

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
November 19, 2014 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, Sr., called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Bob Allen, Robert Brown, Catarina Echols, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, and Jim Wagoner.
Members Absent: Nick Holmes and Bradford Ladd.
Staff Members Present: Cartledge Blackwell and Keri Coumanis.
2. Robert Brown moved to approve the minutes for the November 5, 2014 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. After questions regarding midmonth approvals nos. 3 and 17, Steve Stone 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: Robert Campbell**
 - a. Property Address: 10 South Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/29/14
 - c. Project: Reroof the rear of the house to match the shingles on the front.
2. **Applicant: Tracy Tarvers**
 - a. Property Address: 18 South Julia Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/30/14
 - c. Project: Replace broken glass in rear sunroom with siding, redeck porch with tongue and groove, add wooden wheelchair ramp at rear.
3. **Applicant: Wink Management**
 - a. Property Address: 22 South Reed Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/2/14
 - c. Project: Construct a 10 x 10 addition set 6 inches in from the back corner of the house. Addition's rear to slope to 8'9" with a 1 ¾ slope to the roof. The roof will be asphalt rolled roofing to match the color of the current shingles. The materials will match the house in profile, dimension and material and mimic the house in all aspects such as the skirt board, fascia, etc. Addition to rest on brick piers with lattice between hung appropriately. Construct a 10 & 16 deck across the remaining rear using 5/4 deckboard and stock railing supplied by the MHDC. The deck will be resting on 4x4 wood posts. Brick piers may be used if desired. Lattice will be hung between. Install new wood door per photograph submitted. House to be painted Olympic Gray Marble (D31-3); trim will be white; lattice to be Irish Cream.
4. **Applicant: Steven Dawson**
 - a. Property Address: 107 Saint Francis Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/29/14
 - c. Project: Sandwich board sign for Chick Filet, metal frame, 34" high, 21" wide.
5. **Applicant: Carl Cunningham**
 - a. Property Address: 260 South Broad Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/27/14
 - c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood siding matching the existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint the body of the house in one of the following Olympic paints

or equivalent: D57-4 Steeple Gray; D57-5 Volcanic Ash; or D56-4 Feldspar. Trim to be painted white. Window Sash to be Sherwin Williams SW 7583 Wild Current or equivalent.

6. Applicant: Tom Townsend

- a. Property Address: 401 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/27/14
- c. Project: Window Repair Scope 1. Remove Top and Bottom Sash, and Framing as needed. 2. Repair masonry in rough opening and adjacent areas to provide sound substrate, using historic mortar and stucco per NPS Guidelines. 3. Repair Sash and Framing with either Heart Pine historic wood pieces cut to fit, or, paint-able epoxy wood repair fillers. 4. Sand, prime, paint frame and sashes 5. Reinstall New Window Scope 1. Remove Top and Bottom Sash, and Framing as needed. 2. Repair masonry in Frame and adjacent areas to provide sound substrate, using historic mortar and stucco per NPS Guidelines. 3. New Windows; 6/1, matching existing dimensions, true divided light, wood windows, primed and painted "White". 4. Sand, prime, and paint frame. 5. Reinstall II) Exterior Wall Repairs We will repair cracking with historic mortar and stucco per NPS Guidelines. III) Roof Work. This is provided for in the Notes (left side) on the Plan I sent you today.

7. Applicant: Ricky Vale

- a. Property Address: 1061 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/27/14
- c. Project: Reroof with liquid applied system.

8. Applicant: Alston Fence

- a. Property Address: 1260 Palmetto Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/27/14
- c. Project: Repair/replace rear 4 foot fence to match the original in profile, dimension and materials. It runs from rear of house to rear 6 foot fence. Replace double gates to right of house with a single gate.

9. Applicant: Tim Clarke

- a. Property Address: 1650 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/27/14
- c. Project: Remove existing wooden fencing enclosing the rear lot. Construct a six foot tall skim-coated block wall on the location of the aforementioned fencing. A sliding vehicular gate will extend over the existing drive. Said drive (and a patio) will be repaved.

