

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**November 3, 2010 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

1. The Chair, Jim Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:  
**Members Present:** Gertrude Baker, Kim Harden, Bill James, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Jim Wagoner.  
**Members Absent:** Carlos Gant, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson.  
**Staff Members Present:** Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the 2009 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: Amelia Cade Bacon**
  - a. Property Address: 71 South Ann Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/12/10
  - c. Project: Reroof using Owens Corning to match existing roof on the addition either Desert Tan or Autumn Brown. Paint the house in the existing color scheme: body – tan; trim – white; and shutters – dark green.
2. **Applicant: Palmer Hamilton**
  - a. Property Address: 1407 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/12/10
  - c. Project: Repaint exterior of house matching the existing colors. Repair rotten wood at porch floor columns, and railing using materials to match existing in profile, dimensions and materials.
3. **Applicant: Rudolph Auerbach and Thomas Adkins**
  - a. Property Address: 1752 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/12/10
  - c. Project: 1) repair/replace rotten siding and fascia boards as necessary to match existing in size, dimension and material; 2) remove non-conforming metal windows from rear elevation and replace with two 1/1 wood windows and siding to match existing per submitted drawing; 3) Sand, prime and paint exterior house per submitted and approved paint scheme.
4. **Applicant: Town & Country Roofing**
  - a. Property Address: 50 Saint Emanuel Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/18/10
  - c. Project: Repair the leaking roof. The repair work will match the existing.
5. **Applicant: Mobile Historic Preservation Society**
  - a. Property Address: 350 Oakleigh Place
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/18/10
  - c. Project: Install a concrete drive way on the location of a portion of the removed asphalt drive. Install a concrete walkway to be located the main house and the Oakleigh Place right of way. Resurface a portion a portion of the exiting asphalt drive and parking area. Pressure wash the concrete walking paths and parking spaces. Remove a later the pavers of a later flag stone walkway located to the south of the house. Store the pavers.
6. **Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for the Archdiocese of Mobile**

- a. Property Address: 400 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/19/10
  - c. Project: Reassemble the rear elevation's damaged porte cochere. The original materials will be reused.
- 7. Applicant: Carl James Beard**
- a. Property Address: 1512 Eslava Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/19/10
  - c. Project: Replace the decking on the front and rear porches. The work will match the existing. Repair and replace the railings. The work will match the existing.
- 8. Applicant: James Jones**
- a. Property Address: 360-362 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/20/10
  - c. Project: Replace the canvas on the property's two easternmost awnings. Remove the westernmost awning. Replace the awning with one of the same design as the two easternmost awnings. The canvas awnings will be burgundy in color. The westernmost awning will feature the name of the establishment.
- 9. Applicant: James Wilson**
- a. Property Address: 1218 Elmira Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/20/10
  - c. Project: Reroof the house the house with shingles to match the existing.
- 10. Applicant: Brian Rountree for Kojis Signs**
- a. Property Address: 1500 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/21/10
  - c. Project: Remove the existing wall sign. Install a new wall sign. The multi-component aluminum-faced sign will measure 9 feet in length and slightly under 3 feet in height. The sign will feature reverse channel illumination.
- 11. Applicant: Chip Nolan**
- a. Property Address: 206 South Cedar Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/26/10
  - c. Project: Repair front porch (redeck tongue and groove) and paint house in existing color scheme.
- 12. Applicant: Matthew DeHart**
- a. Property Address: 1112 Old Shell Road
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/12/10
  - c. Project: Install a single section of interior lot privacy fencing. The wooden fence will 6' in height and will extend between the northeast corner of the house and the lot line. The fence will feature a pedestrian and vehicular gate.
- 13. Applicant: Pelican Properties**
- a. Property Address: 7 North Bayou Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/26/10
  - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wooden siding to match the existing in profile, dimension and material. Replace five windows. The replacement windows will match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

1. **2010-78-CA: 154 Davitt Street**
  - a. Applicant: Phillip & Erica Curtin
  - b. Project: New Construction – Construct a rear addition.  
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
2. **2010-79-CA: 912 Charleston Street**
  - a. Applicant: W. Chris McGough with McGough Properties
  - b. Project: Install fencing, paving, a curbcut, and landscaping.  
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
3. **2010-80-CA: 701 Saint Michael Street**
  - a. Applicant: John Zieman
  - b. Project: Restore a building.  
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
4. **2010-81-CA: Washington Square**
  - a. Applicant: Oakleigh Garden District Society for the City of Mobile
  - b. Project: Reinstall sculptural components on the Square’s fountain.

