

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
November 5, 2014 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, Sr., called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Bob Allen, David Barr, Catarina Echols, Kim Harden, Nick Holmes (III), Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone.
Members Absent: Carolyn Hasser and Jim Wagoner.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cartledge Blackwell, and Keri Coumanis.
2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes for the A meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. Mr. Roberts 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: Consolidated Fence Company**
 - a. Property Address: 6-14 South Broad Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/8/14
 - c. Project: Install a temporary six foot chain-link construction fence around the perimeter of the site while work is ongoing on the restoration of a historic complex on the adjoining property. The permit is good for year.
2. **Applicant: Chris McGough**
 - a. Property Address: 33 McPhillips Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/8/14
 - c. Project: Repair the flooring and railings on rear deck.
3. **Applicant: Chris McGough**
 - a. Property Address: 200 Marine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/8/14
 - c. Project: Replace a window and surrounding casing/woodwork to match the existing. Touch up the paint in the affected area to match the existing color scheme.
4. **Applicant: Paul Shestak**
 - a. Property Address: 201 South Warren Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/10/14
 - c. Project: Paint the door Sherwin Williams Jalapeno.
5. **Applicant: Tuan Titlestad with Baytown Builders**
 - a. Property Address: 259 North Jackson Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/8/14
 - c. Project: Renewal of CoA issued on 19 June 2013 – Install 30" tall cast iron fencing atop an 8" to 18" coping wall along the eastern lot line.
6. **Applicant: Chad Marchand**
 - a. Property Address: 306 McDonald Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/16/14
 - c. Project: Install a new concrete drive. Said drive will be located atop the location of the existing drive. The drive will be bordered by old Mobile bricks.
7. **Applicant: Coleman Wood**
 - a. Property Address: 953 Augusta Street

- b. Date of Approval: 10/16/14
- c. Project: Repoint foundation piers using the appropriate mortar (lime based and/or Type N). Stabilize and additional foundation piers. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork and detailing to match the existing as per profile, dimension, profile, and material. Cover any open expanses on wall surfaces with plyboard. Repaint unpainted surfaces (white), plyboard included. Repair damaged windows. Cover windows with plyboard (not damaging historic fabric) that will be painted white. Reroof so prevent water damage to the interior of the dwelling. The roofing materials will match the existing.

8. Applicant: Mike Matthews

- a. Property Address: 1133 Montauk Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 10/10/14
- c. Project: Repair, replace rotten wood to match original in profile and dimension, repair rotten balusters, posts, rails all to match. Repair leaks around windows, reglaze where necessary, repair/replace rotten lap siding.

9. Applicant: Phillip Berry

- a. Property Address: 1263 Selma Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/13/14
- c. Project: Replace rotten wood on garage to match original, repair windows, repaint to match. Install AC unit rear elevation.

10. Applicant: Thomas Roofing

- a. Property Address: 1671 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/14/14
- c. Project: Tear off old 3 tab shingle roof and replace with a 3 tab shingle roof. Charcoal Gray in color.

11. Applicant: Anthony Kahalley

- a. Property Address: 68 Fearnway
- b. Date of Approval: 10/17/14
- c. Project: Replace wood floor decking on the porch matching the existing in profile, dimension and material. Replace/repair wood as required beneath the porch matching the existing in profile, dimension and material. Repair piers as needed using Type N mortar matching the existing in color and strike. Paint repairs as needed. Prime and paint ironwork white repairing it as needed.

12. Applicant: Ricky Armstrong with Modern Signs

- a. Property Address: 1004 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/17/14
- c. Project: Install a new sign. The painted aluminum sign (double-faced) will measure 8 in height and 2'4" width (at its widest point). The sign shape and lettering will advertise the occupying tenant.

13. Applicant: Fasco General Contractors

- a. Property Address: 62 Houston Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/20/14
- c. Project: Paint the house in the following Benjamin Moore paint scheme: body – Light Green; and trim is Dove White.

14. Applicant: R & J Home Repair

- a. Property Address: 462 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/21/14
- c. Project: Paint the front of the building in the same color to match the existing; replace balcony decking as needed to match the existing in profile, dimension and materials. Paint repairs to match.

