

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
October 15, 2014 – 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: Bob Allen, Robert Brown, 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, Cart Blackwell, and Keri Coumanis.
2. Ms. Harden moved to approve the minutes for the meetings of August 20, 2014 and September 17, 2014. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. Mr. Stone moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood**
 - a. Property Address: 101 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/11/14
 - c. Project: Install an ATM and a deposit box (as per discussions and in plans).
2. **Applicant: Julia Fobes**
 - a. Property Address: 113 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/10/14
 - c. Project: Reroof with galvanized metal roof, 5-V crimp.
3. **Applicant: Eugene Morgan**
 - a. Property Address: 158 South Warren Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/10/14
 - c. Project: Updates COA of 3/19/12, repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint to match the existing color scheme.
4. **Applicant: James Oates, contractor/Ed Chamblee, owner**
 - a. Property Address: 205 State Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/9/14
 - c. Project: Repair roof and porch ceiling to match the existing; repair fascia to match the existing; repoint mortar as needed matching the existing in color and strike; repaint doors, windows and trim white; extend porch railing by removing the current top rail and inserting decorative section to match the existing and reinstalling top rail; repair rear porch decking to match the existing, repainting the entire porch.
5. **Applicant: City of Mobile**
 - a. Property Address: 1451 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/9/14
 - c. Project: Repair sections of roof and fascia to match the existing.
6. **Applicant: Bella**
 - a. Property Address: 7 North Conception Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/12/14
 - c. Project: Install a hanging blade sign measuring 20" x 20" in dimension. Said composite sign will feaure the name of the occupying tenant.

- 7. Applicant: Mike Rogers for Cream and Sugar**
 - a. Property Address: 351 George Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/15/14
 - c. Project: Repair foundations, a deck, deteriorated woodwork (to match existing as per profile, dimension, material), and remove the last parts of unused (long collapsed) chimney stack. Repair eaves to match in all respects. Touch up the paint per the exiting color scheme.
- 8. Applicant: Frank Reusser**
 - a. Property Address: 53 Semmes Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/15/14
 - c. Project: Reroof with 25 year three tab black shingle roof.
- 9. Applicant: Tuan Tidlestad with Baytown Builders**
 - a. Property Address: 1704 New Hamilton Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/15/14
 - c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood, repair columns, patch roof, repaint to match.
- 10. Applicant: Mike Catanese**
 - a. Property Address: 1505 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/15/14
 - c. Project: Extend a concrete drive and lay a new parking pad in the rear of the lot (per submitted plan).
- 11. Applicant: Barbara Downing Evatt**
 - a. Property Address: 1706 Laurel Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/16/14
 - c. Project: Remove the façade's later jalousie windows and front door and restore the house's tripartite window grouping (per physical, material, and photographic windows. The three-over-one windows comprising the original fenestration will be replicated. Reopen/restore the original front entry sequence (steps will be moved to the original location. Paint the house per a previously approved color scheme..
- 12. Applicant: Cummings Architectures**
 - a. Property Address: 168 South Broad Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/16/14
 - c. Project: Install a six foot tall wooden privacy fence per a submitted plan. The will step down to three feet as it advances toward the street (Palmetto).
- 13. Applicant: Sondra Dempsey**
 - a. Property Address: 261 North Jackson Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/16/14
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated window components/windows to match the existing as per light configuration, material, profile, etc... Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing. Touch up the paint per the approved color scheme.
- 14. Applicant: Samuel Lee Randolph**
 - a. Property Address: 368 Breamwood
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/16/14
 - c. Project: Reroof with 5 V-crimp metal roof, gray.
- 15. Applicant: Melissa Glazner**
 - a. Property Address: 1658 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/16/14
 - c. Project: Repaint four exterior doors as per existing.
- 16. Applicant: Dennis Gaddy**
 - a. Property Address: 117 Parker

