable.
 - vi. A louvered vent will punctuate said gable.
 - vii. Two sets of square section columnar posts will define the porch.
 - viii. A glazed and paneled wood door (painted) will provide ingress to and egress from the porch
 - ix. A double window will be employed on the eastern portion of the porch. Said windows will be three-over-one or six-over-one in configuration.
 - x. The westernmost portion of the facade will feature two three-over-one or six-over-one windows.
 - m. South (a side) Elevation

- i. The end of the porch bay will define the westernmost portion of the West elevation as it relates to the body of the house.
 - ii. The South Elevation's fenestration (in a westerly to easterly direction) will be as follows: three windows; followed by a pair one smaller window.
 - iii. The small gable roofed (roof oriented to the East and setback from the subject elevation) rear wing will not feature fenestration.
 - iv. A wooden stoop with flight of steps (oriented to the East) with square sections newel posts and picketed railings will situated at the juncture of the body of the house and aforementioned smaller rear wing.
 - n. East (Rear) Elevation
 - i. The southernmost portion of the Rear Elevation will feature a glazed and panel door.
 - ii. The previously mentioned wooden stoop and flight of steps with their associated railing will provide access to the porch.
 - iii. A louvered vent will punctuate the dominate gable.
 - iv. A 15'0" wide advanced small rear wing located off of the northernmost portion of the East Elevation will feature two nine-over-nine windows or three-over-one or six-over-one.
 - v. A gable roof will surmount the aforementioned rear wing.
 - o. North (side) Elevation
 - i. The North Elevation's fenestration (in a westerly to easterly direction) will be as follows: a single smaller window; a pair of windows, the most westerly window shifted east; two windows enlarged to 4'11"; and single window enlarged to 5'11".
- 2. Instate hardscaping.
 - i. Install concrete walkway from street to steps leading to front entrance.
 - ii. Install concrete driveway.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 357 Chatham Street, is located within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application up for review involves construction of single family residential infill between a vacant lot to the North and a contributing house to the South.

The application is the first modular building typology to appear before the Board. A succession of other typologies will appear before the Board in the coming months and years. Modular construction in terms of both individual component and comprehensive volume possesses a long history in Mobile architecture. In 1817, Stephen Hallett, an individual who would become one of the leading figures in Mobile's Antebellum epoch, shipped in disassembled form multiple house frames to Mobile for ultimate construction. Hallett and his brother would go on to develop Mobile's first sash and blind factories. The City would become a center for that particular expression of early industrial prefabrication. Window sashes, louvered shutters, paneled doors, and eared architraves ("Egyptian Doors") were the predominant constructions of those outfits. These were shipped across the City, Gulf, and Black Belt. The types of pre-manufactured components increased in number, design, and material during the last decade of the

Antebellum era before exploding during the Postbellum era. Ironwork and plaster compositions were two locally popular material compositions that joined the more pervasive wooden products. Railings, scroll sawn work, Friezes, crestings, and countless other elements went from individual creation to mass production. Scale and scope also expanded. Following on the heels of Stephen Hallett was Hinkle and Guild of Cincinnati went on to design construct, and ship whole houses. Azalea Manor located at 1624 Spring Hill Avenue is undoubtedly Hinkle and Guild creation. James Barber and latterly Aladdin and Sears & Roebuck followed suit. Modular is then not new phenomenon. The City of Mobile has experimented with it in one recent instance. A house resembling a double shotgun is the single instance of that test project. Known as the “Delaware Double”, that building is located at 906-908 Delaware Street not too far south of the subject property.

Returning to the larger initiative at hand, all proposed designs located within locally designated historic districts will be reviewed by the Board so as to ensure compatibility with the surrounding historical character of the surrounding properties and districts. Other designs will hark to different typologies and stylisms so as to harmonize within particular contexts. As will all infill, context is key when reviewing all new construction in historic districts. When reviewing the applications for new residential construction, the following criteria are taken into account so as to retain architectural and respect historical contexts: placement; orientation; massing; scale; building elements; and materials. Here follows the analysis of this first instance of modular infill construction by the applicant for execution within Mobile’s Historic districts.

With regard to placement, two components are taken into account – setback from the street and distance between buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state that new buildings should be responsive to and maintain the alignment of traditional façade lines (See B-1), as well as the rhythm of side & rear setbacks (See B-2.). The property under review, an inner block situation, is located adjacent to/in the vicinity of contributing buildings and beside a vacant lot. In accord with Design Guidelines, the setbacks reflect the historical character of the contributing aspects of the built landscape. The proposed placement negotiates the placement of two buildings located to either side of it. To the North of the vacant lot is almost lot line setback of the side setback of 1015 Savannah Street. To the South stands 359 Chatham Street, the residence which along with 361 Chatham Street that the proposed placement responds. The side setbacks are traditional in dimension. The façade directly engages the street in its orientation. The proposed front walk and side drive would further stress the primacy of the street and reintroduce lost rhythmic sequence of elements respectful of traditional placement patterns.