15. Applicant: Tuan Titlestad with Baytown Builders

- a. Property Address: 916 Charleston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/22/14
 - c. Project: Reroof a section of flat roof. Repair woodwork and joists. Replace deteriorated siding to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.
- 16. Applicant: Cristina Rodgers**
- a. Property Address: 1113 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/22/14
 - c. Project: Paint the house in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme: body – Banana Cream; trim and decorative features - White; porch deck – dark brown.
- 17. Applicant: Gulf Coast Foundation and Remodeling, LLC**
- a. Property Address: 1133 Montauk Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/20/14
 - c. Project: Replace sill under the house.
- 18. Applicant: Langan Construction**
- a. Property Address: 13 South Reed Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/22/14
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with shingles matching the existing. Repoint the chimney with the appropriate mortar. Repair any eaves to match the existing.
- 19. Applicant: Pro Roofing**
- a. Property Address: 1057 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/23/14
 - c. Project: Reroof the building with shingles matching the existing.
- 20. Applicant: RCLA**
- a. Property Address: 101 Michael Donald Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/24/14
 - c. Project: Install a three foot high picket fence around the vacant lot.
- 21. Applicant: Wink Management**
- a. Property Address: 22 South Reed Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/23/14
 - c. Project: Replace the roof with Architectural shingles, black in color. Repair and replace siding matching the existing in profile, dimension and materials. Replace front soffitt with tongue and groove to match the original that remains on the side; repair side soffitts to match the existing in profile, dimension and material. Repair and replace windows matching the existing in profile, dimension, materials and light pattern. Replace front porch as needed with 5/4 tongue and groove matching the existing in profile, dimension and material. Install lattice between the piers using cross diagonals and framed appropriately. Install six foot dog eared with gates to match the existing near rear corners of house per the plan. Repair front sidewalk in either concrete or brick.
- 22. Applicant: Darrel Williams with Darrel Williams Designs for All Saints (Episcopal)**
- a. Property Address: 151 South Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/23/14
 - c. Project: Repaint Sterling Hall per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme: body - Pavestone, SW 7642 & trim, gables, windows – Well Bred.
- 23. Applicant: Thomas Industries**
- a. Property Address: 1201 Spring Hill Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/23/14
 - c. Project: Repair roof, replacing damaged section. Reroof using a Liquid Applied Membrane **behind the parapet wall. Repairs will not be visible.**
- 24. Applicant: Gulf Coast Foundation and Remodeling**
- a. Property Address: 21 South Julia Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/27/14

- c. Project: Reposition columns to their original locations (per physical evidence and staff file photographs). Replace deteriorated siding to match the existing (as per profile, dimension, and material). Stabilize the foundations.

25. Applicant: Randall Miller with Medics

- a. Property Address: 465 South Broad Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/27/14
- c. Project: Construct a monument sign. The total height of the armature will measure five feet. The aluminum sign face will measure 3' x 6' (double-faced). Install two wall signs. One wall sign will measure 5' x 5'8". A second wall sign will 3' x 3'. None of the signs will be illuminated.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2014-50-CA: 460 Chatham Street

- a. Applicant: Restore Mobile
- b. Project: Restoration and Renovation – Restore a front porch and reconfigure a soon to be exposed Rear Elevation.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2014-51-CA: 259 Stocking Street

- a. Applicant: Charles St. Croix
- b. Project: Ancillary Demolition – Demolish a garage apartment located behind a principle dwelling.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2014-52-CA: 957 Selma Street

- a. Applicant: Eugene Caldwell
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a fire-damaged residential building and a later ancillary structure.

DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2014-52-CA: 1055 Elmira Street

- a. Applicant: Leroy Anderson
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a single family residence.

DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Guidelines
- 2. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-46-CA: 460 Chatham Street
Applicant: Restore Mobile
Received: 9/29/14
Meeting: 10/15/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Restoration and Renovation – Restore a front porch and reconfigure a soon to be exposed rear elevation.