10. Applicant: Ronald G. Smith

- a. Property Address: 1564 Old Shell Road
- b. Date of Approval: 11/4/14
- c. Project: Extend an existing fence (4' wooden picket) along the eastern lot line.

11. Applicant: Andrew Winiarski

- a. Property Address: 1108 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/4/14
- c. Project: Install a generator off of the east (side elevation).

12. Applicant: Tony Jones

- a. Property Address: 221 South Dearborn Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/6/14
- c. Project: Reissue of a CoA renewed on 13 December 2013. The CoAs call for the construction of an addition atop a porch.

13. Applicant: City of Mobile

- a. Property Address: 457 Church Street

- b. Date of Approval: 11/10/14
- c. Project: Reroof building. The roof is behind a parapet wall and is not visible. It will be a flat membrane roof. Install new downspout, gutter and collector heads of stainless steel

14. Applicant: Frost Home Construction

- a. Property Address: 16 McPhillips Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 11/10/14
- c. Project: Reroof the building using architectural shingles.

15. Applicant: Ruth and Vicki Rye

- a. Property Address: 62 Houston Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/10/14
- c. Project: Reinstall railings on the front porch (per submitted designs – MHDC stock).

16. Applicant: Allison Peebles

- a. Property Address: 107 Ryan Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 11/12/14
- c. Project: Install a covering over an existing side stoop. Repair existing fencing and construct a bricked expanse of fencing (same height). Re-install wooden shutters. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair deteriorated woodwork (when and where necessary) to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.

17. Applicant: Brian Caffee with Tim Killian Construction

- a. Property Address: 465 South Broad Street.
- b. Date of Approval: 11/12/14
- c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace existing eight foot high sections of fencing. Install size foot fencing and gates around the garbage dumpster. Replacing an existing inner lot section of four foot high fencing with six foot high fencing. Install a ten by twelve foot storage building (pending administrative review and authorization by Urban Development). Said installation will meet setback requirements.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2014-53-CA: 259 North Jackson Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Tim Lloyd and Jim Gilbert
- b. Project: Ancillary Construction – Construct an ancillary building.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2014-54-CA: 261 North Jackson Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Sondra Dempsey
- b. Project: Ancillary – Construct ancillary buildings.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2014-55-CA: 701 Spring Hill Avenue

- a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Moe’s
- b. Project: Ancillary – Construct an outdoor dining area.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2014-56-CA: 457 Chatham Street

- a. Applicant: Kevin Cross for Cross Property Resource LLC
- b. Project: Restoration/Renovation and Addition – Undertake structural, wall, siding, porch, and roofing work. Construct a new wing/rear addition.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

5. 2014-57-CA: 101 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Tracy Bassett with Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood for the Retirement Systems of Alabama
 - b. Project: Signage – Install tenant signage.
- APPROVED (PENDING THE ISSUANCE OF A VARIANCE). CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion – Mr. Bemis discussed the proposal for a market on the site of the previously planned Mardi Gras Park.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-53-CA: 259 North Jackson Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Tim Lloyd and Jim Gilbert
Received: 10/29/14
Meeting: 11/19/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T-3
Project: Ancillary Construction – Construct an ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

A detached dwelling, this house is one of many 19th-Century brick townhouses that once lined the residential corridors of old Mobile’s northern wards. According to materials located within the property’s MHDC property file, the subject building dates circa 1866. The handsome side hall residence features Italianate detailing.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on June 19, 2013. At that time, the Board approved the construction of two-tiered gallery. Said gallery was recently constructed. The application up for review calls for the construction of ancillary building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts” state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “An ancillary structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
 - 2. “Placement has two components: setback, the distance between the street and a building; and spacing, the distance between its property line and adjacent structures....New buildings should not be placed too far forward or behind the traditional “façade line”, a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along the street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the façade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape. If the traditional façade line or “average” setback is considerably less than that allowed under the Zoning Ordinance, the Review Board will support an application for a variance from

