

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
November 6, 2013 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Robert Allen, David Barr, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, and Jim Wagoner
Members Absent: Nick Holmes, Harris Oswalt, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Staff Members Present: Cart Blackwell and John Lawler.
2. Steve Stone moved to approve the minutes of the October 16, 2013 meeting as amended by the Board. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Steve Stone moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff as presented. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: NAI Mobile**
 - a. Property Address: 54 Saint Emanuel Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/10/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the building. Repave the rear portion of the lot with ballast stone.
2. **Applicant: Morrison Contracting Company, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 101 Beverly Court
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/7/13
 - c. Project: Remove and replace a 10' expanse of sidewalk.
3. **Applicant: Jeff Grille**
 - a. Property Address: 1124 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/9/13
 - c. Project: Install a hot water heater to be located off of the side elevation. The device will be obscured by plantings.
4. **Applicant: Mike Henderson Roofing and Repair**
 - a. Property Address: 1406 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/10/13
 - c. Project: Replace roofing with GAF Timberline Slate shingles and reflash around the chimney.
5. **Applicant: Rameh Dickens**
 - a. Property Address: 112 Kilmarnock Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/13/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Remove plywood from the windows. Replace broken window panes. Install boxed and recessed wooden screening between the foundation piers. Repaint the exterior per the submitted color scheme. The body will be Retro-Colonial Blue and the trim will be Ultra White.
6. **Applicant: Johnna Rogers**
 - a. Property Address: 250 Saint Anthony Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/10/13
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.

- 7. Applicant: Mike Henderson**
 - a. Property Address: 1124 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/10/13
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles. Repair decking if necessary.
- 8. Applicant: Michael Stanley**
 - a. Property Address: 208 South Dearborn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/11/13
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the submitted color scheme (change the color of the body).
- 9. Applicant: William Gill**
 - a. Property Address: 61 South Catherine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/11/13
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the submitted color scheme. The body of the house will be Valspar's Cliveden Leather and the trim will be white.
- 10. Applicant: Ru Chen**
 - a. Property Address: 966 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/11/13
 - c. Project: Repair a monument sign and a wall sign.
- 11. Applicant: Chris McGough**
 - a. Property Address: 915 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/14/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
- 12. Applicant: John Norris Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 1209 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/17/13
 - c. Project: Replace rotten porch decking and reroof, repair and put railings back in place.
- 13. Applicant: Cynthia Nelms**
 - a. Property Address: 12 Semmes Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/18/13
 - c. Project: Install a four foot gate on south side driveway of house, well back; and short section of fence on opposite side.
- 14. Applicant: Sara Sills**
 - a. Property Address: 1661 Lamar
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/18/13
 - c. Project: Paint the house in the following Sherwin Williams paint scheme:
Body: SW 6094: Sensational Sand, Trim: SW 6244: Naval
- 15. Applicant: David Norsworthy**
 - a. Property Address: 204 South Lawrence Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/23/13
 - c. Project: Reconstruct the pergola over the property's rear lot pool.
- 16. Applicant: John Willis**
 - a. Property Address: 356 Marine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/23/13
 - c. Project: Make repairs to a fire damaged house. Replace siding on the side and rear elevations to match the existing. Replace windows to match the originals as per location, configuration, and construction. Reroof the house. Reinstall a six-paneled front door. Repaint per the existing color scheme. Construct a 20' x 20' deck off the rear elevation. The deck will feature a simple picket railing.

17. Applicant: Justin Thompson

- a. Property Address: 270 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/22/13
- c. Project: Install a wall sign on the location of earlier signage. The total square footage of the sign will amount to 31.40 square feet. The metal sign will feature the name of the establishment and will employ reverse channel illumination. The colors of the sign will blend with the color scheme of the building. The manner of the installation will not be detrimental to the building.

18. Applicant: Steve Normand

- a. Property Address: 23 South Lafayette Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/25/13
- c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair deteriorated woodwork (when and where necessary) to match existing in profile, dimension, and material. Construct a wooden gate with a segmental top that will extend over the vehicular drive. Set said will swing inward and will be located well into the lot. Construct a storage shed per MHDC stock plans. Said ancillary building will be located in compliance with setback requirements.

19. Applicant: Eileen Swain

- a. Property Address: 115 South Dearborn Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/25/13
- c. Project: Paint the porch deck and foundation Chatham Street Gray, the walls Selma Street Gray, and the trim white. Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing.