BUILDING HISTORY

This property is comprised of two separate houses that were joined at an early date. A hyphen connects to the two distinct sections of the larger ensemble. The larger eastern portion of the dwelling dates from the last third of the 19th 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 last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on October 15, 2014. The application was heldover for reason of absence of representation. On May 7, 2014, the Board approved the removal and relocation of the rear house to 1006 Texas Street. With this application, the applicants reappear before the Board with plans for the new Rear Elevation.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Foundation screening should be recessed from the front of the foundation piers.”
 - 2. “The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality, and historic period.”
 - 3. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions, and decorative details.”
 - 4. “Often one of the most important decorative features of a building, doorways reflect the age and style of a building Replacements would respect the age and style of the building.”
 - 5. “The type, size, and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help define its style. The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”

- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Grade and level the foundation when and where required.
 2. Make repairs to foundation piers.
 3. Install framed and recessed vertical board foundation screening (wooden) between the house's foundation piers.
 4. Conduct work specific to the house's front porch.
 - a. Reconstruct the underpinnings of the front porch.
 - b. Install tongue-and-groove wooden porch decking.
 - c. Remove later railings on the front porch.
 - d. Install scroll sawn balustrades between the front porch's chamfered posts.
 - e. Said sections of railing will match those installed at 458 Chatham Street.
 - f. Replicate chamfered wooden porch posts to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.
 - g. Remove later front porch steps.
 - h. Construct new wooden porch steps featuring railings matching those employed on the front porch.
 - i. Remove and salvage two later Arts and Crafts informed doors from the façade.
 - j. Install period appropriate four paneled wooden doors.
 5. Remove the connector located between the main portion of the dwelling and the rear portion previously approved for relocation.
 6. Articulate the new West (Rear) Elevation.
 - a. Install wooden siding matching (profile, dimension, and material) that employed on the body of the house.
 - b. Construct a single bay shed roof porch.
 - c. Brick-faced foundation piers will support the porch substructure.
 - d. Framed and recessed vertical board wooden foundation screening will extend between the aforementioned piers.
 - e. Tongue-and-groove wooden decking will be employed.
 - f. Two chamfered porch posts will support hipped roof. Said posts will match those employed on the front porch.
 - g. Wooden railings and newels matching those employed the front porch.
 - h. A single flight of wooden steps with newels and sawn work matching that employed on the porch stoop will provide access to and from the porch.
 7. Reroof the West (Rear) Elevation with shingles matching those employed on the body of the house.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the restoration of a front porch and the reconfiguration of a soon to be exposed rear elevation.

The front porch was altered in manner not in keeping with architectural and artisanal manner appropriate to the house's style and period. The proposed interventions would remedy the aforementioned regrets, as well as address structural and construction concerns. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, particular attention has been extended to the selection handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions, and decorative details (See B-3.). Upon examination, repair, and if necessary the reconstruction of the porch's substructure, tongue-and-groove porch decking, replicated columns, and period appropriate railings will be installed. Later Arts and Crafts informed doors will removed, salvaged, and replaced with four-paneled wooden doors that respect the age and style of the building (See B-4). A more historically and aesthetically attuned flight of porch steps with railing will

provide access to the porch. The stair railings will match those proposed for the porch. Appropriately designed and constructed lattice skirting will be installed beneath the porch and around the whole of the house (See B-1.).

The soon to be exposed rear elevation is informed by the proportions of the exterior elevation and the distribution of the interior rooms. The size and placement of the proposed windows and doors are compatible with the general character of the house (See B-5). Six-over-six in the light configuration, the proposed windows will match those employed on house's other elevations. A door, one matching those proposed for the façade, will be located between the two windows. A symmetrically located porch featuring a historically appropriate shed roof construction will be centered off of the rear elevation. The porch's railings and posts will match those found on the front porch (See B-3.). Wooden siding will match that employed on the rest of the house (See B-2.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-5), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ginny Laurent was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed Restore Mobile's representative. He asked Ms. Laurent if she had any clarifications to address, comments to make, or questions to ask.