- b. Date of Approval: 9/23/14
 - c. Project: Jack and level house, replace rotten wood underneath, if necessary build new piers, to be brickfaced if along perimeter. Place dumpster on property.
- 17. Applicant: Jim Gilbert**
- a. Property Address: 259 North Jackson Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/23/14
 - c. Project: Construct an eight foot concrete wall that will be faced with a skim coat of stucco. The wall will extend an existing wall and will feature a cap. The wall will not extend beyond the front plane of the house.
- 18. Applicant: Grady Dortch & Sons**
- a. Property Address: 415 Flint Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/22/14
 - c. Project: Remove one story collapsed wood shed
- 19. Applicant: Gloria B. Wells**
- a. Property Address: 360 South Broad Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/25/14
 - c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood matching existing in profile dimensions and materials. Paint the house white with white trim.
- 20. Applicant: Dennis Gaddy**
- a. Property Address: 117 Parker Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/23/14
 - c. Project: Jack and level house, replace rotten wood underneath, if necessary build new piers, to be brickfaced if along perimeter. Place dumpster on property.
- 21. Applicant: Pete Burns**
- a. Property Address: 257 North Jackson Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/26/14
 - c. Project: Construct a stuccoed faced/parched concrete block wall. The wall extend in a southerly direction along the northern (side) lot line. Said will begin at the termination of the existing wall. The wall will match the height of walls exiting and approved on the lot and adjacent lot. Said wall commence at the termination of an existing wall and then extended the length of the western (rear) lot line.
- 22. Applicant: Doug Helms**
- a. Property Address: 1204 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/30/14
 - c. Project: Install solar panels on the ground level in back of the enclose rear lot. Said panels will not be visible.
- 23. Applicant: Larry Shelter**
- a. Property Address: 1574 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/30/14
 - c. Project: Replace rotten wood as necessary and repaint with Rocky River Sherman Williams chart.
- 24. Applicant: Teague Construction Systems Incorporated**
- a. Property Address: 209 North Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/1/14
 - c. Project: Reroof the building to match the existing.
- 25. Applicant: Joe Pomeroy with Thomas Roofing**
- a. Property Address: 1005 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/2/14
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with architectural shingles.

- 26. Applicant: Paul Shestak**
- a. Property Address: 201 South Warren Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/2/14
 - c. Project: Repaint ironwork St. Ann Yellow of Vieux Carre color chart. Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing, repaint doors per existing..
- 27. Applicant: Joe Sands**
- a. Property Address: 1625 Lamar Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/3/14
 - c. Project: Reroof an ancillary building with matching shingles.
- 28. Applicant: Brian Williams**
- a. Property Address: 256 North Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/7/14
 - c. Project: Put support sills underneath house.
- 29. Applicant: Marylyn Boone**
- a. Property Address: 1551 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/7/14
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with architectural shingles.
- 30. Applicant: William B. and Robin R. Strickland**
- a. Property Address: 303 South Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/7/14
 - c. Project: Remove and salvage a later door (installed in the 1940s) and reinstall siding to match the existing and replicate a documented original fenestration.

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 2014-44-CA: 1651 Dauphin Street**
- a. Applicant: Paula and Wayne Thorpe
 - b. Project: Addition – Construct a rear addition.
- APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 2. 2014-45-CA: 257 Rapier Street**
- a. Applicant: Bob Caron with Lipford Construction for C. Esther De Wolde
 - b. Project: Addition - Construct a rear addition.
- APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 3. 2014-46-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.
- HELDOVER. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 4. 2014-47-CA: 8 and 12 North Lafayette Street**
- a. Applicant: Ben Cummings with Cummings Architecture for McGill-Toolen Catholic High School
 - b. Project: Redevelopment – Install fencing, paving, and landscaping as part of a parking enclosure.
- CONCEPT APPROVAL. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 5. 2014-48-CA: 1563 Spring Hill Avenue**
- a. Applicant: Ben Cummings with Cummings Architecture for McGill-Toolen Catholic High School
 - b. Project: Demolition and Redevelopment – Demolish a non-contributing building and redevelop the site as an extension of a parking enclosure.
- CONCEPT APPROVAL. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

6. 2014-49-CA: 101-103 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: David Anderson with SBA Communications for the Retirement System of Alabama
- b. Project: Mechanical/Technological – Upgrade cellular antenna atop a multi-story building.