20. Applicant: Scott Services for Regions

- a. Property Address: 56 Saint Joseph Street/106 Saint Francis Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/25/13
- c. Project: Replace a clock face and the interconnected signage to match the existing.

21. Applicant: Buford Sewell

- a. Property Address: 23 Hannon Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 10/28/13
- c. Project: Reinstall porch posts. The work will be painted to match the existing color scheme.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2013-77-CA: 957 Elmira Street

- a. Applicant: Lee Franks
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a fire-damaged residence.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2010-78-CA: 308 Chatham Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Stella Hester
- b. Project: Addition and Fenestration – Construct a rear addition and alter fenestration.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 201079-CA: 1744 Hunter Avenue

- a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Susan Thomas
- b. Project: Fencing and Addition – Construct interior lot fencing and a rear deck.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2010-80-CA: 1565 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Don Bowden with Bowden Architecture for Evan Maisel
- b. Project: Construct a rear addition – The addition will take the form of a garage connected to the building by way of a breezeway.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

5. 2010-81-CA: 7 North Hamilton Street

- a. Applicant: John Dendy with Dendy and Associates for Irvin Grodsky
- b. Project: Demolition and New Construction - Demolish a portion of the rear of the building and construct a new rear porch.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

6. 2013-73-CA: 222 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: David Naman
- b. Project: Construct a balcony and remodel a storefront.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Signage – Serda’s Coffee Company

Discussion of the Serda’s sign, a text case approval, was deferred to a later meeting.

2. Agendas – Nomenclature

Mr. Allen voiced concerns over the use of the word impairment. The Board and Staff entered into an exchange of possible alternatives.

3. Design Review Committees

The procedures, notifications, and follow ups of Design Review Committees were discussed.

4. Architectural Review Board Attendance

MHDC Staff was instructed to contact Review Board representatives who consistently miss meetings.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-77-CA: 957 Elmira Street
Applicant: Lee Franks
Received: 10/4/13
Meeting: 11/7/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition – Demolish a fire-damaged residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This shotgun dwelling dates from 1909. The house and the neighboring residences to the east were built by Herman Hudoff over a two year period. Commonly constructed for rental purposes, shotguns still figure prominently in the building stock of the southern portion of the present day Oakleigh Garden District.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The owner/applicant recently acquired the property. The building had been extensively damaged by an arson-related fire. The owner proposes the demolition of the building.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
 - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure:
 - 1. This building is a contributing residential structure located within the Oakleigh Garden District. Constructed as part of a row of four, three-room deep shotgun houses, the building at one time featured turned porch posts, brackets, and valences. The fenestration to the right of the main entrance was altered at a later date.

- ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. Shotguns were frequently constructed in rows. Maximizing the square footage of a given parcel and affording much needed housing in working class neighborhoods, shotguns such as the subject building contribute to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and overall experience of the southern portion of the Oakleigh Garden District.
- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 - 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced.
- 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. Despite many demolitions, shotguns survive in large numbers across the older residential areas of South's late 19th-Century and early 20th-Century industrial areas. This example is part of a row of four houses that help to define a largely intact stretch of vernacular residential buildings.
- v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 - 1. If granted demolition approval, the applicant would demolish the house, remove the debris, level the site, construct picket fencing across the front lot line, and plant grass on the lot.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. The applicant acquired the property for \$3,000 earlier in the present calendar year.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. The applicant first investigated rehabilitating the fire-gutted building. The project proved economically cost prohibitive. As the owner of several other buildings in the area (all of which are well-maintained) the applicant would like to proceed with demolition of the subject structure for reasons of community appearance and safety.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The owner just acquired the property. It had been on the market for roughly six months. No offers ensued.
- ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 - 1. N.A.
- x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. N.A.
- xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
 - 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 plan):

1. Demolish the building.
2. Level the lot.
3. Plant grass.
4. Construct picket fencing.

STAFF ANALYSIS

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

This house is a contributing residential building located within the Oakleigh Garden District. The shotgun typology figured prominently in building stock of working class neighborhoods such as the southern portion of the Oakleigh Garden District. As with most examples, this house is part of a row of shotguns. All four examples featured scroll sawn brackets and turned posts. Of the four, this dwelling is most altered. While recent decades have witnessed the demolition of many shotguns (a phenomenon that can be witnessed across the South), many examples survive.