After stating that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full, Ms. Laurent took the opportunity to introduce herself to the Board. She explained that she had recently become the director of Restore Mobile. Ms. Laurent told the Board that she looked forward to working with them in the future.

Mr. Ladd thanked Ms. Laurent. He asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask Restore Mobile's representative. No further discussion ensued among the assembled Board members.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd 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 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: 11/5/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-50-CA: 259 Stocking Street
Applicant: Charles St. Croix
Received: 10/3/14
Meeting: 11/5/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Ancillary Demolition – Demolish a garage apartment located behind a principle dwelling.

BUILDING HISTORY

This property is distinguished by two building. In concert, the 1920s main residence’s full-length front gallery, battered porch posts, paired windows, all-encompassing gable, and exposed eaves represent seminal motifs of Arts & Crafts informed “bungalow” design. The 1940s ancillary building possesses upper-story rental space above lower-story vehicular storage and property maintenance areas.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application appears before the Board as a consequence of a communication of unauthorized work brought to the attention of MHDC staff. The work involved the demolition of an ancillary building. A Stop Work Order was issued on September 22, 2014 (the day staff was notified of the work). With this application, the owner proposes the demolition of the ancillary building in question.
- 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. The principle building occupying this inner lot property is not proposed for demolition. Both the main residence and the ancillary building are located

- within the Leinkauf Historic District. The two-story ancillary building possesses features informed by the style and the period impacting its construction. Frame ancillary buildings featuring wooden siding were built across the United States in the first three decades of the 20th Century.
- ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 1. Two-story ancillary buildings of this type, that is a structure featuring ground level vehicular space below rental residential space, populate the back lots of many properties located within Mobile's older suburban areas. While not directly engaging the streetscape, this building and other examples contribute to present day built density and speak to the historical dynamics that animated Mobile's early 20th-Century middle and upper middle class residential establishments.
 - 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.
 - 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 two-story vehicular buildings featuring upper-story rental space were constructed less frequently than single-story vehicular structures, two-story examples were still constructed in large numbers well into the 1940s. Many were (as in this instance) located behind one-story residential building. Examples can be found across Mobile County and the region. Of the locally designated historic districts, Old Dauphin Way and Leinkauf possess numerous examples. A significant number of examples are located behind the grander residential buildings on that stretch of Government Street which extends from Broad to Houston Streets.
 - 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 building and remove debris from the property.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The owner has owned the property for a number of years.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. The owner initially intended to make repairs to the building, but upon discovering termite damage pursued the demolition of the building.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. The property is currently listed for sale. The listing price is \$124,900.
 - 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. See submitted materials.
 - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 1. N.A.

- xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
 - 1. Application submitted.
- 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 materials):

- 1. Demolish a two-story ancillary building.
- 2. Remove debris from the property.
- 3. Clear the location of any obstructions atop the slab.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of an ancillary building. The ancillary building proposed for demolition is located behind a contributing residential building. The principle building would not be physically impacted by the proposed scope of work. When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into account the following considerations: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the impact the demolition would have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

The ancillary building proposed for demolition is one of numerous “dependencies” found across Mobile’s early 20th Century residential suburbs. Featuring lower-story vehicular storage and maintenance spaces and upper-story living quarters, the building’s plans and elevations are characteristic of the style and period of construction. While two-story ancillary buildings are less numerous than single-story examples, significant numbers survive throughout and beyond Mobile’s locally designated historic districts.

As documented by photographs submitted as supplements to the application and evidenced by inspection of the building, the garage suffered from termite infestation. While there is observable destruction of siding, the most destructive termite damage impacted the building’s structural members.

As with most ancillary buildings, the two-story garage structure in question is located behind a principle dwelling which directly engages the street. The ancillary building only engages the passerby by way of oblique views from street and sidewalk.