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Discussion

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

**2010-78-CA: 154 Davitt Street**  
**Applicant: Phillip & Erica Curtin**  
**Received: 10/18/10**  
**Meeting: 11/2/10**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: New Construction – Construct a rear addition.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This house dates from the 1930s. The façade features a projecting gabled bay and a porch, a design treatment popular from the 1870s into the early 20<sup>th</sup> Century.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicants propose the construction of a rear addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, and 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, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
  - 2. “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 and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):
  - 1. New Construction - Construct a rear addition.
    - a. The rear addition will extend westward from the northwest corner of the house.
    - b. The addition will measure 39’ in depth and 33’ 4” in width.
    - c. The foundation level will be the same as that of the body of the house.
    - d. The foundation will feature simulated brick foundation piers interspersed with lattice panels to mimic the foundation treatment of the main house.
    - e. The wooden siding will match the existing.

- f. The three-over-one wooden windows will match those found on the body of the house.
- g. A gable roof will surmount the addition.
- h. The three-tab asphalt shingles will match the existing.
- i. The soffits and rafter tails will be treated in a manner similar to the existing.
- j. The North elevation will feature a paneled and glazed wooden door and three-over-one wooden windows.
- k. A flight of brick steps will access the North Elevation's door.
- l. A porch will located at the northwest corner of the addition.
- m. A paired French door unit and two three-over-one wooden windows will comprise the West Elevation's fenestration.
- n. The South Elevation will feature two coupled three-over-one windows.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

The applicants propose the construction of small rear addition. The addition will be minimally visible from the street. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that additions should be differentiated from yet compatible to the existing historic building. The addition's gable will be set perpendicular to body of the house, thereby providing a visual break between the old and the new. One the corner posts will remain in place. The plan calls for the replication of windows and the use of matching siding, two features which will provide continuity of treatment and detail. The proposal meets the design and material standards set by the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's historic districts.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Phillip Curtin was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked the applicant to give his name. Mr. Curtin responded. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Curtin if he had any comments to make or questions to ask with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Curtin said he did not, but if the Board had any concerns he would address them.

Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Curtin about the addition's total square footage. A discussion of square footage ensued. Mr. Roberts pointed out that the total square footage of the addition was half that of the main house. Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Curtin about the height and pitch of the addition's roof. Mr. Curtin explained to the Board that the roof of the addition would maintain the same pitch as the roof of the main house. He said that the roof would not be visible from the street.

Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Curtin how the foundation would be treated. Mr. Curtin said that while he initially wanted the addition to be situated atop foundation piers, the site conditions proved otherwise. He explained to the Board that house sits on downward graded lot; therefore, the rear addition would be on higher ground than the existing house. A slab foundation was then the only available option. He told the Board that the foundation would feature simulated piers and lattice skirting mimicking those on the main

house. Mr. Wagoner 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**

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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/3/11**

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

**2010-79-CA: 912 Charleston Street**  
**Applicant: W. Chris McGough for McGough Properties**  
**Received: 10/15/10**  
**Meeting: 11/2/10**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Install fencing, paving, curbing, and landscaping.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This house dates from the last quarter of the Nineteenth Century. The L-shaped house features two south-facing porches.