WITHDRAWN.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Guidelines
- 2. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-44-CA: 1651 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Don Williams for Paula & Wayne Thorpe
Received: 9/25/14
Meeting: 10/15/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

This house dates circa 1900. With its project bay and expanse of porch, the house’s façade is a representative example of a popular late 19th-Century street elevation. The house was the longtime home of and remains identified with the Crichton family.

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 August 11, 2003. At that time, the Board approved the enclosure of a rear porch. With this application, the owners propose the construction of a rear addition.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the 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 of the property and its environment.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The addition will take the form of an enclosed living space, a screened porch, and a partially enclose utility area.
 - b. The addition will be rest atop brick foundation piers matching those supporting the body of the house.
 - c. Boxed, recessed, and suspended wooden lattice skirting will be installed between the foundation piers.
 - d. The side walls of the addition will be set back from, yet parallel with the side walls of the body of the house.
 - e. The addition’s wooden siding will match that employed on the body of the house.

- f. The fascia and eave treatments will match that found on the body of the house.
- g. The addition's hipped roof will adopt a pitch mirroring that of the main house's roof.
- h. The roofing shingles will match those found on the body of the house.
- i. The western portion of the South (Rear) Elevation will feature two salvaged four-over-four wooden windows. The casings of the aforementioned windows will match those found on the body of the house.
- j. A four bay screened porch and a single enclosed bay (utility area) will inform the eastern portion of the South Elevation.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. How will the side elevations be treated?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a rear addition. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic of the property and its environment (See B-1). By virtue of being set back from the main house's side walls, the proposed addition will be differentiated from historic fabric. The overall massing, including foundation and ceiling heights, will match the proportions and dimensions (vertical) of the existing. In addition to the aforementioned observations of massing and scale, the materials and decorative treatments will replicate the existing. Fenestration will be salvaged.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), 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.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Don Williams 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. Williams if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Williams replied that the only significant visual difference would be the alteration of the rear roof from a gable to a hip. He explained that the alteration would make the addition less dominant. Mr. Williams added that the work would blend.

Mr. Roberts asked for clarification as to how the roof would be treated. Discussion ensued as to how the western portion of the addition would engage the house. Ms. Harden and Mr. Holmes joined in the discussion. They encouraged Mr. Williams to execute a sketch illustrating how the roof would appear in plan. After sketching out a plan, Mr. Williams distributed the rendering inspection. Upon examining the plan and taking into account the discussion, Mr. Roberts stated that his question had been clarified. He elaborated by saying that renderings in elevation sometimes do not represent what one experiences firsthand.

Mr. Stone asked for clarification as per the type of railing. Mr. Williams responded that the railing would match that employed on the front porch. He went on to state that contractor was deliberating as to whether to install the proposed porch screening inside or outside of the railings and posts.

No further discussion ensued amongst 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. 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 porch railing would match those sections of railing found on the front porch.

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: 10/15/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-45-CA: 257 Rapier Avenue
Applicant: Bob Caron with Lipford Construction for C. Esther De Wolde
Received: 9/29/14
Meeting: 10/15/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

This classically proportioned Arts & Crafts “bungalow” dates from 1906. The dwelling stands as one of Mobile’s least altered regional adoptions/adaptations of the nationally pervasive idiom. The house’s façade, one distinguished by full-length gallery fronting paired bay windows, is of particular note.

