

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**November 2, 2011 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Devereaux Bemis, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:  
**Members Present:** Gertrude Baker, Kim Harden, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Andrew Martin, Harris Oswalt, and Craig Roberts.  
**Members Absent:** Carlos Gant, Jim Wagoner, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson.  
**Staff Members Present:** Devereaux Bemis, Keri Coumanis, and John Lawler.
2. Ms. Harden moved to approve the minutes of the October 19, 2011 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

**B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED**

1. **Applicant: Lucy Kahalley**
  - a. Property Address: 66 Fearnway
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/10/11
  - c. Project: Install a wooden shed in the northeast corner of the lot. Paint the building to match the main house.
2. **Applicant: Sam Winter**
  - a. Property Address: 22 South Lafayette Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/12/11
  - c. Project: Install new garage doors, Model 5951 C.H.I. without the glass top. White in color.
3. **Applicant: Trey Littlepage for CFL, LLC**
  - a. Property Address: 105 South Catherine Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/13/11
  - c. Project: Remove the existing roof and reroof with architectural shingles, charcoal in color. Paint (colors to be submitted later). Re-glaze and repair windows as needed. Repair and replace rotten wood as needed. Replace two sections of front porch deck with ¾ tongue and groove decking.
4. **Applicant: Laura Burton**
  - a. Property Address: 150 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/12/11
  - c. Project: Install window signage. The signage will be applied to the window's outer face. The graphics will include the name of occupying tenant.
5. **Applicant: Greg and Nancy Cavo**
  - a. Property Address: 1263 Selma Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/12/11
  - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. The porch decking will be painted to match the shutters. Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Install interior lot fencing. The wooden fencing will be boxed topped and shadow boxed. The palings will be white and the top will be green. The fence will commence at the southeast corner (rear) of the body of the house and extend to and along the eastern lot line. The fence will extend across the southern or rear lot line. A

vehicular gate (inward opening) will be located on this stretch of fence. The fence will then extend to the north stopping at and tying into the rear plan of the house's back/side porch.

**6. Applicant: Jason Jamieson**

- a. Property Address: 104 South Georgia Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 10/14/11
- c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Replace any deteriorated woodwork that might be encountered.

**7. Applicant: Tilmon Brown for the Archdiocese of Mobile**

- a. Property Address: 400 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/18/11
- c. Project: Scrape, sand, prime, paint, and re-glaze windows. Where repairs are necessary the light configuration and material composition will remain the same.

**8. Applicant: Tuan Tidlestan for Bay Town Builders**

- a. Property Address: 15 South Lafayette Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/18/11
- c. Project: Replace columnar piers to match the existing in profile, dimension, material, and design.

**9. Applicant: J. C. Duke for Alma (Pedro) Habeeb**

- a. Property Address: 1752 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/18/11
- c. Project: Repair damaged roof and soffit and paint repairs as necessary. All work is to match existing in profile, dimension, and color.

**10. Applicant: Bill and Pam Miller**

- a. Property Address: 12 South Lafayette Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/18/11
- c. Project: Reissue of a COA dating from 16 September 2009. The COA calls for the construction of a rear addition.

**11. Applicant: Bernhardt Roofing**

- a. Property Address: 37 McPhillips
- b. Date of Approval: 10/18/11
- c. Project: Reroof using GAF architectural shingles, slate gray in color.

**12. Applicant: Pete Blohme**

- a. Property Address: 19 South Conception Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/19/11
- c. Project: Paint a wall sign on the rear elevation (per submitted plan). The sign will measure a total of 18 square feet. The sign will feature the name of the establishment.

**13. Applicant: Museum of Mobile**

- a. Property Address: 150 South Royal Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/19/11
- c. Project: Remove pavers and install pavers.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2011-72-CA: 1757 Government Street**

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for William Cutts
- b. Project: Restoration and Rehabilitation – Restore a rear wing; remove later alterations; and repair & replace deteriorated features.