**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 December 5, 1994. At that time, the Board approved the installation of a metal security door. The current applicant proposes the installation of a wooden fencing, the construction of a masonry wall, the installation of paving, and the installation of a curbcut.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. Fencing “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered...All variances required by the Board of Zoning Adjustment must be obtained prior to issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.”
  - 2. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.”
  - 3. “Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting. Asphalt is inappropriate for walkways. Gravel and shell are preferred paving materials; however a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment is required for commercial applications. Hard surface materials may also be acceptable”
  - 4. “The appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design. New materials such as grasspave or grasscrete, which provides for a solid parking surface while still allowing grass to grow giving the appearance of a continuance of a front lawn, may be a feasible alternative.”

5. "Parking areas should be screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences or landscaping."
6. "Ordinances relating to parking and landscaping will be enforced by the City of Mobile Urban Development Department in reviewing requests for parking lots."

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):

1. Construct a 6' wall between the house and the western property line.
2. The wall will feature five brick piers brick framing stuccoed wall fields.
3. A brick cap will surmount the fence.
4. The proposed wall is based on the wall constructed at 915 Palmetto Street.
5. The wall will be located 20' from the public right of way.
6. The wall will feature a pedestrian entrance located at the juncture of the existing and proposed walkway (See C 8-9.). An iron gate will extend between the two posts.
7. Install two sections of wooden fencing along the western property line.
8. A 3' wooden fence will extend 20' into the lot from the right of way.
9. A 6' wooden fence will extend from the western termination of the brick and stuccoed wall to the side wing's porch. The applicant is amenable to constructing a wall of the same design as C-2 instead of the 6' wooden fence.
10. Remove the existing concrete walkway.
11. Reinstall and extend the concrete walkway. The extension will allow for paved access to and from the two porches. The walkway will maintain the same width as the existing.
12. Install a curbcut off of Charleston Street.
13. Install a 10' wide and 18' deep concrete driveway.
14. Remove the Popcorn trees?
15. Landscape the lawn.

Clarifications

1. What is the design of the iron gate?
2. How wide is the proposed curbcut at the street?

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

The applicant recently acquired the derelict property. Over the past several years he has restored houses at 906 and 908 Charleston Street. This application involves the construction of a wall, the installation of fencing, the installation of paving, and the insertion of a curbcut. Closely spaced Popcorn trees occupy the area of the proposed work. Urban Forestry has approved the removal of the trees.

With regard to the proposed wooden fence and the masonry wall, the design and materials of both enclosures meet the standards set by the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's historic districts. The commercial establishment to the west of the property allows for the eight foot height of the proposed wall. The design of the wall is based on one constructed in the same district. In accordance with Board recommendations, the wooden fencing steps downward as it nears the street. Staff does not believe the fencing impairs the architectural or historical integrity of the building or the district.

The applicant has received approval from the offices of Right of Way and Traffic & Engineering regarding the installation of the curbcut. Similar curbcuts have been approved in the area. The curbcut will allow for off street parking on this densely trafficked section of Charleston Street. The proposed drive and walkway meet the design and material standards established by the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. Staff does not believe the proposed hardscaping will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of the application and requests Staff approval for the proposed gate once a gate is selected by the applicant. The Board and the applicant also need to agree on the material requested in part C.9. of the staff report.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Chris McGough was present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. McGough about the clarifications outlined in the Staff Report. Mr. McGough told the Board that he had not selected a design for the gate. He said that the outer width of the curbcut would be the same as other single curbcuts in the vicinity. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. McGough if he had any additional comments to make or questions to ask with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. McGough answered no.

Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. McGough how far the house was situated from the western property line. Mr. McGough explained to the Board that it essentially abuts the western property line. Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. McGough where the fencing would stop in relation to the recessed west wing, particularly if it would stop at the porch or extend the length of the lot line.

Mr. Roberts interjected. He told Mr. Gough that a brick and stucco wall would cost more than a wooden fence. Addressing Mr. McGough and his fellow board members, Mr. Roberts spoke about the handling stuccoed surfaces. He told Mr. McGough that if he intended the wall fields to be composed of stucco-faced concrete block, he would need to pay close attention as to how the stucco was applied. A discussion of stucco and stucco substrates ensued. Mr. Roberts cited the prototype fence as good example as to how a stucco wall field should be treated.