the Board of Zoning Adjustment to allow for new construction closer the street and more in character with the surrounding historic buildings.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. The ancillary building will be located in the northeast corner of the lot.
2. The building will measure 21’ 6” in width and 25’8” in depth.
3. The building will rest atop an existing concrete slab. Said slab will be slightly extended.
4. The building’s hipped roof will be sheathed with asphalt shingles which will match those employed on the main house.
5. The East (street-facing) Elevation will feature a roll up paneled and glazed vehicular door measuring 18’ in length and 7’ in height. Existing brick piers will flank the vehicular bays. The wall surrounding the vehicular door will be faced with stucco.
6. The North (adjacent lot facing) Elevation, an existing lot line wall, will not feature fenestration.
7. The West (rear) Elevation will be sheathed with hardiboard siding matching that employed on the house’s rear addition.
8. The South (side of house facing) Elevation will be comprised of the following West to East sequence: an enclosed storage shed bay featuring an open door (properly cased) and two latticed bays (boxed and suspended) extended between square section columnar piers featuring decorative capitals.
9. A stucco-faced wall (matching existing walls) will extend between the house and the ancillary building. A pedestrian passage (opening) will punctuate the wall. An iron gate will be employed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of an ancillary building. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that “the appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.” (See B-1.) While the design of the proposed ancillary building respects the design and scale of the main residence, the location of the building (one in advance of the principle building) obscures the house. The Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state that “new buildings should not be placed too far forward or behind the traditional ‘façade line’, a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along the street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the façade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape.” (See B-2.) Staff recommends moving the proposed garage back into the lot (to the west). Recessing the structure to location in plane or behind the front wall of the house will respect the “façade line” established by the main house. Relocation of the building will address compliance issues pertinent to Mobile’s Downtown Development District (DDD) Code. Staff notes that while that while metal and/or composition garage doors are authorized by the Design the Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, the (DDD) Code does not approve there usage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (2), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and historical character of the property and the district. As proposed, Staff does not recommend approval of the application. If the building was moved westward into the lot in such a manner as to respect the traditional façade line Staff would recommend approval of the application. A variance would be required for the garage doors.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Kearley if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Kearley stated that it was his understanding that T-4 sections of the Downtown Development District allowed for construction on the lot line. He cited an example of a building constructed on the lot line only two lots south of the subject lot as an instance of building located on the street-abutting lot line. Mr. Kearley explained that the owners prefer the location as submitted. He informed the Board that the applicants were amenable to using wooden garage doors so to conform to Downtown Development District Code.

Mr. Roberts and Mr. Kearley entered into an exchange regarding garage doors.

Discussion ensued as to the location of the building.

Mr. Kearley informed the Board that the applicants would be amenable to recessing the building so that the front of the ancillary structure aligned with the front plane of the main residence (body of the house).

No further Board discussion ensued.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Steve Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that the building would be aligned with front plane of the body of the main residence and the vehicular door would be made of wood.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Steve Stone 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 following the issuance of any possible variances granted by the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

The motion received a second and was approved. Mr. Roberts voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/19/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-54-CA: 261 North Jackson Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Sondra Dempsey
Received: 10/29/14
Meeting: 11/19/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T-3
Project: Ancillary – Construct ancillary buildings.

BUILDING HISTORY

This center hall cottage dates circa 1900. The traditional dwelling type is overlaid with and complemented by fashionable Queen Ann turned posts, ornamented railings, and perforated motifs.

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 March 3, 1997. At that time, the Board denied an application calling for the alterations to the façade’s fenestration. The application up for review calls for the construction of two ancillary buildings.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “An ancillary structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Construct a carport.
 - a. The building will be located in the northwest corner of the lot.
 - b. The building will measure approximately 14’ in width and 20’ in depth.
 - c. The building will rest atop an existing masonry foundation.
 - d. Square section piers featuring bases and capitals will support the building’s hipped roof.
 - e. Asphalt shingles will sheath the roof.
 - 2. Construct a storage building.
 - a. The faceted building will be located in the southwest corner of the lot.
 - b. Boxed and framed lattice panels will front comprise the wall facings.
 - c. A double latticed door will afford entry to and from the building.