This building contributes to the built density of the Oakleigh Garden District and the rhythmic spacing of buildings on Elmira Street. As part of an intact row of four shotguns, the demolition of this inner lot building would create a vacuum in the center of the block.

Prior to an early 2013 fire, the house was unoccupied. The original turned posts, railings, and brackets had been removed. A picture window located to the side of the front replaced the original sash window. The fire devastated the building’s wall and roof structures.

If granted demolition approval, the applicant plans to demolish the building, remove debris, level the lot, plant sod, and install a three foot high wooden fence across along the inner edge of the sidewalk.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and historical character of the building. Taking into the account the condition of the fire-damaged building, the effect the building’s deteriorated state has on the district, and the efforts made to sell the building, Staff recommends approval of the demolition.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Lee Frank 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. Franks if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Franks answered yes. He informed the Board that prior to his purchase of the property earlier in the calendar year, the fire-damaged house had been vacant for over ten years. Mr. Franks spoke of drug-related activities and other unpleasantness that had been taking place on the property following the fire.

Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Franks if the fire that damaged the subject dwelling was among the arson-related fires that had plagued southern Oakleigh over the past several years.

Mr. Franks answered yes.

Mr. Blackwell stated that the house was the twenty-third dwelling to be either extensively damaged, or fully consumed by an arson-related fire.

Mr. Franks informed the Board that his own home, which is located on adjoining property to the east, had been damaged on account of the fire.

Mr. Allan raised concern regarding the demolition. He stated that while the house had been listed for sale for six months, the applicant had only recently acquired the property. Mr. Allan voiced reservations over approving a demolition on such grounds.

Mr. Blackwell stated that it was only in the past year that the Board had required property owners to list a property for sale for six months before considering a demolition request. He stated that previously the Board had only taken into the account 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. Mr. Blackwell spoke of the condition of the building and how the current condition negatively impacted the surrounding district. He stated that demolition, while lamentable, was advisable on account of the circumstances.

Mr. Allen reiterated his concerns.

Mr. Karwinski informed his fellow Board members that he had driven by the property and based on his inspection, the building was basically gone.

No further Board discussion ensued.

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

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 approved. Mr. Allen voted in opposition.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district and the building, but that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued on account of the condition of the building.

The motioned and received a second and was approved. Mr. Allen voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/6/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-78-CA: 308 Chatham Street
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Stella Hester
Received: 10/14/13
Meeting: 11/7/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Addition and Fenestration – Construct a rear addition and alter fenestration.

BUILDING HISTORY

The dwelling, a single-story wooden side hall with a slightly projecting rear wing, was constructed for Frances Irwin in 1888.

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 new owner proposes the construction of a rear addition and the alteration of fenestration on side and rear elevations.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterized the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
 - 2. “The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The rear addition will square out the southwest corner of the building.
 - b. The addition will rest atop brick foundation piers matching those employed on the body of the house.
 - c. The addition will feature wooden siding matching that employed on the body of the building.
 - d. Existing corner boards will remain in place so as to demarcate the existing historic fabric from the new construction.
 - e. The addition will feature salvaged wooden windows.
 - f. The additions will feature an eaves/fascia treatment matching the existing.
 - g. A pent/hip roof configuration will surmount the addition.

- h. The roofing shingles will match those employed on the body of the house.
- i. The South (side) Elevation of the addition will not feature fenestration.
- j. The West (rear) Elevation will feature two salvaged six-over-six wooden windows and a relocated six paneled wooden door (See C-1-E and C-2- for the windows.).
- k. A flight of relocated steps will access the aforementioned door.
- 2. Alter fenestration on the West (Rear) Elevation.
 - a. Remove and relocate a six-over-six window.
 - b. Install replacement siding over affected areas. Said siding will match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material
- 3. Alter fenestration on the North (side) Elevation.
 - a. Remove two six-over-six window.
 - b. Relocate the smaller of the aforementioned windows to the location of the larger.
 - c. Install replacement siding over affected areas. Said siding will match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a rear addition and the alteration of fenestration on a side and the rear elevations.

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards state that new additions shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment (See B-1.). The retention of corner boards on both the side and rear elevations would allow the proposed addition “to read” as a later alteration to existing historic fabric. The maintenance of the same floor level, use of matching siding, adoption of matching details, and the reuse of salvaged windows would allow for compatibility of scale and detail.

