

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

November 2nd, 2016 – 3:00 P.M.

Pre-Council Chambers, 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: Catarina Echols, Kim Harden, Nick Holmes III, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, Robert Allen, Robert Brown, Jim Wagoner and Steve Stone.
Members Absent: Carolyn Hasser and David Barr.
Staff Members Present: Cartledge W. Blackwell and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Stone moved to approve the minutes for the October 19th, 2016 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. Mr. 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:** Emmett Farnell
 - A. Property Address: 204 Rapier Avenue
 - B. Date of Approval: 10/5/2016
 - C. Project: Replace and repair rotten lapsiding, 1" x 4" tongue and groove, fascia board, soffit, and other wood trim to match in dimension, material, size and profile. Repair balcony. Repaint to match existing.
2. **Applicant:** Bradford and Francie Ladd
 - A. Property Address: 2301 DeLeon Avenue
 - B. Date of Approval: 10/5/2016
 - C. Project: Infill carport section of rear dependency. Area so described is not visible from public view. Siding and window treatments to be reflective of main building. Materials and details to be in accord with Design Review Guidelines. Work to be completed per submitted plans.
3. **Applicant:** Shirla Lunsford
 - A. Property Address: 56 N. Georgia Avenue
 - B. Date of Approval: 10/6/2016
 - C. Project: Replace rotten siding and boards to match existing, repair windows to match existing, replace broken panes, repaint.
4. **Applicant:** City of Mobile
 - A. Property Address: 522 Dauphin Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 10/6/2016
 - C. Project: Emergency stabilization of west wall.
5. **Applicant:** Advantage Sign Company on behalf of Alexander Shunnarah Law
 - A. Property Address: 204 Conti Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 10/7/2016
 - C. Project: Install hanging blade sign.

- 6. Applicant:** Sign Pro on behalf of Matt LeMond
 - A. Property Address: 560, 562, 566, 568 Dauphin Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 10/7/2016
 - C. Project: Install hanging blade sign.
- 7. Applicant:** Melanie Bunting
 - A. Property Address: 107 Parker Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 10/7/2016
 - C. Project: Repair and replace wood as needed to match existing in dimension, profile, and material. Repaint to match existing. Install framed lattice between piers.
- 8. Applicant:** Apex Roofing and Restoration
 - A. Property Address: 1157 Church Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 10/7/2016
 - C. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in timberline slate.
- 9. Applicant:** Susan Goff
 - A. Property Address: 304 Congress Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 10/10/2016
 - C. Project: Repaint to match existing.
- 10. Applicant:** Rameh Khazen
 - A. Property Address: 1322 Dauphin Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 10/10/2016
 - C. Project: Construct 6' wooden dogeared fence along North rear perimeter of lot line connecting to Eastern portion of fence. Repair (if not repairable replace) two porch columns to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Repair and replace rotten wood to match in exact profile, dimension and material. Paint siding in SW 7661 "Reflection" (light grey) with trim to be white. Replace address numbers on front door. Pressure wash rear deck. Install new front porch light to match style of house.
- 11. Applicant:** E. Bradford and Francie A. Ladd
 - A. Property Address: 2301 DeLeon Avenue
 - B. Date of Approval: 10/11/2016
 - C. Project: Modification to Previously Approved Plans (17 June 2015) – Slightly advance the plan on a portion a rear addition's west (side) elevation per submitted plans and elevations. The detailing, surfacing, fenestration, etc. will match the existing.
- 12. Applicant:** Richard & Linda Green
 - A. Property Address: 325 McDonald Avenue
 - B. Date of Approval: 10/12/2016
 - C. Project: Remove later jalousie windows from an infilled side porch. Install windows appropriate to the style and period of the house within the infilled porch bays.