**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**2. 2011-73-CA: 155 South Monterey Street**

- a. Applicant: Eric and Kim Boone

b. Project: Rehabilitation and New Construction – Construct a side elevation dormer; construct a rear addition; install siding; and paint the house.

**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**3. 2011-74-CA: 1700 Church Street**

a. Applicant: J. R. Delchamps on behalf of the Estate of Charles E. Harris & St. John's Episcopal Church

b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a single family residence.

**WITHDRAWN. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Discussion

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

**2011-72-CA: 1757 Government Street**  
**Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for William Cutts**  
**Received: 10/11/11**  
**Meeting: 11/2/11**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Leinkauf  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: B-1  
Project: Restoration and Rehabilitation – Restore a rear wing; remove later alterations; and repair & replace deteriorated features.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

With its Southern Colonial Revival portico, stone-faced walls, and terracotta roofing tiles, this early 20<sup>th</sup>-Century residence is among the most eclectic residences located on the western portion of Government Street.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on September 21, 2011. At that time the Board approved the removal of porch infill and the demolition of a later rear addition. The applicant’s representative returns to the Board with an application involving the restoration of the rear elevation and the removal of later alterations.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  1. “Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive features, the new shall match the old in design, color, texture and other visual qualities and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing feature shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.”
  2. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted plans):**
  1. Restore the Rear (South) Elevation and kitchen wing.
    - a. Remove concrete blocks that infill the original fenestrated bays.
    - b. Install one-over-one wooden windows matching those found on the body of the house in the reopened window bays.
    - c. Reinstall wooden siding on the walls of the kitchen wing’s second story.
    - d. Reconstruct a gabled roof atop the kitchen wing.

- e. The roof will be sheathed with a standing seam metal roof whose color will match the red tiles located atop the main house.
  - f. The second story of kitchen wing's East Elevation will feature two two-light wooden windows.
  - g. A canvas awning will be located over the wing's East Elevation door.
  - h. Install a four paneled door in the aforementioned door bay.
  - i. Repair the East Elevation's steps.
  - j. Install two one-over-one windows in the existing first story window openings of the kitchen wing's Rear (South) Elevation.
  - k. Three two-light wooden windows will be located on the second story of the rear wing's South Elevation.
  - l. Install one-over-one wooden window in the existing first story window opening of the kitchen wing's West Elevation.
  - m. Two light wooden windows will be located on second story of the rear wing's West Elevation.
  - n. Install a wooden railing matching the stair railing on the re-exposed rear porch.
  - o. Construct a flight of wooden steps to access the porch. Railings will be employed on the steps.
  - p. Install boxed, framed, suspended, and recessed lattice skirting between the porch's foundation piers.
2. Remove a later gallery/solarium situated atop the West Elevation's porch (related work in that area as well).
    - a. Install a wooden railing matching the one located on façade's second story balcony atop the West Elevation's porch.
    - b. Repair the framing and glazing that encloses the West Elevation's porch.
    - c. Install a tripartite window grouping in the location of an earlier window that was later converted into a door.
  3. Repair and/or replace deteriorated features and institute minor alterations.
    - a. Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
    - b. Repair, and when necessary replace, terracotta roof tiles to match the existing.
    - c. Repair and when necessary replace windows and glazing to match the existing in with regard to material composition and light configuration.
    - d. Install gutters and downspouts.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the restoration of a Rear Elevation, the removal of later alterations, and the in kind repair/replacement of existing features, as well as minor alterations.