If granted demolition approval, the applicant would complete the demolition of the garage, dispose of the debris, and remove any obstructions atop the concrete slab.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the property or the district. Staff recommends approval of the demolition of the deteriorated and partially demolished ancillary building.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Charles St. Croix was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Mr. St. Croix explained that when he acquired the property the ancillary building had been in a state of disrepair. He informed the Board that he had only used the building as a place of dry storage and that the fall of a tree had caused further damage to the building. While assessing the storm damage, termite damage was discovered. Mr. St. Croix that more deterioration was discovered during the when the building was being demolished. He added that the ancillary building was detracting from the main house and that he was actively trying to sell the property.

Mr. Ladd thanked Ms. Laurent. He asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant. A discussion ensued as to the insurance literature found within the Board packets.

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

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 property or district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/5/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-51-CA: 957 Selma Street
Applicant: Eugene Caldwell
Received: 10/13/14
Meeting: 11/5/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition – Demolish a fire-damaged residential building and a later ancillary structure.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to materials located within MHDC staff files, this shotgun with a recessed side wing, vernacular paring largely restricted to Mobile, dates circa 1904.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on July 17, 2013. At that time, the Board denied an application calling for the demolition of the twice fire-damaged residential structure and rear lot ancillary building. The applicant was instructed to list the property on the market. The property was never listed on MLS. The owner/applicant reappears before the Board with a second demolition submittal. The application was prompted by the issuance of multiple Notices of Violation (NOV). Said citations were issued as part of the first phase of a larger interdepartmental blight campaign combating derelict unoccupied buildings located within the Oakleigh Garden District.
- 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:
 - 2. *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:

- v. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
 - 1. This property possesses a contributing residential building and a later ancillary structure. The property is located in the Oakleigh Garden District. A fine extant example of the shotgun with recessed wing typology, the main building is one of many such residential buildings that once lined the older residential arteries south of Mobile's old city center. The ancillary building is not of the same architectural caliber as the main dwelling. It dates from after 1970.
- vi. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. This inner lot property's principle building contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and historical character of the streetscape and surrounding district. On account of narrowness of the lot and the location of the house, the ancillary building is neither visible from nor does it engage Selma Street.
- vii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 - 1. The majority of the building materials are capable of being reproduced. If not currently manufactured, salvage and/or custom materials could be obtained.
- viii. 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. Despite the demolition of scores of this house type (principle dwelling), significant numbers survive in the Church Street East, Oakleigh Garden, Old Dauphin Way, and Oakdale Historic Districts. The subject example is unique in that it is one of three surviving pairings of butterfly-like houses. The ancillary building is an example of numerous storage-related dependencies dotting back lots located across the country.
- vi. 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 house, level the site, and remove debris.
- vii. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. The owner/applicant acquired the property on August 20, 1975 for a sum of \$15,000.
- viii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. Following the first fire, the owner made some repairs to the building. After the second fire (both arson-related), the building was partially mothballed. Other than demolition, the owner has not proposed other alternative uses for the property.
- ix. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The property was listed for sale, but not placed on MLS.
- x. 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. See submitted application.
- xi. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;

1. N.A.
- xiii. 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.
2. Not provided.
- xiv. 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 a fire-damaged contributing building.
2. Remove debris.
3. Level the site.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a contributing residential building. When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into account the following considerations: 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.

This contributing dwelling is representative of a distinctive residential typology that is largely restricted to Mobile. A combination of a shotgun with a recessed wing, this vernacular building type is reflective of societal, economic, and material conditions that animated the Gulf Coast during the latter half of the 19th Century. Large numbers of shotgun with wing dwellings were constructed for rental, speculative, and individual purposes in Mobile’s southern and eastern quarters during the Postbellum era. The Oakleigh Garden District possesses the largest number of surviving examples. The subject example is one of three surviving butterfly-like pairings found within the Oakleigh Garden District.

Arson-related conflagrations and deferred maintenance have contributed to the main house’s current condition. Two fires occurring in 2010 and 2011 impacted the architectural and historical character of the principle dwelling. The center portion of the building, a juncture at which the original portion of the house and a later addition merge, was particularly impaired. While some mothballing efforts (plyboard coverings over windows) were made, a vast section of the building’s roof has remained open to the elements. Replacement materials are still being reproduced.