The Design Review Guidelines state that the size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building (See B-2). This proposal calls for the alteration three fenestrated units. A window located on the West (Rear) Elevation’s projecting ell would be moved just to the north of its existing location. On the North (a side) Elevation, two windows would be removed. The rearmost window of the aforementioned would be relocated to location of the other window. In previous applications of this type, the Board has requested that the framing of windows proposed for infill remain.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of the application with the retention of the original window framing on the North (side) elevation. Staff also recommends that the window sash be salvaged and stored on site.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Allen recused himself from the discussion and ruling.

Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Kearley if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Kearley explained the reasons behind the alteration to the fenestration located on the side and rear elevations.

Mr. Stone asked Mr. Kearley if the house was going to be repainted. Mr. Kearley answered yes. He added that a color scheme had not been selected.

Mr. Karwinski stated that he had only one question. He asked Mr. Kearley if foundation screening would be extended between the foundation piers as it was on the body of the house. Mr. Kearley answered yes. He said that while the screening does not appear on the plans as submitted, revised plans show the continuation of lattice screening that would match the existing.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response from the audience, 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, amending facts to note that framed and recessed lattice (wooden) skirting would extend between the addition's foundation piers.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/6/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-79-CA: 1744 Hunter Avenue
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Susan Thomas
Received: 10/17/13
Meeting: 11/20/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fencing and Addition – Construct privacy fencing and a deck.

BUILDING HISTORY

This “minimal traditional” dates from 1945. The house features historical motifs such as traditional windows and door surrounds on a period massing.

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 4, 2007. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a rear addition. With this application, the applicant proposes the construction of privacy fencing and the extension of a rear deck.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. Fencing “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
 - 2. “New additions and related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Remove portions of the existing picket fencing.
 - 2. Construct privacy fencing.
 - a. The fencing will measure 6’ in height.
 - b. The fencing will be located atop a portion of the existing picket fencing. Said 3’ high sections of fencing would be removed.
 - c. The gate sections will match the design of the fencing sections.
 - 3. Construct an extension to an existing deck beneath an existing pergola.
 - a. The deck will feature the same skirting as the existing deck.

- b. Portions of the deck will feature a picketed railing of the submitted design.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the construction of fencing and a deck on a corner lot property. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that fencing “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered (See B-1.). The proposed 6’ high privacy fence would be of a simple design and located atop the location of a portion of the exiting picket fencing. The fencing in question encloses a portion of the backyard of this deep corner lot property. Set back from the street and in plane with the proposed fencing. The location of the fencing does not pose an issue with the Traffic Engineering.

The proposed rear deck would serve to extend a narrow deck that extends along the house’s West (a side) Elevation. Said deck would be located beneath an existing pergola. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, the proposed deck would be reversible (See B-2.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Mr. Kearley answered no.

Mr. Wagoner asked for clarification regarding the location of the proposed fencing. Mr. Kearley addressed Mr. Wagoner’s inquiry.

Mr. Karwinski stated that he had two issues that he wanted to address. First, he said that he had concerns regarding the placement of a privacy fence almost right on the sidewalk. Mr. Karwinski that visually it would be better to place the proposed fencing four to five feet back from the inner edge of sidewalk. Locating the fence in aforementioned would allow the installation of ground plantings that would obscure the installation. Secondly, Mr. Karwinski stated that the location of the fencing might pose safety-related concerns on account obscuring pedestrian traffic from the sight lines of vehicles exiting the property’s driveway. He recommended recessing and angling the fencing as a means of addressing both concerns.

Mr. Kearley stated that the fence is already setback 18” from the sidewalk. On account of the size of backyard, he said further recessing the fence would make the space less usable. Mr. Kearley spoke (from experience) of moving vehicles in reverse from the driveway.

Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that he had taken the proposed site plan to Traffic Engineering. Representatives of the aforementioned department did not have any concerns regarding the location of the proposed fencing.

Mr. Wagoner said that Mr. Karwinski's point was valid, but if Traffic Engineering did not have any concerns he did not.

Mr. Karwinski suggested straightening the driveway.

Mr. Kearley said that straightening the curved drive was not being considered on account of the difficulty of removing the concrete surfacing.