With regard to the restoration of the Rear Elevation, exploratory demolition approved on September 21, 2011 resulted in the discovery of much of the rear wings original structural components and decorative details. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that restorations should be substantiated by documentary, physical, or visual evidence. Window bays, porch levels, porch stairs, porch posts, and porch railings survive intact. Where damaged, they will match the existing. Siding treatments and window treatments will match those employed elsewhere on the house. On account of the amount visual and physical evidence revealed during the initial phases of demolition of the alter rear wing, Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

The interior of this house was remodeled at an early date. Subsequent exterior alterations followed in ensuing decades. Among the later alterations was the addition of second story gallery/solarium atop the West Elevation's porch. The gallery is not in keeping with classical detailing employed on the body of the house. It was recommended at the September 21, 2011 meeting that the addition be removed. The applicant proposes the removal of the later gallery/solarium and the restoration of the West Elevation's porch to its original single story configuration. A tripartite window unit would be installed within an original window unit. A balustrade matching the façade's original railing would enclose the upper level of the restored porch. The West Elevation's porch infill would also be repaired, and when necessary replaced, to match the existing. Based on the physical evidence of the original treatment and the lack of significance of the later solarium, Staff does not believe its removal will impair either the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

The remainder of the application calls for the repair, and when necessary, the replacement of existing features. All of the repair and replacement work would match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Gutters and downspouts would also be installed. Staff does not believe the work will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the 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. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Kearley if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Kearley answered no.

Mr. Kearley was asked to explain the second phase of the restoration project to the Board. Mr. Kearley explained the proposal to the Board. Staff reiterated their recommendation.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant's representative. Speaking of the kitchen wing, Mr. Karwinski told Mr. Kearley that a hipped roof was preferable to the proposed gable. Mr. Kearley said that it was hard to know what constituted the original configuration because evidence of the kitchen wing's original roof structure was not encountered during the exploratory demolition.

Mr. Karwinski recommended a different railing and columnar treatment for the rear porch.

Mr. Kearley said he would mention the roof and porch recommendations to the applicant.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Karwinski 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 give the applicant the option of using single posts on the porch and employing a hipped roof over the kitchen wing.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Karwinski 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: 11/2/12**

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

**2011-73-CA: 155 South Monterey Street**  
**Applicant: Eric and Kim Boone**  
**Received: 10/12/11**  
**Meeting: 11/2/11**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Rehabilitation and New Construction – Construct a side elevation dormer; construct a rear addition; install siding; and paint the house.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This hipped roof bungalow once featured a full length gallery. In its original form, the house resembled numerous other high end bungalows located throughout the confines of the present day Old Dauphin Way Historic District.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on September 21, 2011. At that time, the application called for the removal of dormer, the construction of a new dormer, the installation of siding, the construction of a rear addition, and the painting of the house. The applicant withdrew the application to take into account the Staff Report and the Board’s recommendations. The applicant returns to the Board with a revised proposal reflecting both the earlier Staff Report and the Board’s feedback.
- 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 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.
  - 2. “The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period.”
  - 3. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterize the property. The work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
  - 4. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
  - 5. With regard to colors, “period color schemes are encouraged.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):



1. Construct a dormer on the North (Side) Elevation.
  - a. The dormer will measure 16' in length.
  - b. The dormer will measure 5' in height.
  - c. The dormer will be faced with wooden siding matching that found on the house.
  - d. The dormer's roof will be sheathed with shingles matching those already employed on the house.
  - e. The dormer will feature two coupled wooden window pairings.
2. Remove the plywood facings that sheath the infilled portions of the front porch
3. Face the wall's of the aforementioned porch infill with wooden siding matching that employed on the house. Corner boards will be retained.
4. Construct a rear addition.
  - a. The rear addition will measure 13' in length and 10' in depth.
  - b. The addition will rest atop brick foundation piers.
  - c. Boxed, framed, suspended, and recessed wooden lattice skirting will extend between the foundation piers.
  - d. The addition will be sheathed with wooden siding matching that of the body of the house. Corner posts will remain in place.
  - e. The addition's North Elevation will feature a single two-light window whose upper sash will match other diamond center paned windows located on the North and South Elevations.
  - f. The addition's East Elevation will feature a paired one-over-one wooden window unit and a glazed and paneled wooden door already used to access the rear elevation.
  - g. A flight of wooden steps with flanking wooden railings will access the aforementioned door.
5. Paint the house per the submitted color scheme.
  - a. The body will be Pinwheel.
  - b. The trim and decorative details will be High-Hiding.
  - c. The porch decking will be Garden Path.
  - d. Other details will be Garden Path.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the construction of a dormer on the house's North Elevation, the installation of siding on the infilled portion of the front porch, the construction of a small addition off the rear elevation, and the painting of the house.