- 13. Applicant:** Will Mastin of GDSI on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Jack Mostellar
- A. Property Address: 105 Ryan Avenue
 - B. Date of Approval: 10/12/2016
 - C. Project: Reconstruct front steps with repurposed brick. Construct steps on opposite side of front porch to match existing. Landscape yard employing the use of concrete paver paths and rear courtyard. Construct 6' masonry wall with brick cap and wooden trellis gate along southern perimeter of property.
- 14. Applicant:** Mack Lewis
- A. Property Address: 158 S. Jefferson Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 10/13/2016
 - C. Project: Repaint exterior to match the following: Body in SW Studio Taupe; Trim: White; and Porch Decking, Steps, and Shutters in Bellingrath Green. Replace and/or add operable louvered shutters as necessary.
- 15. Applicant:** Adams Painting and Repair on behalf of Julie and Peter Albrecht
- A. Property Address: 1715 Laurel Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 10/17/2016
 - C. Project: Repaint to match existing color scheme.
- 16. Applicant:** Davis and Michon Trent
- A. Property Address: 162 Roper Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 10/19/2016
 - C. Project: Repair woodwork (to match) and replace sills.
- 17. Applicant:** LBH Properties
- A. Property Address: 63 LeMoyne Place
 - B. Date of Approval: 10/19/2016
 - C. Project: Paint per the following color scheme:
 - Body: SW 6165
 - Decking: SW 6164
 - Trim: NN 18
 - Door: RR 18
- 18. Applicant:** Glen McGee on behalf of Bella and Beau Properties
- A. Property Address: 1456 Ohio Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 10/20/2016
 - C. Project: Replace fascia and corner boards to match existing in profile, dimension and materials. Repaint with body in gray and trim in white. Install wooden 6' dogeared fence along side and rear perimeters of lot not to extend past front plane of house.
- 19. Applicant:** Steve Stone of behalf of John Serda
- A. Property Address: 600 Government Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 10/20/2016
 - C. Project: Close and open a storefront door to match revised plan submitted. Install removable planters and outdoor seating barriers per elevations. Add parking lot screening at existing lot. Screen will consist of 3'0 high and 6'0" high sections of black aluminum or painted steel fence with landscaped areas at interior of fencing

and a portion of fencing will have vines. Install signage which meets design guidelines as painted metal or wood, non-illuminated above front entrance. Reconstitute ironwork. Repaint building. (Work outlined is pursuant to variance.)

20. Applicant: Nation's Roofing on behalf of Trey Langus

- A. Property Address: 2-4 N. Cedar Street
- B. Date of Approval: 10/21/2016
- C. Project: Recover building roof with TPO.

21. Applicant: Jerry Graham

- A. Property Address: 1215 New St. Francis Street
- B. Date of Approval: 10/24/2016
- C. Project: Finish roofing with 3-tab asphalt shingles to match existing.

22. Applicant: Ronald and Ruth Suggs

- A. Property Address: 354 Regina Avenue
- B. Date of Approval: 10/24/2016
- C. Project: Construct previously approved deck off rear of house. Replace soffit, fascia, and eaves to match in profile, material and dimension. Repair and repoint brick steps off front porch. Repaint to match existing or historic color scheme.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2016-24-CA: 2304 DeLeon Avenue

- A. Applicant: Mr. Pete Vallas Pete Vallas Architect on behalf of Dr. Grant & Mrs. Brie S. Zarzour
- B. Project: Rehabilitation and Addition – Restore a porch, construct a porch, alter secondary fenestration, and construct a rear addition

2. 2016-25-CA: WALA 206-210 Government Street

- A. Applicant: J.E.B. Shell on behalf of Hebrides LLC
- B. Project: Balcony Construction and Façade Rehabilitation – Construct galleries and alter fenestration.

3. 2016-26-CA: 1005 Texas Street

- A. Applicant: Mr. Warren Mason
- B. Project: Demolition – Demolish a contributing dwelling.

4. 2016-27-CA: 1058 Elmira Street

- A. Applicant: Mr. Ruth Smith
- B. Project: After-the-fact-Approval- Retain unauthorized windows obtained without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Discussion.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2016-24-CA: 2304 DeLeon Avenue

Applicant: Mr. Pete Vallas Pete Vallas Architect on behalf of Dr. Grant & Mrs. Brie S. Zarzour

Received: 10/17/2016

Meeting: 11/2/2016

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Rehabilitation and Addition – Restore a porch, construct a porch, alter secondary fenestration, and construct a rear addition

BUILDING HISTORY

This dwelling dates from 1908. The second oldest residence in Ashland Place, the house was described in *The Mobile Register's* Trades Edition of 1908 as being Swiss in style. The same account recorded that the architect of the design was George B. Rogers. Rogers would go on to design and/or restore three other houses in the Ashland Place residential development.

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. According to the MHDC vertical files, this property has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review calls for the restoration of a porch, construction of a porch, alteration of secondary fenestration, and construction of a rear addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 1. “Preserve an original porch or gallery on a house.”