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/applicant proposes the construction of a rear addition.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standard’s for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guideline’s for Mobile’s Historic Districts, 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 of the property and its environment.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The addition will take the form of a rear porch.
 - b. The addition measure 14’ in depth and 32’ in width.
 - c. The addition will be parallel with, but recessed from the side walls of the main dwelling.
 - d. The addition will rest atop brick veneered foundation piers.
 - e. Boxed, recessed, and suspended lattice foundation skirting matching that found of the body of the house will extend between the piers.
 - f. The porch deck will be faced with a skirt matching that employed on the body of the house.
 - g. The porch will feature tongue-and-groove decking.
 - h. The porch will feature four square section posts and possessing boxed bases and capitals.
 - i. Pilasters will match the posts.

- j. A picketed railing will extend between the porch posts.
 - k. A single flight of wooden steps with railings matching those enclosing the porch bays will extend from the central bay of the porch's three bay East (Rear) Elevation.
 - l. An Expanse of wall faced with wooden siding matching that employed on the body of the house will comprise the porch's North Elevation.
 - m. A hipped roof with a pitch matching that of main house's roof will surmount the addition.
 - n. The roofing shingles will match those found on the body of the house.
2. A concrete patio will be located at the foot of the porch's steps.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a rear addition. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic of the property and its environment (See B-1). In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, the proposed addition is differentiated from the historic house by means of being side setbacks (See B-1.). While the walls are parallel with those main house's side walls, the setback allows the addition to "read" as a later alteration. The foundation and ceiling heights will replicate the existing. The materials and construction methods (such as a tongue-and-groove porch decking) are part of design that respects the architectural character of the house. The location and surface treatment of the patio are similarly mindful of the historic context.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), 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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Bob Caron 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. Caron had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Stone asked Mr. Caron about the chimney flue. Mr. Caron addressed Mr. Stone's query.

Mr. Blackwell noted that alterations to the Rear Elevation's fenestration were not mentioned in either the Scope of Work or the Staff Analysis. Several amendments to the application were discussed as a consequence of the aforementioned neglects.

The center portion of the rear elevation, an expanse defined by a tripartite grouping formed by a window-door-window sequence, was the first subject of discussion. It was explained that the subject area constitutes a later feature (The pertinent section of wall enclosed a recessed rear porch). The proposed plan involves the installation of new fenestration in the location. The Board did not object to the alteration of later fabric.

The Board then discussed the removal of the Rear Elevation's northernmost window and its replacement with a pair of windows. Mr. Caron explained that the applicant would like to use double-paned windows.

Mr. Bemis noted that the current Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that window replacements must match the existing and that in approving double-paned windows the action would not be in accord with said regulations. Mr. Caron was asked if he would be amenable to using single-paned windows. Mr. Caron said yes. He added that while single-paned windows would cost more, he was amenable to employing them.

Mr. Bemis stated that the proposed windows would not match the light configuration of the rest of the windows. Ms. Harden suggested possibly infilling the lower portion of the window. Mr. Caron stated the objective was to gain more light. By infilling the lower portion of the window, what natural illumination which is afforded would be lessened.

Mr. Roberts voiced concerns about the applicant's ability to agree to changes without the applicant represent. Mr. Caron assured Mr. Roberts that he was authorized to discuss and agree to alterations.

Mr. Holmes reminded his fellow board members of the location of the windows.

Mr. Bemis asked Mr. Caron if the windows from the altered middle portion of the Rear Elevation could be salvaged and reused in the subject location. Mr. Caron reiterated the rationale of the proposal.

Mr. Blackwell pointed out that the house features multiple window types.

Mr. Bemis recommended the use of one-over-one windows.

Ms. Harden stated that while she understood the rationale and admired the project, she still held a reservation. She elaborated by stating that the proposed intervention (fenestration) was not reversible.

Discussion ensued as to whether to approve a pair of four-over-one, six-over-one, or one-over-one windows.

Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Caron if he was amenable to amending the proposal. Mr. Caron explained that he was amenable to amending the application to employ six-over-one (true divided light) wooden windows.