When the applicants appeared before the Board at the September 21, 2011 meeting, the application called for the removal of the original front dormer and its replacement with a new dormer. The Board advised the applicants to consider alternative locations for the dormer. This revised application calls for the construction of a North or Side Elevation dormer. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that alterations and new construction should be differentiated from yet compatible with the historic building. The dormer will be located above the North Elevation's canted bay window. The proposed dormer would feature siding, rafter, and roofing shingle treatments that would match those found on the body of the house. The wooden windows, while cased to match the existing, will be of a different light configuration thereby providing differentiation between the old and the new. On account of the location and the design, Staff does not believe the proposed dormer will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

The southern portion of the front porch was infilled in the 1980s. At that time, the infill was faced with plywood. The applicants propose the removal plywood sheathing and installation of wooden siding. At

the September 21, 2011, the Board recommended that the applicants submit measured drawings depicting the proposed work. The submitted drawings show that the siding will match the existing in profile dimension and material. Corner boards will remain place to allow the infill to “read” as a later, albeit more sympathetic, alteration. Staff does not believe the installation of the proposed siding will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

The applicant’s original submission for a rear addition squared out the northeast corner of the house. After altering the plans so to relocate the dormer and addressing additional site related issues, the applicant’s propose a smaller addition, one which is in large part confined to the rear porch. The proposed addition’s siding, window, and roofing shingles would match the existing. The existing shed roof would extend over the addition. An existing rear door would be reused. Corner boards would remain in place to provide differentiation between the old and new work. On account of the size, location, and design of the proposed work, Staff does not believe the addition will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building.

The proposed color scheme was discussed at length during the course of the last meeting. The September 21, 2011 Staff Report stated that the “proposed color scheme, while not objectionable, is not appropriate for an Arts and Crafts-influenced house.” Staff does not recommend approval of the color scheme.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval in part and denial in part.

Based on B (1-4), Staff does not believe the construction of the side dormer, the re-facing of the porch infill, and the construction of the rear addition will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of that portion of the application.

Based on B (5), Staff believes the proposed color scheme will impair the architectural and the historical character of the building. Staff does not recommend approval of that portion of the application.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Kim and Eric Boone were present to discuss the application.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicants. He asked Mr. and Mrs. Boone if they had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. The applicants answered no.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicants.

Ms. Baker asked the applicants if they were still adamant about the color scheme.

Mr. Karwinski asked about the detailing and sheathing of the dormer.

Mr. Karwinski asked if the handrail was an existing feature. The applicants answered yes.

Mr. Karwinski asked the applicants about corner boards.

Ms. Baker reminded her fellow Board members that when the property last appeared before the Board a proposed dormer had been a point of contention.

Mr. Karwinski asked what type of siding would be employed on the rear addition. He also asked whether corner boards would be retained.

Mr. Karwinski made several recommendations. He suggested that the rear steps employ a landing, that a roof extend over said landing and that corner boards be retained.

Staff also recommended the retention of the corner boards.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that corner boards will be retained and that the applicants have the option to employ Mr. Karwinski's suggestions regarding the landing and its umbrage.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/2/12**

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

**2011-74-CA: 1700 Church Street**  
**Applicant: J. R. Delchamps on behalf of the Estate of Charles E. Harris, Jr and the St. John's Episcopal Church**  
**Received: 10/14/11**  
**Meeting: 11/2/11**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Leinkauf  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Demolition – Demolish a single family residence.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This contributing residence dates from the first third of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. The single story house features a gabled stoop entrance and a large side porch.