The Design Review Guidelines state that mass - the relationship of the parts of the larger whole comprising a building - for new construction should be in keeping with arrangement and proportion of surrounding historic residences (B-3). The proposed house adopts the large block-like massing a dominant thread of thread of the Arts and Crafts Movement’s predominant residential typology – a “bungalow. A continuous foundation and dominant roof anchor the building. A rear wing and advance porch feature smaller, but proportionally responsive gable roofs. These advances and recesses of plan, coupled with the depth of the front porch, serve to relieve and enliven the massing without causing for irregularity. The outward massing of the building, a block with a corner porch surmounted by a gabled roof, is one found within and beyond the boundaries of the surrounding Oakleigh Garden district. The scale of the porch and massing of the proposed house respond to a prevalent historical typology in general and specific. – a porch fronted residence, more specifically the corner porch bungalow (See B-13.). The roughly two (2) foot height of the foundation is reflective of traditional foundation elevations (See B-5.) and dwellings on properties abutting the subject address. The façade’s more compartmentalized treatment is even more responsive to historical traditions (See B-5.). While a raised slab in construction, the foundation would feature a regularized sequence of simulated stucco-faced piers which would serve to simultaneously unify and compartmentalize that lowest level of the built elevation

The massing of the structure, one informed by 9' ceilings atop a continuous 1' skirt board, is compatible with the architectural context of the contributing landscape which it is situated amidst (See B-7.) As mentioned previously, the dominant street-oriented gable roof is relieved by a secondary roof informing the front porch, as well as secondary roof informing the surmounting (See B-15.).

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

With regard to building components, the Design Review Guidelines call for responsiveness to traditional design traditions. Innovation is not ruled out, but compatibility is the goal. The asymmetrically composed and partially porch-fronted residence takes inspiration in both general and more importantly in specific senses from an architectural typology that animated Mobile's architecture during the first third of the 20th Century - the corner porch bungalow. As mentioned in the portion of the narrative articulating massing, the typology evoked has precedent in the immediate and surrounding landscape (See B-8.). Going further into building components, the building employs sash window types (sash) and wall treatment (siding) that inform the immediate and vast majority of the surrounding architectural and historical context (See B-11.). While the type of window is responsive, the configuration could be bettered. The proposed window spacing affords a traditional solid-to-void ratio (See B-10.). Only one faux window set within the westernmost portion the West Elevation might be suggested. All the proposed window designs are simply cased as the dominant treatment for window surrounds (See B-11.) in the area. Placement and employ of special features such as brackets and vents also serve tie the building to other historic buildings.

In accord with the Design Guidelines for New Construction, the building materials, while of the present day, blend with those employed in the past and in immediate surroundings (See B 9 & 14.). Hardiboard siding and aluminum clad windows are approved for new construction within Mobile's Historic Districts.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. What is the proposed setback from the street?
2. What is the depth of the front porch?

NON-BINDING STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Consider a six-over-six window configuration as the dominant window pattern.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-15), Staff does not believe this application would impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application and requests to approve the color scheme administratively upon its provision by the applicant.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. John Ruzic recused himself from the discussion and departed from the room.

Mr. Mike Rogers was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Blackwell welcomed Mr. Rogers and asked if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Rogers expressed his team's excitement for the project. He explained that this application is the first of more modular housing types worked to fit in the landscape. He further explained that the modular building parts are shipping from Northern Alabama in two portions and will hinge at the roofline. Mr. Rogers stated in a typical building cycle a residence would take 6-10 months to build, however with modular housing the process will take two months with minimal impact on the surrounding neighbors. He explained that the investors of the project had purchased twenty lots in the neighborhood. He continued to explain that the lots purchased have already been cleaned and maintained. He then stated his hopes for the project to encourage development.

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

Mr. Roberts thanked Mr. Rogers for the positive work in the neighborhood. Mr. Roberts asked the staff to ensure the railing details were similar to other railings in the landscape. He then suggested to Mr. Rogers that the shutters be left off the house. Mr. Rogers replied that staff had been helpful in the process and that the applicants were open to suggestions and amenable to not using shutters.

Mr. Stone stated the narrow windows on the front bedroom need the shutters for width or may need to be widened. Mr. Blackwell suggested to note on the COA the front elevation bedroom windows would either have shutters or the width be 3'. Mr. Roberts stated the 3' window width would be the better option. Mr. Rogers stated many considerations were taken by the architect when designing the project.

Mr. Allen stated that at an earlier date the Board did not approve shutters on his bungalow. Mr. Blackwell apologized that a previous Board did not allow the shutters, but noted evidence of original bungalows having shutters and encouraged Mr. Allen to consider installing shutters.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment.