- d. A splayed hipped roof sheathed with asphalt shingles will surmount the structure.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of two ancillary buildings – a carport and storage shed. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that “the appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.” (See B-1.) With regard to the carport, the proposed building’s scale and materials complement the principle residence. The proposed storage shed observes the design and material standards. However, the roof pitch is not in accord with the (DDD) Guidelines. Additionally, the construction of two ancillary buildings exceeds the number secondary structures authorized by Mobile’s Downtown Development District (DDD) Code. A variance would be required for the construction of both buildings, as well as the roof pitch of the storage shed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based B (1), Staff does not believe this application would impair the architectural or the historical character of the property of the district. While the proposed buildings meet the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, the number of structures exceeds the allotment authorized by the (DDD) Code. At this juncture, Staff recommends the construction of the garage as proposed or the construction of a building combining both vehicular and storage functions. Construction of both buildings would involve the issuance of a variance by the Board of Adjustment. Pending the issuance of variances for both buildings and the pitch of the storage shed’s roof, staff would recommend approval of the application as proposed.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant’s representative. He asked Mr. Kearley if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Kearley stated that Mr. Blackwell had explained the application in full.

Mr. Harden asked for clarification as to the location of the proposed buildings. Mr. Kearley addressed Ms. Harden’s query.

Mr. Allen asked for clarification as the rulings the Board could adopt. Mr. Blackwell outlined several options.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, he 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

The Board adopted a two part ruling.

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

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that pending issuance of variances from the Board of Zoning Adjustment (for two ancillary buildings and the roof pitch of the storage shed) that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for the construction of both the carport and storage shed buildings.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/19/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-55-CA: 701 Spring Hill Avenue
Applicant: Douglas Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Moe's
Received: 10/29/14
Meeting: 11/19/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning:
Project: Ancillary – Construct an outdoor dining area.

BUILDING HISTORY

This multi-building complex occupies a triangular block bound by Spring Hill Avenue, Washington Street, Dauphin Street, and Scott Street. Dating from 1946, the flat-iron like main entrance features streamlined features.

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 January 16, 2012. At that time, the Board approved the alteration of later fenestration. The application up for review calls for the construction of an outdoor dining area.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “An ancillary structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Remove palmetto trees (planted within the past two years).
 - 2. Construct two outdoor dining platforms.
 - a. The outdoor dining structure will be comprised of two elevated platforms located within the right of way off of Spring Hill Avenue.
 - b. The two dining platforms will measure 12’ x 45’ 6” and 10 x 41’ 6” in dimension.
 - c. An existing pedestrian curbcut will extend between the two platforms.
 - d. The wooden platforms will rest atop wooden foundation pilings
 - e. The deck structure will be sheathed with wooden decking.

- f. Wooden picketed railings interspersed with pergola-like post will extend around the platforms.
- g. Ramps will allow ingress to and egress from the platforms.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that ancillary construction should “complement the design and scale of the main building.” (See B-1.) Simple in design and independent of the main building, the posts and railings articulating the proposed dining platform neither physically impact the structure nor impair the appearance of the main building. Outdoor dining spaces animate the experience of a number of local eateries. Previous constructions have been approved for Heroes Sports Bar on Dauphin Street and the Royal Scam on Royal Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant’s representative. He asked Mr. Kearley if the curbing would remain in situ. Mr. Kearley answered yes.

Mr. Oswalt then asked Mr. Kearley if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Kearley stated that the palm trees would remain in place. He explained that the deck would wrap around said trees. He also cited another example of an approved, but unconstructed dining platform (Café 219).

Mr. Kearley introduced the owner. The Board welcomed and complimented the proprietor.

No further Board discussion ensued.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Steve Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that the palm trees would remain in place.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Stone 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: 11/19/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-56-CA: 457 Chatham Street
Applicant: Kevin Cross with Cross Property Resource LLC
Received: 11/3/14
Meeting: 11/19/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Restoration/Renovation and Addition – Undertake structural, wall, siding, porch, and roofing work. Construct a new wing/rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This paired door workman’s cottage dates from 1878. The house was remodeled in the 1920s.