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

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Wagoner moved that, based upon the facts as 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: 11/6/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-80-CA: 1565 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Don Bowden with Bowden Architecture for Evan Maisel
Received: 10/18/13
Meeting: 11/7/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a rear addition – The addition will take the form of a garage connected to the main dwelling bay way of an intervening breezeway.

BUILDING HISTORY

This grand residence dates circa 1900. Featuring one of the finest surviving Aesthetics Movement interiors located in a Mobile dwelling, the inside of the house lives up to the exterior in terms of scale and treatment.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on June 5, 2013. At that time, the Board approved the demolition of later side and rear additions.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. With regard to additions “the new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
 - 2. “New additions and adjacent and related new construction shall be undertaken in such a way that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans).
 - 1. Construct a rear addition – The addition will take the form of a garage connected to the main dwelling bay by way of an intervening breezeway.
 - a. The garage-hyphen addition will rest atop a concrete slab.
 - b. The addition will be faced with wooden siding that will match that found on the body of the house with regard to profile and dimension.
 - c. The addition’s trim and fascia will match that employed on the body of the house.

- d. The gabled roofs will be sheathed with GAF Camelot “Antique Slate” tiles.
 - e. West Elevation
 - i. The hyphen portion of the addition’s West Elevation will feature a single two-over-two window and a salvaged paneled door fronted by a screened door.
 - ii. A transom will surmount the aforementioned door.
 - iii. The pitch of the roof will continue over the aforementioned entrance.
 - iv. The porch will feature a square section porch post matching those employed on the main house’s rear elevation.
 - v. The hyphen portion of the addition’s West Elevation will be situated behind a court defined by a wooden wall.
 - vi. The aforementioned wall will feature siding matching that employed on the main body of the house. The height of the wall will be 42” in height. The gate design will match those of the wall expanses.
 - vii. A generator will be located within the enclosure.
 - viii. The West Elevation of the garage portion of the addition will feature an advanced shed roofed bay.
 - ix. The West Elevation of the garage portion of the addition will not employ fenestration.
 - f. South Elevation
 - i. The addition’s South Elevation will feature two paneled garage doors which will be composite in composition.
 - ii. The top of the continuous cornice return will be sheathed with shingles matching those on the garage’s roof.
 - iii. The gable will be punctuated by a two-over-two wooden window.
 - g. East Elevation
 - i. The East Elevation of the garage portion of the addition will feature a pair of two-over-two wooden windows.
 - ii. The hyphen portion of the addition’s East Elevation will feature a single two-over-two window and a salvaged paneled door fronted by a screened door.
 - iii. A transom will surmount the aforementioned door.
 - iv. The pitch of the roof will continue over the aforementioned entrance.
 - v. The porch will feature a square section porch post matching those employed on the main house’s rear elevation.
 - vi. A small concrete walk will extend to the south of the porch.
2. A small concrete skirt-like pad will front the garage entrance.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a rear addition. The rear addition would take the form of a two car garage connected to the principle dwelling by way of hyphen-like passage.

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards state additions should be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment (See B-2). The adoption of a hyphen to connect the garage to the original house will serve to differentiate the new from the historic fabric. Matching siding, eaves, and windows will allow for compatible of elements and details.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Don Bowden was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He complimented Mr. Bowden on the work being done on the prominently located residence. Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Bowden if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Bowden explained to the Board that the design had to be adjusted on account of several heritage trees. He told the Board that some of the trees had not been included on the property survey. Mr. Bowden elaborated on the design by saying that the elevations of the main part of the garage had been shifted and the hyphen slightly elongated.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant's representative.

Mr. Karwinski said that he had an issue. Speaking to the applicant, his fellow Board members, and Staff, he stated that drawings submitted were not the same as those presented for approval. Mr. Karwinski said that the Board did not have proper time which to fully review the work.

Mr. Ladd stated that changes were simple because the concept was the same.

Mr. Bowden reiterated that the elevations had been shifted and hyphen extended, but the concept and details remained the same.

Steve Stone agreed with Mr. Ladd and Mr. Bowden.

Mr. Karwinski concurred, but noted that procedure should be respected. He said that the earlier application should have been withdrawn and the one up for review submitted.

Mr. Bowden explained that he had offered to do what Mr. Karwinski suggested, but Staff had encouraged him to amend the application instead of withdrawing it.