2. "Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character."
3. "Use elements that are appropriate to the style, texture, finish, composition and proportion of the historic structure."
4. "Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color, and/ or wall plane."
5. "Design an addition to be compatible with the character of the property, neighborhood and environment."
6. "Design the building components (roof, foundation, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture."
7. "Maintain the relationship of solids to voids of an exterior wall as established by the historic building."
8. "Place an addition so that it is subordinate next to the historic residential structure."
9. "Place or design an addition to the rear or side of a historic building, wherever possible."
10. "Design an addition to be compatible in massing or scale to the historic structure."
11. "Use exterior materials and finishes comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension, and composition."
12. "Design doors and windows to or onto an addition so to be compatible with the existing structure."
13. "Design the scale and proportion and character of a porch addition, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets to be compatible with the existing historic structure."
14. "Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure."
15. "Design a window in an addition to be compatible to those in the historic building."
16. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
17. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Restore and make improvements to the houses principle entrance.
 - A. Remove later concrete steps.
 - B. Construct new concrete steps that would extend along both the porch's South and East Elevations.
 - C. Raise the elevation level of the porch to its original height (It was sunken at an earlier date.).
 - D. The porch floor and steps will be surfaced with concrete pavers.
 - E. Remove later brick porch piers.
 - F. Reconstruct chamfered and molded paired porch posts with associated molding based on surviving fabric, "ghosts marks", and extent examples still in situ (See photographs of the façade's extant cantilevered balcony for intact columnar devices.).

- G. Repair and if necessary replicate “cloud lift” brackets and other devices located on and about the porch’s entablature.
 - H. Construct a “piazza screen” within the porch’s south-facing bay. The hinged shuttered installation will also be employed in fixed form between the reconstructed paired porch posts.
2. Construct new side porch off West elevation.
- A. The L-shaped porch will be three bays in composition.
 - B. The porch will be 32’ 4” in length.
 - C. The depths of the porch will vary between the deeper southern and narrower northern portions of the porch.
 - D. The porch will rest atop a brick-faced foundation matching that extending around the body of the dwelling.
 - E. The porch posts will match those to be reconstructed on the East Elevation’s main porch and those still in situ of the Façade’s (South Elevation) cantilevered balcony.
 - F. The southernmost porch posts will be paired in nature.
 - G. The northernmost porch posts will be singular in nature.
 - H. The southernmost portion of the porch will feature two bays of the same width.
 - I. The single bay northern portion of the porch will be recessed at a plane behind the southernmost porch.
 - J. Integrated hipped roofs will surmount porch.
 - K. The porch’s entablature treatment will match that found on the main porch.
 - L. The porch will be surmounted by a standing seam metal roofing panels.
 - M. The aforementioned roofing panels will be galvalume (grey) in color.
3. Alter fenestration on the East, North, West Elevations (sides)
- A. East Elevation
 - i. Remove later metal windows.
 - ii. Remove a corner board from a previously infilled sleeping porch.
 - iii. Install matching siding within the infilled sleeping porch.
 - iv. Relocate a nine-over-one window in the former second-story sleeping room location.
 - v. The aforementioned window matches the light configuration of those found elsewhere on the dwelling.
 - B. North Elevation
 - i. Remove later metal windows from the rear elevation of a previously enclosed sleeping porch.
 - ii. Install matching siding in the location of the aforementioned later fenestration.
 - C. West Elevation
 - i. Remove (for reuse elsewhere) three nine-over-one windows from the first-story.
 - ii. Install four sets of double French wooden doors with surmounting transoms to match those found on the body of the house in the aforementioned location.
 - iii. The aforementioned doors will open onto West Elevation’s porch.