Mr. Karwinski told the applicant that if he extended the wall or fence to the corner southwest corner of the house, the porch would be left open for view. He suggested using lattice to infill the area bound by the porch post, the wall pier, the upper railing, and the soffit. Mr. Karwinski told Mr. McGough that he considered the use of a masonry wall inappropriate to the size of the lot and the material composition of the house. Mr. James addressed the applicant and his fellow Board members by saying that brick walls and frame buildings are compatible.

Mr. McGough explained to the Board that since the property does not have a backyard, the proposed enclosure would be the only private space on the densely built up lot. He said that while the side wing's porch would be obscured by the wall, the porch fronting the main body of the house would remain in full view. Mr. Karwinski told Mr. McGough that he had two suggestions. First, he should remove the tree abutting the front steps because it would cause foundation problems. Secondly, the three-foot wooden fence should stop at a point even with the front plan of the house.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending fact C (1.)<sup>2</sup> to state that there would be four instead of five brick piers.

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 and that Staff be authorized to approve the design of the proposed gate.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/3/11**

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

**2010-80-CA: 701 Saint Michael Street**  
**Applicant: John Zieman**  
**Received: 10/4/10**  
**Meeting: 10/20/10**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Restore the building.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This two-story brick commercial structure was constructed in 1892. The exterior was partially stuccoed and corner entry was added during a 1920s renovation.

**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 owner proposes a major restoration of the exterior and renovation of the interior.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The exterior of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. Replacement of exterior, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension, and material. Particular care must be taken with masonry. Consult with staff concerning the mortar mixture for re-pointing historic brick. Bricks and mortar should match the original in color, finish (strike) and thickness. The finish and scoring of new stucco work should match the original.”
  - 2. “Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building.”
  - 3. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original windows sashes and glazing.”
  - 4. Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
  - 5. “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.”
  - 6. “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with style of the building.”

7. "Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings shall not be undertaken."
  8. "Deteriorated features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of the deterioration requires replacement of distinctive features, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture and other visual qualities where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence."
  9. "Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible."
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Restore the building
    - a. East Elevation (Façade)
      1. Reconfigure the balcony to replicate the 1890s treatment evidenced by a period photograph.
      2. Repair the stucco on the ground floor's walls.
      3. Re-point the bricks.
      4. Repair the stucco entablature and parapet, replacing the stucco to match the existing when necessary
      5. Install a cast iron railing of similar design as the 1890s treatment.
      6. Reinstall a transom bar within the ground floor's four southernmost doors.
      7. Remove the boarding from the fenestrated bays.
      8. Install four paneled doors in the ground floor's four southernmost doors thereby replicating the 1890s doors.
      9. Reopen the angled northeast corner entrance.
      10. Install a multi-light wooden French door with flanking sidelights within the northeast corner's angled entrance.
      11. Reinstall two-over-two wooden windows units within the upper story's window bays.
      12. Install four paneled doors in the upper story's door units.
      13. Install operable wooden louvered shutters thereby replicating the 1890s shutter treatment.
    - b. South Elevation
      1. Repair the stucco on the walls and the entablature/parapet, replacing the stucco when necessary to match the existing.
      2. Remove the stucco from the window sills thereby exposing the brick.
      3. Remove boarding from the fenestrated bays.
      4. Alter the dimensions of the upper story's easternmost window unit to be consistent with the heights of the elevation's other windows.
      5. Install two-over-two wooden window units within the upper story's eastern and western window fenestrated bays. A tripartite window will be located in the center bay.
      6. Repair the stucco on a portion the south elevation's of walled court. When stucco needs to be reapplied or replaced the work will match the existing.
    - c. West (Rear) Elevation
      1. Remove boarding.
      2. Remove the old staircase.
      3. Reconstruct the stairs to match the existing.
      4. Reconstruct the framed lattice screen at the western end of the stairs.