**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 property is in the process of being gifted to St. John's Episcopal Church. The application calls for the demolition of the house, the leveling the lot, and the planting grass. .
- B. The regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building's loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
  - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
    - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
      - 1. This contributing residence is one many single story houses featuring a stoop accessed front entrance and a screened side porch. This wood frame example is situated on a corner lot amid buildings of similar date and style.
    - ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;

1. This building is located in the westernmost block of Church Street. Extending through three historic districts, the final block of Church Street, upon which this house is situated, is located within the Leinkauf Historic District. This house and others of comparable date and similar treatment comprise an intact streetscape which extends from Breamwood to Houston Streets. The house contributes to the built density, architectural significance, and historic integrity of the surrounding district.
- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
  1. A portion of the west elevation has collapsed due to deferred maintenance. The interior has been trespassed upon on numerous occasions. Despite the destruction, the building survives largely intact and the building materials are capable of being reproduced. .
- iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
  1. Single story houses of this design can be found across the Southeast and Northeast.
- v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
  1. If granted demolition approval. The applicants would level the lot and plant grass on the site. The lot would function as a green space.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
  1. The property is being gifted to St. John's Episcopal Church.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
  1. After assessing the condition of the house, the Church did not consider alternative uses for the property.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
  1. The property has not been listed for sale. It is currently in the process of being gifted to the St. John's Episcopal Church.
- ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
  1. N.A.
- x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
  1. N.A.
- xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and
  1. Application submitted.
- xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
  1. See submitted materials.

3. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):
1. Demolish a contributing residential building.
  2. Level the lot.
  3. Plant grass.

#### CLARIFICATIONS

1. Will any trees be removed?
2. Will fencing remain in place?

#### STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a single family residence. Demolition applications entail the review of the following concerns: the architectural significance of the building; the effect of the demolition on the streetscape and surrounding district; the condition of the building; and the nature of the proposed development.

This house is a contributing residence in the Leinkauf Historic District. The single story wooden residence, like many of the same date and style, is distinguished by stoop accessed front entrance and a screened side porch.

The house is located in the westernmost block of Church Street. Church Street extends through three of Mobile’s historic districts. All buildings on this final block of Church Street are extant. Several other buildings facing this stretch of Church Street are of the same period and similar design. This house and the neighboring dwellings contribute not only to the built density, but also the architectural and the historical character of the Leinkauf Historic District.

This house suffers from deferred maintenance. A portion of the building’s West Elevation is open to both the elements and trespassers. The building is capable of being restored.

If granted demolition approval the applicant’s would level the lot and plant grass on the site.

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and the historical character of the building and the historic district. Staff does not recommend approval of the demolition of the contributing residence.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY

J. R. Delchamps and Thomas Heard were present to discuss the application.

#### BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the property’s representative. He asked Mr. Delchamps and the Reverend Heard if they had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Delchamps

explained that he represents the estate of the deceased owner. He told the Board that the interior is beyond repair. Mr. Delchamps pointed out the exterior's deplorable condition.

Staff pointed out that the property in question is part of an intact streetscape.

Ms. Baker asked Mr. Delchamps and the Reverend Heard as to the Church's intentions for the lot. Reverend Heard told the Board the lot could be used as part of possible expansion of the Church complex.

Mr. Oswalt recommended that property be listed for sale. The property's representatives responded by saying that the house could not be shown in its current condition.

Mr. Roberts addressed the property's representatives. He told Mr. Delchamps and the Reverend Heard that the Mobile Historic Development Commission's Ordinance does not advocate demolitions.

The Reverend Heard told the Board that deterioration was but one issue. Replacement and repair would exceed the value of the property.

Mr. Karwinski stated that major points of concern the building and its contribution to the street scene.

Mr. Delchamps told the Board that the building was beyond repair when it was inhabited. He said that the deplorable condition had since exacerbated.

Mr. Harden asked the property's representatives to consider other options. She reiterated Mr. Oswalt's suggestion regarding the listing of the property.

Mr. Bemis stated that if the Board approved the demolition yet another historic building would be replaced by an empty lot.

Mr. Delchamps withdrew the application.