- iv. Shift the location of three second-story windows.
 - v. Repair/replace wooden siding to match.
 - vi. Roof the construction with asphalt shingles.
4. Construct a rear addition.
- A. The addition will take the form a hyphenated connector between the main house and the existing garage.
 - B. The East Elevation will feature a glazed wood framed French door accessed by way of telescoping flight on concrete paver steps.
 - C. The West Elevation will feature a nine-over-nine wooden window.
 - D. The easternmost wing of the existing garage will be deconstructed, and expanded in footprint to the south (closer to house) so as to accommodate present day vehicles.
 - E. The fenestration of garage's expanded footprint will feature a nine-over-nine wooden window on the East Elevation and a double rolling door double vehicular door on the South Elevation.
 - F. The foundation treatment of the hyphen and the expanded footprint of the reconstructed portion of the garage will be tailored to the existing context (brick-faced for hyphen and slab for garage)
 - G. Wooden siding to match the existing.
 - H. Reroof with matching shingles.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the following: restoration of and improvements to a porch; construction of a new side porch; alteration to side and later fenestration; and the construction of a rear addition. These restoration and rehabilitative efforts would positively impact a contributing residential structure. For the most part, the work is minimally visible from the public view on account of the size of the lot, the situation of the dwelling on the lot, the elevations of the proposed changes, and composition of the house.

With regard to the restoration of and improvements to the house's main porch, said umbrage was altered in the 1920s. The current brick piers are of a heavier proportion and different bay sequence than the lost originals. Multiple manipulations to historic fabric attest to changes made to a gallery that featured elements and features matching those found on façade's cantilevered balcony. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the proposed work on the porch preserves original features and character and recaptures lost character as substantiated by physical evidence (See B 1-2 & 16-17.). The existing entablature exhibits signs of alteration. The surviving elements and details, as well as "ghost marks", match those of the façade's aforementioned cantilevered balcony. The proposed porch posts are based on those found on said umbrage. As with the entablature and bay sequence, the grade or elevation of the porch has been changed. "Ghosts marks" and other physical signs of original porch height have informed the restored porch elevation. The proposed "piazza screen" constitutes a reversible intervention. A number of Mobile residences from multiple architectural and historical epochs featured such screening.

In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the proposed porch addition is located on a secondary elevation (See B- 9.) The proposed side gallery commences at point two rooms deep into the house. On account of the advanced nature of those front rooms and the house's proximity to West lot line, the full depth of the porch would not be experienced from the public view. The aforementioned features, along with the single-story nature of the porch, afford differentiation from the original fabric (See B-4.). The scale and proportion of the porch respect both the body of the house and the houses on street and within the district (See B 10 & 14.). Just as the subordination of form reflects the relationship the main porch to the house so does the spacing of the porch bays (See B 7-8.). Details and elements are based on those found on the original porches (See B-.13).

The alteration of fenestration off the porch (said location not visible from the public view) and on a later altered rear sun porch is also proposed. Windows removed from the porch would be salvaged and reconstituted in the former sun porch location and other locations. Later metal windows would be removed from the latter. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the new fenestrated bays opening onto the porch would be compatible with those found on the dwelling (See B-12.). The doors are based on those opening off the house's southwest corner room.

With regard to the proposed addition to the rear elevation, said new construction would be two-part in scope. The addition would take the form of a hyphen-like connector linking the house to the garage and the deconstruction & expansion of the vehicular portion of said ancillary construction. As with construction of the porch addition, the proposed hyphen-like connector is successfully differentiated from the plane so as "to read" as sensitive later alteration (See B-4.). The scale, placement, materials, fenestration, and scale are responsive to the main dwelling, as well as the garage (See B 5-16.). These same design considerations apply of the expansion of the vehicular portion of the garage. Other instances of garages connected to principle dwellings include 113 Ryan Avenue and 207 Lanier Avenue. Fenestration either reemploys, replicates, or responds to that of the main house/context (See B-12).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-17), Staff does not believe this application would impair the architectural or the historical character of the property or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Pete Vallas was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Mr. Vallas noted that he considered the entrance door on the West side of the dwelling as unusual for the 1908 building date, as well was a ground floor room enclosed by glass walls.

Mr. Roberts praised the applicant on his design for renovations and additions. He inquired as to the addition of shutters to enclose the eastern side entrance from street view. Mr. Vallas replied the shutters can be open or closed as the owner's see fit.

Mr. Roberts remarked the rear addition and porch may need handrails in locations to meet code related requirements. Mr. Vallas elaborated on the design process for renovation of the house. He stated that the existing columns located on the East elevation were installed at a later date. He noted that the new columns on entrance porch will replicate the original columns and use ghost marks to determine their locations. Mr. Vallas informed the Board that existing historic windows will be repurposed and relocated so as to respect the historic integrity of the house.

Upon inquiry, Mr. Vallas also confirmed the West elevation's new porch will be screened.