Located within an almost intact block of historic buildings, this house contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and historic character of the southern portion of the Oakleigh Garden District. Arson has claimed historic buildings north, south, east, and west of the dwelling. As one of only three surviving butterfly pairings of its building type in the neighborhood, the house’s location/orientation is as important as the rhythmic impact on the block.

If granted demolition approval, the applicant would demolish the house, remove debris, and level the lot. The Board has adopted a policy requiring applicants requesting the demolition of property’s principle building to list the property on MLS for a period of six months before authorizing the demolition of said structures. The applicant listed the property for sale, but the listing was noted placed on MLS.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and the historical character of the building and the surrounding district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Eugene Caldwell was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Mr. Caldwell addressed the Board. He explained that he had inherited the building from his mother. Mr. Caldwell told the Board that the house was one of several of his properties that had been impacted by arson-related incidents. He added that several buildings in his ownership had burned to ground. After articulating the repairs and intimating the expenditures he had made to the property, Mr. Caldwell told the Board that after the second fire he had found it cost prohibitive to make further investments in the house. He stated that he had listed the property for sale.

Mr. Blackwell reiterated the Staff Report in reminding the Board that while the property had been listed for sale, it had not been listed on MLS.

Mr. Caldwell told the Board that the property was back on the market and that it was entered into MLS. He added that he had entered into an agreement with a realtor for a three month period.

Mr. Ladd told Mr. Caldwell that with all the investment and improvements in the area he might consider employing another realtor, one specializing in listing historic properties and/or familiar with the area.

The condition of the building was discussed.

Mr. Allan stated that he was aware of at least one recent offer that had been made on the property.

When queried as to the listing price, Mr. Caldwell said that the house and lot were for sale for \$6,000 and the adjoining lot for \$6,000.

Mr. Blackwell spoke of ongoing revitalization efforts in the immediate vicinity of the building.

Mr. Ladd reiterated to Mr. Caldwell that he might find it advisable to engage a more proactive realtor. Admitting that it was not his business to direct others in their business affairs, Mr. Ladd informed Mr. Caldwell that he had a marketable property in a revitalizing location.

Board members expressed their empathy with Mr. Caldwell's personal travails, but cited precedent for requiring salvageable properties to be officially listed with MLS prior to approving demolitions of principle structures.

Mr. Bemis addressed the Board. He told them that Mr. Caldwell was a relation of Satchel Paige and that when he visited Mobile he stayed with his relations at the subject property. Mr. Bemis stated that since Paige's birthplace had been demolished, 957 Selma Street was the only tangible link to his heritage remaining in Mobile.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant. No further discussion ensued.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application.

Ms. Laurent addressed the Board. Speaking on behalf of Restore Mobile, Ms. Laurent expressed her support of the Staff Recommendation and the Board's ongoing actions to prevent demolitions. She said that while Restore Mobile was engaged in other revitalization projects, other individual and collective concerns existed who could take on the project.

Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued. The applicant was informed that before the Board would consider another demolition application, the property would have to be officially listed on MLS for a period of six months and/or redevelopment plans submitted.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DENIED.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-52-CA: 1055 Elmira Street
Applicant: Leroy Anderson
Received: 10/14/14
Meeting: 11/5/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition - Demolish a single family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house dates circa 1925. A mixture of societal and design impulses, the house features forms and motifs associated with a later vein of Arts and Crafts “bungalows”, as well as astylar tendencies that more fully manifested themselves in the post World War II period.

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. Along with 953 Augusta Street (See preceding application.), the subject property is one of four owner unoccupied residential buildings recently issued Notices of Violations by the MHDC and Urban Development. Part of an interdepartmental blight initiative, the citations represent the first phase of a larger blight project.
- 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:
 - 3. *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:
 - ix. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
 - 1. This house dates from circa 1925. While listed as non-contributing property in the 1991 expansion of the original 1972 Oakleigh Garden Historic District boundaries, the building would now qualify as contributing building. The transitional dwelling is an example of 1920s infill construction in an area

largely defined by 19th-Century building stock. Featuring later Arts & Crafts motifs (exposed eaves, paired windows, prominent porch, etc...), along with ahistorical characteristics (no reference to specific historical idioms) more fully explored during the post World War II era, the house constitutes a blending of a 20th -Century impulses on the regional vernacular level.