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 July 17, 2013. At that time, the Board denied a request to demolish the building. A new owner applicant proposes extensive restoration and renovation campaign. The proposed scope of work includes: installation of new foundation piers; repair and/or replacement of sub floor structural components; replacement of siding; repair and/or replacement of porch posts; and the reroofing of the dwelling.
- 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. “A building’s base or foundation gives the building a sense of strength and solidity, and serves to tie the structure to the ground.”
 - 2. “The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality, and historic period. The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior, finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
 - 3. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions, and decorative details.”
 - 4. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and the pitch and the color.”
 - 5. With regard to doors “replacements should respect the age and period of the building.”

6. “Original windows should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing. The size and placement of new windows or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
7. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterize the property. The new shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historical character of the property and its environment.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Remove foundations
2. Salvage bricks from the original foundation.
3. Construct foundation piers. All exterior perimeter foundation piers will be faced with bricks salvaged from the original foundation piers.
4. Recessed and boxed (wooden) lattice foundation screening will extend between the foundation piers.
5. Repair and when necessary replace joists and the subfloor.
6. Remove the house’s wooden siding.
7. Replace the house’s wooden siding with hardiboard siding.
8. Repair and when necessary replace the front porch’s posts to match the existing as per design, material, proportion, and detail.
9. Install porch railings.
10. Remove later front doors.
11. Install period appropriate four-paneled wooden doors.
12. Reinstall six-over-six wooden windows.
13. Alter fenestration on the North (Side) Elevation. Remove two six-over-six window openings (windows removed) and install two six-over-six windows of lower heights.
14. Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.
15. Construct a new rear wing/addition.
 - a. The new construction will measure 36’ 6’ in depth and 28’ in width.
 - b. The newly constructed rear wing will rest atop a pier foundation.
 - c. The exterior piers will be faced with salvaged brick.
 - d. Boxed and suspended lattice (wooden) foundation skirting will extend between the piers.
 - e. The walls will be faced with hardiboard siding.
 - f. The addition will feature nine-over-nine windows. Said windows will be framed in the same manner as the main house’s windows.
 - g. The fascia and eave treatments will match those distinguishing the main house.
 - h. The main house’s hipped roof will extend over the addition.
 - i. The same roofing shingles will be employed.
 - j. The South Elevation will feature a pair of nine-over-nine windows and two six-over-six windows.
 - k. The East (Rear) Elevation will feature a recessed southeast corner porch. A flight of steps with stoop (with picketed railing) will be located beneath the porch overhang. A glazed and paneled wooden door will afford access to and from the stoop.
 - l. The North Elevation will feature three nine-over-nine windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the restoration/renovation of single family residence and the construction of a new rear wing/addition.

With regard to the foundation work, the Design Review Guidelines state that “a building’s base or foundation gives the building a sense of strength and solidity, and serves to tie the structure to the ground.” (See B-1.) This 1870s house was remodeled in the 1920s. At that time, a continuous foundation treatment replaced individual bricks piers. The restoration of the original foundation treatment with the reuse of salvaged materials will recapture architectural and historical integrity.

Addressing the house’s siding, the Design Review Guidelines state that “the exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality, and historic period. The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior, finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”(See B-2.) While the hardiboard siding might match the profile and dimension, said siding would alter the material and historical character of the house.

An inner lot building, this house’s façade is the primary elevation impacting the public view. A full-length gallery distinguishes the façade. The Design Review Guidelines state that “historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions, and decorative details.” (See B-3.) Porch columns should be repaired; when the posts cannot be repaired replaced, they will be replaced matching the original in profile, dimension, design, and material.

Two paired door units are a distinguishing stylistic component of this workman’s house. The original doors were replaced at an earlier date. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, the proposed replacement doors “respect the age and period of the building.” (See B-5.).

With regard to windows, the Design Review Guidelines state that “original windows should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing. The size and placement of new windows or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.” (See B-6). While the proposed alterations to original fenestration on the North (side) Elevation would be located in the same location as the existing windows, said windows would not be of the same size.

This house is surmounted by a hipped roof. The Design Review Guidelines state that “original roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and the pitch and the color.” (See B-4.) The roofing materials are will match the existing.