5. Re-expose the encased iron posts off the ground floor gallery.
  6. The railing will match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
  7. Install new wooden four paneled doors.
  8. Repair and/or replace the lower story's fenestration to match the existing.
  9. Install two-over-two wooden windows in the two of the upper story's fenestrated bays.
  10. Install a railing matching the original stair railing within the bays of the upper gallery.
  11. Replace the missing columnar post at the southwest corner of the second story gallery with one that will match the existing.
  12. Where necessary, repair and replace the stuccoed parapet/entablature. When stucco needs to be reapplied or replaced the work will match the existing.
  13. Reroof the gallery roof.
  14. Replace rotten woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
- d. North Elevation
1. Repair the stucco on the walls and the entablature/parapet, replacing when necessary to match the existing.
  2. Remove the stucco from the window sills thereby exposing the brick.
  3. Reopen the northeast corner's angled entry (See 1. a. 9-10).
  4. Reopen the three bay storefront unit located at the western end of the elevation.
  5. The central multi light double French door of the storefront unit will be surmounted by a wooden transom. The transom will also extend over the flanking glazed openings, thereby replicated the 1920s fenestration configuration.
  6. Install two-over-two wooden window units in the ground and upper story.
  7. Install operable wooden louvered shutters matching the 1890s shutters. One of the ground floor's shutter units will be vertical board in type so to replicate the 1890s appearance.

#### Clarifications

1. Will the walls enclosing the rear of the property be repointed and stuccoed?
2. Has the applicant consulted with the offices of Right of Way and Traffic and Engineering regarding the reconstruction of the façade's original gallery?
3. What type roofing will cover the rear gallery?
4. What type stucco will be used?

#### STAFF ANALYSIS

This building has stood in a mothballed state for many years. Though in need of repair, the exterior is remarkably well preserved. The applicant proposes an extensive restoration campaign for the exterior, as well as major renovation of the interior.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that replacement of missing features should be documented by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence. The applicant has based the restoration of the east and north elevations on an early photograph documenting the original appearance of those two elevations. The photograph shows the façade's original gallery configuration. The existing columnar bays of the

lower floor need only to be adjusted to recapture the original treatment. If the applicant has not already done so, he will need to consult with the offices of Traffic & Engineering, Right of Way and possibly Alabama Power regarding the reconstruction of the façade's gallery. The remarks for Alabama Power are mentioned for safety's sake and are probably outside the purview of the Architectural Review Board.

The work proposed for the south and west elevations constitutes either in kind replacement or simple maintenance. As per the proposed repointing and stuccoing, the applicant should consult with Staff regarding this portion of the scope of work. The Guidelines clearly state that the re-pointing of brick as well as the finishing and rescoring of stucco work should match existing.

Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-9), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the district. Pending the aforementioned clarifications, Staff recommends approval of the application. If not granted approval from Traffic & Engineering and Right of Way to reconfigure the front gallery, Staff recommends the conservation and restoration of the existing balcony treatment.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

John Zieman and Tilmon Brown were present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Zieman if he had any comments to make or questions to ask with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Zieman answered no. Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Zieman about the planned use of the building. Mr. Zieman explained to the Board that building be residential or residential/commercial.

Mr. Brown addressed several points of clarification. He explained to the Board that the stuccoed parapets would be repaired and replaced. He told the Board that the stairs would be reconstructed to reflect their original configuration, one not featuring a landing. A discussion of City Codes ensued. Mr. Brown addressed the utility pole located adjacent to the area of the proposed balcony reconstruction. He told the Board that the power and telephone companies were in discussion as to which entity was responsible for removal of the pole. He told the Board that several window types were found and survive on the building. These windows would be replicated.

Mr. Karwinski said that he had several questions to ask. He asked the applicant, his representative, and Staff about the tripartite window depicted on the west elevation drawings. Mr. Blackwell explained that the three part window configuration survives beneath the boarding. Mr. Brown told the Board that the tripartite window originally lighted the upper landing of flight of stairs. Mr. Karwinski asked if the jack arches on the east elevations would be replicated in stucco on the south elevation. A discussion ensued. Mr. Blackwell explained that since the applicant was applying for a preservation tax credit, he would need to have documentary evidence for any conjectural alterations. Mr. Brown told the Board that features which could be documented, such as the doors and the balcony would be replicated. Other existing features such as the stucco would remain intact, only repaired.