Mr. David Baker, a resident of the neighborhood, asked why the architect chose the bungalow typology instead of a double cottage or other typology to fit the neighborhood. Mr. Rogers explained the process of selecting and designing the modular housing. He noted in surveying the area that the bungalow is actually a common typology.

Mr. Blackwell added that Mr. Rogers consulted the MHDC on typologies which fit the landscape. He noted two houses on the street fit the same vocabulary. He went on to say that other typologies and epochs, the Creole and Victorian for instance, will be come before the Board at later dates. Mr. Blackwell stated that each address would come before the Board and considered in context.

Mr. Blackwell clarified for Ms. Celia Murphy, a resident of the neighborhood, the definition of "simulated piers". It was noted that the actual foundation construction was raised pier. Mr. Blackwell apologized for the discrepancy in the staff report.

Upon being asked, Mr. Rogers replied to Mr. Roberts' query about how the modular housing units were fabricated.

Ms. Murphy expressed her concern that if this plan was approved it would set a precedent since it was a model plan. Mr. Blackwell noted each application is considered on a case by case basis and approved per lot and landscape.

Mr. Jamie Betbeze, resident of the neighborhood, thanked Mr. Rogers for his investment in the neighborhood.

Mr. Kevin Cross, representing the Historic Mobile Preservation Society (HMPS), expressed support of the project. Mr. Cross further expressed his support as a resident of the neighborhood, but asked for clarification on the porch size as it has particular importance to the culture and climate of the South. Mr. Rogers stated the porch size was a comfortable 16' x 10'.

Mr. Allen stated his concern with the configuration of the windows and the narrow size of the front windows. He noted 13 of 16 bungalows in the neighborhood possessed a multi light pattern of three-over-one. Mr. Rogers stated the multi light pattern could be investigated.

Mr. Allen expressed concern over the solid-to-void ratio of the elevations, particularly the two side elevations. He stated the bungalow had simple variations of windows. Mr. Blackwell noted some bungalows, as seen in the Fearnway neighborhood, had several patterns of windows with no particular rhythm.

Mr. Rogers stated that he could not speak for the architect, but several items were taken into consideration when designing the project as per windows. He noted that staff had similar questions as to the location of windows. Mr. Rogers further noted that there was some room to alter the window schedule, however cost was a concern. Mr. Roberts expressed his thoughts that the architect chose the types and locations of windows to correlate to the floor plan. He suggested limiting the house to three windows.

Mr. Allen reiterated his concern with the solid-to-void ratio and rhythm. Mr. Roberts noted the side elevations are often more irregular in rhythm. Mr. Stone stated the house was on an inner lot.

Mr. Allen inquired as to a set of three small windows on a side elevation. Mr. Blackwell stated small windows were often located in kitchens and examples could be found in the landscape on S. Georgia Avenue and Rapier Street.

Mr. Allen expressed his concern that the window patterns on the side elevations were too irregular for a bungalow. Mr. Roberts suggested either holding over the application for revised elevations or coming to a resolution and amending the application at the current meeting. The applicant was amenable to coming to a resolution, and if the plan did not work coming back before the Board.

The Board agreed whether three-over-one or six-over-one multi light pattern be employed. The Board then discussed each elevation separately and noted changes to the windows.

The Board agreed the South elevation should be as follows in a westerly to easterly direction: three larger windows and one window in lieu of three small windows and a double window.

The Board agreed the rear elevation was not a concern since it was out of public view.

The Board agreed the North elevation be configured as follows from an easterly to westerly direction: enlarge window to 5' 11", enlarge to middle windows to 4' 11", shift smaller window two feet east.

The Board agreed that the two front windows should be enlarged and spaced correctly.

Mr. Blackwell restated the changes to the facts as follows: the house will be built on stucco piers; all windows will change in configuration to three-over-one or six-over-one; the front elevation windows will be enlarged, spaced correctly, and will not have shutters; the South elevation should be as follows in a westerly to easterly direction: three larger windows and one window in lieu of three small windows and a double window; North elevation be configured as follows from a easterly to westerly direction: enlarge window to 5'11", enlarge two middle windows to 4'11", shift smaller window two feet east.

No further discussion ensued from amongst the Board.

No comment ensued from the audience.

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 amended by the Board to note the house will be built on stucco piers; all windows will change in configuration to three-over-one or six-over-one; the front elevation windows will be enlarged, spaced correctly, and will not have shutters; the South elevation should be as follows in a westerly to easterly direction: three larger windows and one window in lieu of three small windows and a double window; North elevation be configured as follows from a easterly to westerly direction: enlarge window to 5'11", enlarge two middle windows to 4'11", shift smaller window two feet.

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 building and the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration: November 6, 2018