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards state that “new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterize the property. The new shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historical character of the property and its environment.” (See B-7). As proposed, the coupling of foundation piers constitutes the only point of differentiation between the historic and proposed new fabric. Staff recommends the use of a “corner board” at the point where the existing house and the new addition meet and perhaps place the addition under a cross gable to further differentiate the new from the old.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval and denial in part.

Based on B (1, 3-6), Staff does not believe the foundation, window, door, porch, and roof work would impair the architectural or historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of the aforementioned portions of the application.

Based on B (7), Staff believes the addition would impair the architectural and historical character of the building and the district. Pending the applicant's amenability as to the use of "corner boards" positioned at the juncture of the historic and proposed work and the consideration of a cross gabled roof, Staff would recommend approval of the addition. As proposed, Staff does not recommend approval of the aforementioned scope of work.

Based on B (2), Staff believes the removal of historic siding and the installation of hardiboard siding would impair the architectural or historical character of the building or the district. Staff does not recommend approval of that portion of the application. However, staff has no objections to an approvable addition utilizing a matching cement board. Additionally, Staff does not recommend approval of the railing as there is no physical or photographic documentation of the porch having railings.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Kevin Cross was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that the applicant was amenable to amending his application so be in accord with portions of the Staff Recommendation. He told the Board that Mr. Cross would like to amend the application as follows: "corner boards" would be employed at the junctures of the old and new work (on both side elevations); railings would not be employed; and six-over-six windows would repaired and/or constructed.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Cross if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Cross explained to the Board that when he took on the project, he knew that he was taking on major investment. That said and at that time, he did not realize the extent of the work. After investigating the condition of the building and making earlier interventions (such as the demolition of the later rear wing), he developed the application submitted for review.

Mr. Cross addressed each of the points of concern. He explained that the addition of railings on the front porch came about for reasons of code. He stated that, based on a brief discussion with Mr. Blackwell, given the height of the building's elevation, railings might not be required. He stated that he was amenable to not using railings on the front porch. Mr. Cross informed the Board that he was not averse to using "corner boards" at the juncture of the original house and the addition.

Mr. Cross then stated the Board that for reasons of expense and maintenance he preferred to use hardiboard siding as opposed wooden siding.

Mr. Roberts and Mr. Blackwell reiterated the Staff Report by referencing the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. Mr. Roberts noted that hardiboard is allowed on additions and new construction.

Ms. Harden asked Mr. Cross if it was possible to procure hardiboard siding that would match the wooden siding in profile and dimension. Mr. Cross answered yes.

Mr. Cross told the Board that he was amenable as to replacing wooden siding on the dwelling to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.

Mr. Cross then introduced to the Board the idea of moving the building three to five feet to the south. He then went in the rationale behind the moving of the building. He explained that when meeting with Bert Hoffman in Urban Development, Mr. Hoffman informed that for reasons of code that the addition might not be able to have windows on the North (a side) Elevation on account of fire-related restrictions. Discussion ensued. Mr. Coumanis asked Mr. Cross if he had called for a predevelopment meeting. Mr. Cross answered no. Ms. Coumanis encouraged him to do so. She elaborating saying by that meeting representatives from the Fire Department and other concerned departments would allow for broader exchange and definitive statement. Mr. Blackwell volunteered to assist Mr. Cross.

No further Board discussion ensued.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note the following: repairing and replacing of wooden siding on the building to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material; not using railings on the front porch; and employing “corner boards” to differentiate at the juncture of the old and new work (a window grouping to addressed).

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Stone 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: 11/19/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-57-CA: 101 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Tracy Bassett with Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood for the Retirement Systems of Alabama
Received: 10/31/14
Meeting: 11/19/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning:
Project: Signage – Install tenant signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

Said to be the first skyscraper on the Gulf Coast, the Van Antwerp Buildings has been one of Mobile’s most beloved icons since its completion in 1908. The ten-story building was designed by architect George B. Rogers and was the centerpiece of the Van Antwerp business empire, a multivarious concern embracing real estate, wholesale and retail pharmaceuticals, and agricultural feed products. With its steel reinforced concrete structure and glazed terracotta wall facings, the building revolutionized the building trades and expanded stylistic exposure.