Mr. Ladd told Mr. Karwinski that while he understood his reasoning, the changes were minor and the design a good one. He and Mr. Bowden noted that it would not be visible from the public view.

Mr. Karwinski stated that of the initial and revised designs, he preferred the latter.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response from the audience, 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 amended to note that the hyphen had been lengthened and the elevations shifted.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/6/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-80-CA: 7 North Hamilton Street
Applicant: John Dendy with Dendy and Associates Architects for Irvin Grodsky
Received: 10/21/13
Meeting: 11/7/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition and New Construction - Demolish a portion of the rear of the building and construct a new rear porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Metzger House dates from 1875. The overall form of the house -a shallow-hipped roof, single-story double pile fronted by full length gallery - recalls the appearance of houses located within the State's interior.

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 house has been mothballed for many years. The building was cited for code violations during a 2013 sweep of downtown. The owner proposes the demolition of a deteriorated portion of th rear elevation and the construction of a rear porch.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided."
 - 2. With regard to additions "the new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."
 - 3. "New additions and adjacent and related new construction shall be undertaken in such a way that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired."
 - 4. "The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building."
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Demolish a portion of the southwest of the building (a cabinet that served to terminate the southern portion of an earlier porch.

2. Repoint the Rear (West) Elevation's masonry joints with an appropriate mortar.
3. Construct a new rear porch.
 - i. The three bay porch will rest atop a continuous brick foundation.
 - ii. The aforementioned bricks will be salvaged from the demolished cabinet.
 - iii. The brick foundation of the porch will be capped by an advanced edge.
 - iv. A south-facing flight of wooden steps will provide access to and from the porch.
 - v. The square section posts will be based on the front porch's square section posts.
 - vi. A simple picketed railing will extend between the porch posts and the outer side of the steps.
 - vii. A surviving portion of the Rear Elevation's lost northwest corner ell's northern wall will be retained.
 - viii. A hipped roof will surmount the porch.
 - ix. The porch's hipped roof will be sheathed standing seam metal roofing panels.
4. Reinstall fenestration within the window bays
 - i. From North to South the Rear Elevation's fenestration will be as follows: A nine light French door, a pair of six-over-six windows, a glazed and paneled door with surmounting transom, two six-over-six windows. All of the aforementioned units will be made of and framed by wood.
5. Reconfigure paving and parking.
6. Plant grass in the northwest corner of the lot.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the demolition of a rear cabinet and the construction of a rear porch.

With regard to the partial demolition, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that the removal of historic materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided (See B-1.). When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into account additional concerns, including the following: the architectural significance of the construction; the condition of the subject property; the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment. Minimally visible from the public view, the small cabinet was part of rear service court that once featured a northwest corner wing. The cabinet is in a bad state of repair on account of demolition by neglect. The roof has collapsed. The brick work suffers from multiple maladies.

As per the proposed rear porch addition, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment (See B-2). The lower height and substructure of the porch would serve to differentiate the new work from the existing historic fabric. Traditional materials and replicated details would allow for the new construction to complement the existing.

Regarding the fenestration, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that the size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building (See B-4). The proposed fenestration is in keeping with the historic character of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application. Staff does recommend that the applicant install plantings in the rear area's green space.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

John Dendy was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Mr. Dendy informed the Board that a small section of the lost ell's western wall would be retained as ghost of that portion of the building.

Mr. Ladd asked if bricks would be salvaged. Mr. Dendy answered yes. He said that bricks from the cabinet would be used to construct the proposed porch's foundation.

Mr. Wagoner expressed his admiration of the house and appreciation that work was being done to restore the house.

Mr. Dendy explained that the proposed work represented phase one of a two part revitalization effort. He state that a latter point, a more comprehensive exterior and interior campaign would begin on the remainder of the building

Mr. Wagoner inquired as to the intended use of the building.

Mr. Dendy stated that building would likely be adaptively reused as an office.

Ms. Hasser inquired as to the composition of the hardsurfacing. Mr. Dendy addressed Ms. Hasser's query.

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

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. Karwinski 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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/6/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-73-CA: 222 Dauphin Street
Applicant: David Naman
Received: 9/3/13
Meeting: 10/2/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Construct a balcony and remodel a ground floor storefront.