Mr. Karwinski asked about the reopening of the corner entry. He asked why this feature was being kept when documentary and pictorial evidence showed that it was a later alteration to the 1892 building. Mr.

Karwinski questioned why the application called for only a partial return to the 1892 appearance. A discussion of the varying levels of preservation (preservation, restoration, rehabilitation) and the requirements of preservation tax credits ensued. Mr. Karwinski asked about the outward swing of the proposed east elevation doors. A discussion of City Codes ensued. Mr. James explained that the project was more a rehabilitation than a restoration.

Mr. Wagoner asked if there was anyone from the audience who wanted to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Wagoner 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, amending facts as follows: change C 1 (D) 6 to note that windows will not be installed as shown as in plan; change the heading of the project restoration to rehabilitation; note that the west elevation's northernmost ground floor window will be feature four lights; change C 1 (D) 5 to note that the French doors and window framing will be wooden.

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 approved. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/3/11**

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

**2010-81-CA: Washington Square**  
**Applicant: Oakleigh Garden District Society for the City of Mobile**  
**Received: 10/18/10**  
**Meeting: 11/2/10**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District  
Classification: NA  
Zoning: NA  
Project: Reinstall sculptural components on the Square's fountain.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

The site of Washington Square was deeded to the City in 1850 on the condition that property become a public park and promenade. Bordered by Chatham, Palmetto, Charleston, Charles, and Augusta Streets, the pentagon-shaped park features a large center fountain from. The fountain was installed sometime between 1906 and 1916. Four identical sculptural groups once occupied four of the fountains eight pedestals.

**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. Washington Square has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. As part of its ongoing restoration of the Square's artwork and furnishings, the Oakleigh Garden District Society proposes the installation of dolphin astride putti atop the center fountain's four pedestals.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. "Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence."
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Reinstall sculptural components on the Square's fountain.
    - a. The four sculptural components will be placed atop the fountains four empty pedestals.
    - b. The four identical sculptures, putti astride dolphins, are similar in type to the original sculptural groupings.
    - c. The sculptures will be made of cast aluminum and will have a Robinson Verdi gris finish.

Clarifications

- 1. What are the dimensions of the sculptures?

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

Washington Square is one of Mobile's best preserved parks. The Oakleigh Garden District Society recently funded the restoration of the Square's iconic stag sculpture. As part of the ongoing restoration of the Square's circa 1916 sculpture and furniture, the Society proposes the reinstallation of sculptural components atop the center fountain.

The proposed sculptures, putti astride dolphins, would occupy the same pedestals of the original sculptures. The composition and height are roughly the same as the lost originals. The finish will be similar. Staff does not believe this proposal will impair the architectural or the historical character of the district.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Chip Herrington was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Herrington if he had any questions to ask or comments to make regarding the Staff Report. Mr. Herrington introduced himself to the Board. He told the Board that the reinstallation of figures atop the fountain was result of years of fundraising and deliberations. Mr. Herrington said that over the past several years, Stoney Chavers, the Oakleigh Garden District's previous president, had meet with City Departments and other entities in an effort to make the project a reality. He said that the Society now had the necessary funds to purchase and install the figures. Mr. Herrington pointed out that several families owning houses facing the Square were underwriting the work. He said that the existing plumbing would be reused, but the pvc pipes would be removed. The fountain would essentially be a mirror fountain with jets flowing from the statuary, as was originally conceived. Mr. Herrington told the Board that the Society hoped to have the sculptural components installed prior to their annual Black and Blues fundraiser.

Mr. Karwinski said that he had two comments. First in this age of equality, would there be two male and two female statues. Discussion ensued. Second would the fencing surrounding the fountain be removed? Mr. Herrington told the Board that the fencing served to keep children out of the fountain; therefore as a safety concern, the fencing is necessary.

## **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 as written

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Oswalt 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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/3/11**