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 scheduled to appear before the Architectural Review Board on October 15, 2014. At that time, the Board was to have considered an application involving the reinstallation of mechanical equipment. The application up for review calls for the installation of six signs advertising the building’s principle tenant.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building.”
 - 2. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.”
 - 3. “The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principle building, not to exceed 64 square feet. A multi-tenant building is also limited to a maximum of 64 square feet.”

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

- 1. Install an upper building sign (See Sign A in diagram and application.).
 - a. This wall sign will be affixed to the mechanical block’s North Elevation.
 - b. The aluminum sign will be measure 16’ in length and 1’ 9” in height.
 - c. The sign’s total square footage will amount to 30.4 square feet.

- d. The sign will be back lit.
- 2. Install an upper building sign (See Sign B in the diagram and application.).
 - a. This wall sign will be affixed to the Elevator Tower's East Elevation.
 - b. The aluminum wall sign will measure 24' in length and 2' 8" in height.
 - c. The sign's total square footage will amount to 62.4 feet.
 - d. The sign will be back lit.
- 3. Install an upper building sign (See Sign C in the diagram and application.).
 - a. This wall sign will be affixed to the Elevator Tower's South Elevation.
 - b. The aluminum wall sign will measure 18' in length and 2' in height.
 - c. The sign's total square footage will amount to 36' square feet.
 - d. The sign will be back lit.
- 4. Install a horizontal blade sign (See Sign D in the diagram and application.).
 - a. This window/wall/horizontal blade sign will be mounted from the soffit of a transom window located on the ground floor/mezzanine's East Elevation.
 - b. The aluminum sign will measure 13' 10" in length and 1' 6" in height.
 - c. The total square footage of the sign will measure 21 square feet.
 - d. The sign will not feature illumination.
- 5. Install a blade sign (See Sign E in the diagram and application.).
 - a. The blade sign will be located at the location of an existing blade sign extending from the soffit of the main entrance's marquee.
 - b. The composite sign will measure 5' 1 in length and 3' 2" in height.
 - c. The double-faced sign will measure a total of 32.8 square feet.
 - d. The sign will not feature illumination.
- 6. Install a diagonal corner sign (See Sign F in the diagram and application.).
 - a. The diagonal corner sign will extend from the building's rounded northeast corner.
 - b. The composite sign will measure 6' 4" in length and 12' in height.
 - c. The total square footage of the sign will measure 76' 8".
 - d. The sign will not feature illumination.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. Clarify composite (material description for both the marquee's blade sign and the diagonal corner sign).
2. Clarify the exact location and installation of the window/blade sign (Sign D in diagram.).

STAFF ANALYSIS

It should be noted that the building has been approved for two large signs with the name of the building running down the south and west faces.

This application involves the installation of tenant signage. Six signs are proposed. The signs are as follows: three upper building signs; a blade sign; a window sign; and a diagonal corner sign. When reviewing signs, the Board takes into account the following: size, location, material, historic fabric, and lighting. The Downtown Development District (DDD) Code takes into account additional size, location, material, and lighting considerations.

As all of the proposed signage exceeds the existing variance over 64 square feet, the signage package would require a variance from the Board of the Zoning Adjustment (See B-3.).

The upper building sign proposed for the North Elevation (See Sign A in diagram.) measures 16' in length and 1' 9" in height. Said sign would be located on the building's mechanical block. Measuring a

total of 30.4 square feet, the aluminum sign would be back lit. Minus the square footage allotment, the proposed signage meets the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. The (DDD) set a limit on the number of upper building signs. The building already possesses the maximum number of upper building signs. Additionally, the (DDD) Code does not allow illuminated signage.

The upper building sign proposed for the East Elevation (See Sign B in diagram.) measures 24' in length and 2' 8" in height. Said sign would be located on the building's elevator tower. The aluminum sign would measure a total of 62.4 square feet. The sign would be back lit. Minus the square footage allotment, the proposed signage meets the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. The (DDD) set a limit on the number of upper building signs. The building already possesses the maximum number of upper building signs. Additionally, the (DDD) Code does not allow illuminated signage.