Mr. Oswalt opened the period of public comment. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Wagoner 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. Wagoner moved that, based upon the facts as written by Staff in the report, 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: 11/3/2017

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2016-25-CA: 206-210 Government Street

Applicant: Mr. J.E.B. Shell on behalf of Hebrides, LLC

Received: 10/5/2016

Meeting: 11/2/2016

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East District

Classification: Non-Contributing

Zoning: T5.2

Project: Balcony Construction and Façade Rehabilitation – Construct galleries and alter fenestration.

BUILDING HISTORY

From the façade, this two-story commercial building “reads” as a single building. In fact, the building is grouping several commercial buildings. The current façade dates from the 1970s. Portions of a 1920s building survive within the interior of the easternmost section of the building. Other vestiges of what once one of the most fashionable blocks in 19th Century Mobile might lurk within. .

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. According to materials in this property’s MHDC vertical file, 206-210 Government Street last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on May 22, 2006. At that time, the Board approved exterior changes to and signage for the building.

- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Design changes to a non-historic building are to be compatible with the district.”
 - 2. “Design an alteration to retain placement and orientation that is compatible with the district.”
 - 3. “Design an alteration to appear similar in massing and scale with historic commercial buildings in the district.

4. “Use building elements that are of similar profile and durability to those seen on historic buildings in the district.”
 5. “Maintain a solid void-to-ratio on building walls that is similar to those seen on historic buildings in the district.”
 6. “Aluminum-clad wood” and “extruded aluminum”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans, reports, etc...):
1. Construct galleries and balcony from 206-210 Government Street.
 - A. The gallery will measure 125’ in width/length along Government Street (South Elevation/Façade).
 - B. The galleries will measure 8’ in depth
 - C. The gallery sequence will extend nineteen bays along Government Street.
 - D. The aforementioned bays are informed by and will define the nineteen fenestrated bays as follows (from West to East) five covered - 4 uncovered – 5 covered – 1 uncovered – 3 uncovered – 1 uncovered.
 - E. The covered portions will possess a slight advance when compared to/experienced with the unroofed portions of gallery.
 - F. The upper-story portions of the galleries will adopt an alternating sequence of roofed and promenade-like sections.
 - G. The gallery would be steel in construction.
 - H. The faceted gallery posts will feature splayed bases and molded caps and necking.
 - I. The ground floor gallery bays will feature arcuated and straight lattice-like valences that extend between the lower necking and the terminal portions of the caps.
 - J. The second floor portions of the gallery will be feature picketed railings between the faceted upper-story posts.
 - K. Straight valences of the same pattern as those on ground level will be employed on the two easternmost roofed portions.
 2. Remove existing windows and security screening from the South Elevation (Government Street façade)
 3. Install one-over-one wooden windows in the fourteen westernmost fenestrated bays of the South Elevation (Government Street façade). Said windows will be either aluminum-clad wood or extruded aluminum in construction.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves changes to a prominently situated commercial building located at the northeast corner of Government Street and South Joachim Streets. From the Government Street (façade), the building “reads” as a single block. In fact, the structure is comprised of a grouping of building, dating from the 1920s through the 1970s. The current facade (South Elevation) and side (West) Elevation date from 1970s. This proposal, the first phase of larger revitalization of the site, involves the construction of galleries extending the length of the façade and the installation of new fenestration on that same elevation.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that changes to non-historic buildings should be compatible with the surrounding district (See B-1.). Cast and wrought iron umbrages of varying construction – gallery, balcony, and canopy – once extended over the rights of way throughout the whole of the historic (extant and not) commercial areas that defined the present day Henry Aaron Loop. Famed Mobile born academic, war hero, and memoirist, Dr. Eugene Sledge recounted that it was once possible to walk from Dauphin Street the waterfront and be covered by our City’s “iron lace” in some form or fashion for whole of the built distance. The most notable and expansive instance of cast iron galleries survive at the LeClede Hotel, just one block east of the subject site. Galleries have been reconstructed on contributing buildings and added to contributing and non-contributing buildings in almost two dozen instances in the past twenty years across the downtown historic districts.