- x. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. The subject dwelling contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and historic character of the Oakleigh Garden District.
- xi. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 - 1. The building materials are either capable of being reproduced or acquired as salvage material.
- xii. 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. Though the building is only one of several structures of its period and style in the Oakleigh Garden District, instances of this typological/stylistic subset can be found across the country.
- vii. 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. The applicant has intimated in conversation and communicated in the application an intention to redevelop the property. No post demolition plans were submitted.
- viii. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. The owner acquired the tax lien on the property on December 27, 2010.
- ix. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. The owner has not articulated to staff alternative uses of the property other than demolition and possible redevelopment.
- x. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The property has not been listed for sale.
- xi. 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. Not provided.
- xii. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. N.A.
- xv. 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.
 - 3. Application submitted.
- xvi. 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 a single family residence.
 2. Remove debris.
 3. Level the lot.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a non-contributing residential building. When reviewing demolition applications the Board takes into account the following considerations: 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.

Dating circa 1925, this dwelling represents a blending of design impulses. At once featuring later bungalow motifs and elements, the house also possesses an ahistorical character more generally encountered in post World War II residential construction. Transitional dwellings of this sort are rare in the Oakleigh Garden District.

This building is an example of a degree of deferred maintenance that qualifies as demolition by neglect. Deteriorating roofing shingles have not been repaired thereby allowing the elements to jeopardize the building’s structure and interiors.

While the applicant has intimated in conversation and stated in the demolition application that he would like to redevelop the property, no plans have been provided. Additionally, the Board has adopted a policy requiring applicants requesting the demolition of property’s principle building to list the property on MLS for a period of six months before authorizing the demolition of said structures. The building has not been listed for sale.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and the historical of the surrounding district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Leroy Anderson was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Mr. Anderson explained the steps and articulated the timeline informing his acquisition of the tax lien and now the tax deed on the property.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant. No further discussion ensued.

Discussion ensued as tax lien and deed acquisitions. Ms. Coumanis clarified the distinctions.

Mr. Anderson alluded to the condition of the building and nature of the acquisition.

Mr. Blackwell spoke of ongoing revitalization efforts in the blocks surrounding the building.

Discussion regarding the condition and significance of the building ensued. Mr. Roberts asked why the building was not listed as contributing. Mr. Blackwell explained that when the local district was expanded in 2009, the surveyor neglected to check the date of the construction. Ms. Coumanis elaborated upon the age and evolution of the house. She added that while the roof was failing the structure of the house was in good shape.

Mr. Anderson explained that he that as he owns other properties in Mobile's historic districts, he is experienced in the process.

Mr. Blackwell stated that when considering demolitions, redevelopment plans are subject to review. He stated that while redevelopment was intimated in the application, no plans were submitted.

Mr. Anderson asked for clarification as to how he could coordinate his efforts to address citations issued on the property. He said that the he would be operating under time restraints.

Mr. Bemis advised Mr. Anderson to make as many as the necessary repairs as possible. He also suggested obtaining contracts and beginning efforts to address concerns.

Mr. Anderson was advised that he should consider listing the property for sale. He explained the title issues. Ms. Coumanis stated that purchasing tax liens is a common procedure.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application.

Ms. Laurent addressed the Board. Speaking on behalf of Restore Mobile, Ms. Laurent expressed her support of the Staff Recommendation and the Board's ongoing actions to prevent demolitions. She said that while Restore Mobile was engaged in other revitalization projects, other individual and collective concerns existed who could take on the project. She stated that at an earlier the date Restore Mobile had approached the applicant about restoring the property.

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 amended by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The applicant was informed to either list the property on MLS for six months or submit a complete redevelopment plan for consideration.

DENIED.