It was noted that the application also called for the installation of retractable screens. Mr. Caron elaborated upon the location, mechanics, and composition of the screens.

No further discussion ensued amongst 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. Holmes 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 the alteration of the later entry sequence and the replacement of a single window with two six-over-one wooden (true divided light) windows.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Holmes 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: 10/15/15

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 May 7, 2014. At that time, 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

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Coumanis and Mr. Bemis explained that on account of their involvement with the project and the commitment of municipal funds enabling its implementation, they would like to holdover the review of the application.

Review of the application of the application was heldover.

HELDOVER.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-47-CA: 8 and 12 North Lafayette Street
Applicant: Ben Cummings with Cummings Architecture for McGill-Toolen Catholic High School
Received: 9/23/14
Meeting: 10/15/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing and Contributing (The physical fabric of the contributing dwelling will be not be impacted)
Zoning: R-2 and R-1
Project: Site Redevelopment – Install paving, fencing, and landscaping as part of a parking enclosure.

BUILDING HISTORY

A multi-family complex occupies the site of 8 North Lafayette. The building dates from the last third of the 20th Century. A single-story wooden dwelling previously occupied the lot. A late Queen Anne dwelling occupies the front half of 12 North Lafayette Street. Dating from 1898, the irregularly massed and two-storied dwelling features a wrap-around porch and varied roof forms.

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. Both 8 and 12 North Lafayette Street belong to McGill-Toolen Catholic High School. 8 North Lafayette Street last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on December 18, 2014. At that time, the Board approved the demolition of the multi-family housing complex occupying the site. 12 North Lafayette has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review calls for the installation of paving, fencing, and landscaping. The redevelopment project would occupy the whole of the 8 North Lafayette Street lot and would extend behind, but would not physically impact the dwelling located at 12 North Lafayette Street.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Parking areas should be screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences or landscaping.”
 - 2. “The appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design.”
 - 3. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location, and materials be compatible with the property.”
 - 4. “Ordinances relating to parking and landscaping will be enforced by the City of Mobile Urban Development Department in reviewing requests for parking lots.”

5. "Proposed lighting should be designed to avoid invading surrounding areas."

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Grade the site.
2. Remove two curbcuts.
3. Construct a new curbcut.
 - a. The inner edge of the curbcut will measure approximately 25' 1 1/2" in width.
 - b. The outer edge of the curbcut will measure approximately 44' 11" in width.
4. Install fencing.
 - a. The fencing will match the design of the fencing located on the adjacent property to the south of the site.
 - b. The fencing will extend the length of 8 North Lafayette Street's western expanse (in line with the fencing of the property to south).
 - c. The fence will extend along the existing north lot line separating 8 North Lafayette Street from 12 North Lafayette Street.
 - d. The fence will turn in a northerly direction behind the house occupying the front portion of the 12 North Lafayette Street.
 - e. The fence will extend rear portion of the northern lot line of 12 North Lafayette Street.
 - f. The fence will extend along the east lot lines of both 8 and 12 North Lafayette Street and will tie into the fencing located on the southern lot line of 8 North Lafayette Street.
 - g. An inward opening vehicular gate will provide access to and from the parking enclosure (See C-3 for the curbcut.).
5. Install hardsurfacing.
 - a. The asphalt surfaced lot will contain a total of sixty-six (66) parking spaces.
6. Install landscaping.
 - a. Landscaping located within the fencing will extend around the perimeter of the paved areas. Said landscaping will be ground level, intermediate, and upper level in height.
 - b. A landscaped island/stormwater detention island located in the center of the parking area will also feature plantings.