In accord with the Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, the construction of the galleries in advance of the subject building’s South Elevation (façade) and along principle thoroughfare of the corner site would retain (and strengthen) the placement and orientation of the building (See B-2.). As with nearly all historic galleries, the proposed gallery would extend the length of the façade. The LeClede Hotel is again the most important extant example. The overall design, one which employs a rhyme of two-tiered and single-tiered galleries, is at once respectful of the geometry informing the blocky nature of the building, while it at the same time engenders a humanistic breaking of the block into individual components which comprise a larger whole (See B-3.) Informed by the location of existing pilaster-like devices and window locations, the bay sequence of the galleries reiterates the solid-to-void of the walls and rhythmic sequence of fenestration on the building (and galleries of buildings situated on the block and adjacent blocks) (See B-5.). The galleries would be constructed with elements of the same proven durability as those employed on other approved projects already completed by the applicant (examples being Nos. 18 & 20-26 South Royal Street; See B-4.).

The façade’s existing windows date from the 1970s. The window units are of a design and a construction which are not in concert with the guidelines. Said windows are fronted by security screening. The proposed windows are of a design and constructed of a material outlined as acceptable in the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (See B-6.). The shape and light configuration of said windows are more traditional in nature. Additionally, the removal of the security panels will make for a more pedestrian and perception friendly experience.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-6), Staff recommends approval this application. Staff does not believe this application would impair either the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Ben Cummings and Mr. J.E.B. Shell were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Largue provided the Board with revised elevation drawings. Mr. Blackwell clarified the gallery depths. He stated that Staff was amenable to working with the applicant's design professional so as to secure the use of retractable stairs.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt asked the applicant and applicant's representative if they had any questions, comments, or clarifications to address.

Mr. Cummings briefed the Board on the history and design process for the building's exterior. He noted the current façade was erected across the front of three buildings in 1970 by WALA News. In the proposed design, the façade will remain, however windows will be replaced and a gallery will be added the extent of 206-210 Government Street. Mr. Shell reiterated the design will bring a cohesive aesthetic and coverage from Joachim to Conception Streets.

Mr. Cummings remarked on the retractable stairs drawn on the South and West elevations and that he is currently working with the correct offices for permitting.

Mr. Roberts noted that in the revised drawings the iron work were more contemporary and windows become 1/1 in composition. This is confirmed Mr. Cummings. Mr. Roberts asked for clarification as to the composition of the windows. Mr. Blackwell noted that the windows will be either aluminum clad or aluminum extruded in material.

Mr. Stone inquired about the location of doors. Mr. Cummings confirmed the first level doors remain. A second level door on the eastern portion of the 1970's façade will be installed and storefront in style.

Mr. Holmes noted several items. In regard to the second story door, he noted the swing needs to turn inward. As for the retractable stairs, he recalled an instance they were allowed at the Steeple on St. Francis and that when the building is occupied the stairs must locked in the down position.

Mr. Holmes inquired in detail as to the railing design. Mr. Shell provided a close up of a balcony bay. The design was complimented.

Mr. Blackwell stated - noting the changes in the gallery depths, design of railings, and installation of second story door - that staff recommends application as amended.

Mr. Oswalt turned the discussion to the audience. After hearing no response, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

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 the facts per submitted plans so as to note corrected gallery depths, railing designs, and addition of a second story door.

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: 11/3/2017

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2016-25-CA: 1005 Texas Street

Applicant: Mr. Warren Mason

Received: 10/17/2016

Meeting: 11/2/2016

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition-to a contributing dwelling.

BUILDING HISTORY

This dwelling dates circa 1890. The shotgun dwelling type, which features, single room width and multiple room depth with doors arranged in fill, represents a vernacular form common throughout the Southeast. Shotguns were typically constructed in urban areas for rental or speculative purposes. They often occur in rows. Many were constructed as part of the mill or manufacturing housing developments. First used as a typical dwelling, the structure was later altered as a meeting house, as noted by changes to fenestration. The current owner purchased the structure in 1997. This property was added Oakleigh Garden Historic District as part of a 2007 local expansion.

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. According to MHDC property files, the subject address has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review calls for the demolition of the contributing shotgun building.