BUILDING HISTORY

Erected in 1879, 222 Dauphin is one of the three units comprising the Demouy Row, one of Mobile's finest extant examples of Italianate commercial architecture of the Postbellum 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 last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on October 16, 2013. At that time, the Board tabled an application for lack of information. The same application had been tabled on October 2, 2013. The application involved the construction of a balcony and the remodeling of a storefront. With this application the applicant intends to clarify the Board's concerns. A plan, more detailed elevation, and door designs have been provided.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible the massing, size, 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 property and its environment would be unimpaired."
 - 3. "Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence."
 - 4. "Changes that create a false sense of historic sense of historic development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall be not be undertaken."
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Construct a cast iron gallery.

- a. The gallery will be supported by four cast iron posts matching those employed on the two other units which comprise the complex.
- b. The gallery will be 6' 2" in depth and extend between the unit's pilasters.
- c. The gallery will feature an Italianate style railing. The sections of railing will be extended between newel-like posts vertically aligned with the posts supporting the gallery.
- d. The decking will match that employed on the adjacent unit's gallery.
- 2. Repair and if necessary replace wooden windows to match the existing in composition and light configuration.
- 3. Remove the 1950s recessed entrance.
- 4. Reconfigure the ground floor storefront.
 - a. The ground floor storefront will be comprised of two parts.
 - b. A stuccoed bulkhead will be constructed.
 - c. The storefront units will be aluminum in composition.
 - d. Both door and the transom above the door will be made of wood.
 - e. The western portion of the storefront will feature a glazed wooden door surmounted by a transom.
 - f. The eastern portion of the storefront will feature a recessed bay featuring a double door flanked by glazed bays.
 - g. All of the storefront's easternmost fenestrated bays will be surmounted by aluminum transoms.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a gallery and the alteration of a ground floor storefront.

As the building's upper-story door bay indicates and early 20th-Century photographs and Sanborn Maps depict show, this building once featured a cast iron gallery. Cantilevered in form, the balcony was later replaced by a projecting marquee (See B-3). The proposed gallery would feature the same four bay elevation and 6' 2" depth as the galleries fronting the buildings two western units. The balcony to the east is of the same projection. Traditional railings like that proposed have been approved on reconstructed balconies located across the Lower Dauphin Commercial District. The structure and posts of the balcony allow this historically informed intervention to read as a sympathetic addition to traditional commercial context (See B-1 and 4). In previous meetings (which no representative was present) the Board voiced concern over the type of door. A design of the proposed door has been provided.

The ground floor storefront dates from the 1950s. While a testament with regard to changing technologies, marketing practices, and design aesthetics, the recessed entrance is not an exemplar of Modern design. Better examples survive and have been preserved elsewhere on Dauphin Street (223 Dauphin Street for instance). The proposed store front affords access to the ground floor and upper story units. A similar solution can be seen at the remodeled storefront located at 3 South Royal Street. Wooden ground floor storefronts have been approved across the Lower Dauphin Commercial District.

From previous applications reviewed by the Board, staff notes that the first floor storefront is not centered and the balcony posts therefore visually block the façade at the appropriate breaks; and the storefront and the second floor do not align.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

While Staff does not believe the proposed rehabilitation impairs the architectural or the historical character of the building or the historic district (See B 1-3.), Staff notes that proposed storefront and

balcony do not align and that a better solution to the design problem would be more appropriate. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

David Naman was present to discuss the application

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He complimented Mr. Naman on his efforts to improve his family's downtown holdings. Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Naman if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions for Mr. Naman.

Mr. Allen asked if the iron security gate would be reused.

Mr. Naman answered no.

Mr. Naman informed the Board of a discrepancy in the plans. He stated that the proposed storefront would be in plane with and not recessed from the adjacent storefronts.

Mr. Karwinski said that he had one comment to make. He stated that he did not believe the proposed storefront was the best solution for this building. Mr. Karwinski observed that a pattern and continuity between the ground and upper floors was not present.

Discussion ensued. Mr. Naman asked Mr. Karwinski what would he suggest as an alternative to the proposed plan. Mr. Karwinski suggested a solution like that adopted at 220 Dauphin Street (Mama's restaurant). Mr. Naman said that he was not amenable to that particular alternative.

Mr. Ladd stated that the proposed ground floor treatment represented a vast improvement over the existing ground floor.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response from the audience, 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, amending facts to note that the ground floor storefront would be in plan with the adjacent facades.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/6/14