The upper building sign proposed for the South Elevation (See Sign C in diagram.) will measure 18' in length and 2' in height. Said sign would be located on the building's elevator shaft. The sign's total square footage would amount to 36' square feet. The sign will be back lit. Minus the square footage allotment, the proposed signage meets the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. The (DDD) set a limit on the number of upper building signs. The building already possesses the maximum number of upper building signs. Additionally, the (DDD) Code does not allow illuminated signage.

The proposed horizontal blade sign/window blade sign (See Sign D in diagram.) would measure 13' 10" in length and 1' 6" in height. The aluminum sign would measure 21 square feet. The sign will not feature illumination. . The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that "signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building." (See B-1.) Said sign would be mounted from the soffit of a transom window located on the ground floor/mezzanine's East Elevation. As the northernmost bay of the ground floor/mezzanine's East Elevation is both a distinctive feature of the building, further clarification is required for the location and installation of the signage

The proposed blade sign (See Sign E in diagram.) would measure 5' 1 in length and 3' 2" in height. Said blade sign will be located at the location of an existing blade sign extending from the soffit of the main entrance's marquee. The composite sign will composite double-faced sign will measure a total of 32.68 square feet. The sign will not feature illumination. While the sign meets the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts (the overall size of the signage proposal), the size of the blade sign exceeds the square footage allowed for blade signs as defined in the DDD Code. Further clarifications would be required as to the material of the sign face.

The proposed diagonal corner sign (See Sign F in diagram.) would measure 6' 4" in length and 12' in height. The total square footage of the sign will measure 76' 8". The sign will not feature illumination. Said sign would extend from the building's distinctive rounded northeast corner. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that "signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building." Further clarification is required for the signage materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff recommends approval in part and denial in part.

Based on (1-3), Staff does not believe the upper building signs (See signs A-C in the diagram.) would impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Pending the issuance of a variance from the Board of Adjustment for the size and lighting of the signs, Staff recommends approval of two of the

upper building signs. This would be in keeping with the signage approved on the First National Bank Building.

As submitted and based on B (1), Staff requests (See Sign D in diagram.) further clarification as per the location and installation of the subject sign.

Based B (1-3), Staff not believe the blade sign proposed for the marquee (See Sign E in Diagram.) would impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Pending clarification as the material composition and the issuance of a variance from the Board of Adjustment, Staff recommends approval of the marquee's blade building sign.

Based B (1), Staff believes the proposed diagonal corner sign (See Sign E in Diagram.) would impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff does not recommend approval of the diagonal corner sign.

Since the requested signage exceeds the amount allowed by law the Board can only approve signage pending issuance of a variance by the Board of Zoning Adjustment. However, staff believes the Board should look at all the signage requested in aggregate and to determine the signage appropriate to the building.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Susan Gallagher, Steve Timms, and Chris Thrash were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the RSA's representatives. He asked Ms. Gallagher, Mr. Timms, and Mr. Thrash if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Timms explained to the Board that the signs were not being proposed by the RSA, but by the building's chief tenant.

Discussion ensued as to the overall signage package.

The Board discussed which of the upper body signs should be removed.

The Board concurred with the Staff Report as per the installation of the diagonal corner sign.

Discussion ensued as to the location, construction, and lighting of the window sign.

Mr. Blackwell explained the rationale behind the titling of the signage.

Mr. Bemis asked about additional tenant signage. Mr. Timms said that any additional tenant signage would appear at a later date.

The variance process was mentioned and briefly discussed.

No further Board discussion ensued.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Harden 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 facts to note that the Sign D would be moved closer to the building so as to not jeopardize the more ornamental portions of the terracotta.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

The Board recommended approval in part and denial in part.

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, four of signs composing the application do not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that upon issuance of variances from the Board of Zoning a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for Signs A, B, E, and D.

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, two of signs composing the application do impair the historic integrity of the district or the building. Signs C and F were denied.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/19/15