B. With 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 property features a shotgun dwelling located in the local portion of the Oakleigh Garden District.
 - ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 1. The dwelling contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, historic character, and architectural integrity of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
 - iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced or acquired.
 - 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. While shotgun dwellings represent the predominant residential building typology of southeastern portions of the Oakleigh Garden Districts local portion, this example ranks among the best constructed and most elaborated detailed. The building features a “twin” on the adjacent property to the East. Another contributing house possessing passageless interior is located to the East of the “twin” dwelling. In opposite or westerly direction of the subject property, there exists a contributing “Creole Cottage” and a lot marketable for historic infill construction.
 - 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 applicant would demolish the building and level the site.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The current owner acquired the property in 1997 for a price of \$4000.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;

1. The owner has only considered demolishing 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.
- 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. Not provided.
- 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.
 1. Not provided.
- xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
 1. See submitted materials.
2. *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 plans):

1. Demolish the dwelling
2. Level the site.

STAFF ANALYSIS

When reviewing applications calling for the demolition of a property’s primary structure, the following criteria are among those taken into account: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

1005 Texas Street is a contributing residential building in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The house constitutes a well-constructed, proportioned, and detailed shotgun dwelling. A residential architectural typology with suggested African associations and Gulf Coast origination, shotguns vastly outnumbered all other dwellings in mill villages, speculative developments, and rental constructions across the American South during the latter half of the 19th Century and first decades of the 20th Century. While many examples survive in Mobile’s traditional northern and southern residential quarters, considerable numbers have been destroyed. The subject shotgun residence is not only architectural significant, but also notable in that it is one of pairing of “twin” buildings.

With regards to the condition of the building, the building requires maintenance, but is fully capable of being restored.

In addition to being one of a pair of identical shotguns, the building occupies a center location in a largely intact historic residential block. The building contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and architectural character of the streetscape. As evidenced by infill construction on the block to the west and the restorations in the block to the north and northwest, active revitalization and restoration efforts are ongoing.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished and the site would be cleared of debris.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application would impair either the architectural or the historical character of the property and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Warren Mason was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell stated the application for demolition was a result of nuisance citations and that staff was amenable with working with the applicant in effort to sell the property. Mr. Oswalt thanked Mr. Blackwell.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Oswalt asked the applicant, Mr. Warren Mason, if he had any questions to ask, clarifications to address, or comments to make.

Mr. Wagoner asked if the applicant would be agreeable to listing the house with an MLS agent for six months and then returning before the board. Mr. Mason stated he would be been amenable to doing so.

Ms. Harden conveyed to Mr. Mason that sealing and covering openings such as windows and doors from outside animals, vagrants, and weather damage will assist in keeping him from being subject to further city fines.

Mr. Wagoner briefly responded to a question of Mr. Mason concerning the real estate process. He explained real estate agents typically take a fee from the purchase price of a property after a property has sold. Mr. Oswalt suggested the applicant speak with a couple of realtors before choosing one.

Mr. Mason expressed his concern for being cited over damaged and deteriorated fascia boards. Mr. Stone suggested the secure and replace the cited boards.

Mr. Oswalt then opened the period of public comment. After hearing no response, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

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 written by Staff, that the application does impair the architectural and the historical character of the building and the district and that a certificate of appropriateness not be issued. It was noted Mr. Mason shall mothball the property properly and list the property for six months on MLS.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2016-25-CA: 1058 Elmira Street

Applicant: Ms. Ruth Smith

Received: 10/6/2016

Meeting: 11/2/2016

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: R-1

Project: Approval after the Fact- Approval after the fact- Retention of unauthorized windows installed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

BUILDING HISTORY

This dwelling dates circa 1891. The westernmost portion of the dwelling constitutes an exemplary instance of a “working man’s shotgun”. The recessed eastern portion of the building has been altered. It has yet to be determined in the latter was original to the building or an early addition. Regardless of the dating of the two parts of the larger whole, the residence comprises a nice instance of shotgun with wing, a notable and largely Mobile specific residential housing typology. bay shotgun plan, was later altered with a side gable addition. Although there have been alterations to the exterior, this structure is a solid example of the “working man’s shotgun” architectural form.

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. According to materials in this property’s MHDC vertical file, staff member John Sledge received a SRO report on July 25, 2016 reporting work being performed without a building permit. This work included the replacement of existing windows. It was after this the applicant’s contractor at the time, Mr. Pinkie Henderson, applied for and received a Certificate of Appropriateness by staff to remove rotten wood lapsiding, porch decking, columns and other wood components such as fascia and replace to match existing in profile, dimension, and material on July 25, 2016. Ms. Smith called the MHDC office in

late September and requested a site visit to assist with the proper framing of windows. Once on site, Ms. Largue noticed that windows were installed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The windows are not in keeping with Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts for reason of their material (vinyl). Ms. Largue contacted Ms. Smith via email when she did not attend the site visit. Ms. Smith met with Ms. Largue October 5, 2016 to discuss the Architectural Review process so she might put forth an application calling for the retention of the windows.

- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
1. "In instances when there is a request to replace a building's windows, the new windows shall match the existing per location, framing, and light configuration."
 2. "Acceptable window materials: wood sash, steel if original to structure, custom extruded aluminum, aluminum clad wood, windows approved by NPS."
 3. "Unacceptable window materials: Vinyl, mill finished aluminum, interior snap-in muntins (except when used in concert with exterior muntins and intervening dividers)."
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans, reports, etc...):
1. Retain unauthorized fenestration – twelve (12) vinyl windows - installed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application for an after-the-fact-approval involves the retention of windows installed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. According to photos in this property's MHDC vertical file, this dwelling's fenestration was altered prior to 1989 expansion of the Oakleigh Garden National Register District. Metal windows were installed prior to that date. It was those metal windows which were removed. The aforementioned alterations occurred before the property's inclusion in the Oakleigh Garden National Register District. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's state that replacement fenestration should match as closely to original windows as per configuration, profile, and materials (See B-1.). Though the light configurations are appropriate with the style and period of the house, the Guidelines do not allow for the installation of vinyl windows (See B-2.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and historical character of the building and the surrounding historic district. Staff does not recommend approval of the retention of the unauthorized windows.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Blackwell recommended the board work with applicant to replace windows by wither a phased replacement or replacing windows in a different light configuration. Mr. Blackwell noted the applicant has been working with staff.

Ms. Ruth Smith, Ms. Pinkie Henderson, and Ms. Valarie Smith were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell suggested that the Board might consider a phased replacement of the windows, the use of a simplified light configuration, or possibly investigation of Certificate of Economic Hardship. Mr. Oswalt thanked Mr. Blackwell.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt asked the applicant and her family members if they had any questions to ask, clarifications to address, or comments to make.

Ms. Ruth Smith provided a background of this project involving the non-authorized windows. She stated that she hired a man, who she and her family thought to be reputable, to make repairs on the house. The windows were purchased at \$130.00 each, and installed at \$200.00 each. Initially the work performed by the man hired was to their satisfaction. Slowly, the family noticed a difference in the man's behavior and work. Work being performed was not up to standards or code, the air conditioned unit was stolen, wiring was ripped out, etc. It was at that time that Ms. Ruth Smith realized the man hired had not pulled the proper permits. Ms. Smith stated she went to pull the building permits and was told to go to the MHDC office. She told the Board that while at the MHDC she met with staff employee, Ms. Paige Lague, and was told the windows were unauthorized and then applied for after-the-fact-approval. Ms. Smith expressed that she has now invested \$24,000 into the house. She also noted she is currently filing charges and obtaining a warrant for the man who did not fulfill the work for her home.

The Board expressed commiseration with Ms. Smith's predicament.

Mr. Stone asked Ms. Ruth Smith if the man was a licensed contractor. Ms. Smith responded he was not, but that he claimed he was licensed.

Mr. Blackwell suggested the application be heldover for the investigation of options, including exploration as to the legality, process, and particulars of a Certificate of Economic Hardship.

Mr. Holmes commented that more information would be necessary about the Certificate of Economic Hardship. Mr. Harden agreed that it would be helpful to holdover the application until more information on the nature of a Certificate of Economic Hardship could be obtained.

Mr. Roberts asked if this property was located in the Oakleigh Garden District expansion. Mr. Blackwell responded that it was located within boundaries of the local expansion.

Mrs. Smith stated she was agreeable to the holdover. However, she questioned if work on the interior was allowed since the need for providing heat in the winter months was an upcoming concern. Ms. Harden and Mr. Holmes replied work on the interior could be performed with the proper permitting.

Mr. Oswalt opened the period of public comment. With no response, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of open discussion.

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, and the that application be heldover for

investigation of other options and the exploration of the pursuance of an application for economic hardship.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the facts and discussion taken place, the application be heldover for staff to explore Certificate of Economic Hardship and other opportunities.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.