CLARIFICATION/REQUEST

1. Address landscaping.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the redevelopment of two adjacent inner block lots. The project would entail the installation of paving, fencing, and landscaping. The resulting parking lot and enclosure would occupy the whole of 8 North Lafayette Street and would extend behind the contributing house located at 12 North Lafayette Street. While the latter would be physically unaffected by the proposed work, the project would entail the removal of a non-contributing and unsympathetic multi-family infill construction. The aforementioned building was approved for demolition in December of 2014.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that parking areas should be screened from view by fencing and landscaping (See B 1). Built and landscape features will minimize the impact of the proposed work (See B-2.). An existing six foot tall aluminum fence located on adjacent parking lot to the North of 8 North Lafayette Street would extend along frontage of the latter property and then wrap around the side and rear of 12 North Lafayette Street. Said fencing will extend along 12 North Lafayette Street's North (side) and East (rear) lot lines and will tie into matching fencing located on South lot line of 8 North Lafayette Street. An inward opening vehicular gate will allow for access to and from the lot.

Fencing of the proposed type and height is authorized for commercial and/or institutional properties. Perimeter and interior landscaping in the form of ground level, intermediate height, and upper level landscaping will be planted within the fenced enclosure. Additional plantings will be employed within the internal landscape/water detention island.

With regard to paving materials, The Design Review Guidelines state that modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location, and materials be compatible with the property (See B-3.). Two existing curbcuts will be removed and a single concrete curbcut will be constructed. The curbcut will afford access to and from an asphalt parking lot. Any and all lighting will be pointed downward and coordinated with Urban Development so as avoid invading surrounding areas (See B-5.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-5), Staff does not believe this application will not impair the architectural or historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Pending clarification of landscaping and final approval from the Board of Zoning Adjustment, Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Father Bry Shields and Ben Cummings were 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 Father Shields and Mr. Cummings if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Cummings explained that the project entailed the demolition of the non-contributing condominium building (previously approved), installation of landscaping, fencing, and parking. It was noted that demolition of the condominium had already been approved by the Board.

Mr. Stone instigated a discussion of the total number and location of McGill-Toolen's parking spaces. Mr. Blackwell noted that the construction of a previously approved student center instigated the project up for review. He explained that the aforementioned project would displace a significant number of parking spaces. Mr. Blackwell noted that the number of parking places indicated on the submitted materials included all existing and proposed parking.

Mr. Holmes encouraged the approval of the application.

Mr. Bemis asked for clarification regarding landscaping. Mr. Ladd recommended that Staff approve the landscaping component. Mr. Bemis encouraged that the project be subject to a public hearing. He called upper-story plantings. Mr. Bemis recommended plantings other than crepe myrtles. Father Shields and Mr. Cummings stated that Kent Broom, the project's landscape architect, would be developing the landscape plan. A question was regarding lighting. Mr. Blackwell stated that Urban Development would require all signs to not invade surrounding areas.

Mr. Bemis recommended concept approval of the project. Mr. Ladd asked what the Board would be approving. Mr. Bemis explained that the project would be approved in essential form, but implementation and final approval would be subject to the Board's review of any landscaping and lighting.

No further discussion ensued amongst 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. It was noted landscaping and lighting plans would be required.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Holmes moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness in concept form for the proposed work. Submission of landscaping and lighting would be required for final approval.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/15/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-48-CA: 1563 Spring Hill Avenue
Applicant: Ben Cummings with Cummings Architecture for McGill-Toolen Catholic High School
Received: 9/29/14
Meeting: 10/15/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Demolition and Redevelopment – Demolish a non-contributing building and redevelop the site as an extension of a parking enclosure.

BUILDING HISTORY

This commercial office development dates from 1973.

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 27, 2014. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a rear addition to office building proposed for demolition. In addition to the proposed demolition, the application up for review calls for the resurfacing, hardsurfacing, extension, fencing, and landscaping of an parking area that will function as an extension of improved parking enclosure located on the adjacent property to the north of subject site..
- 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;
 - ii. This single-story commercial strip type development was constructed in 1973. The building is a non-contributing structure located within Old Dauphin Way

- Historic District. The inner lot oriented plan and parking attuned nature of the complex speak to a 1970s automobile informed design ethos.
- iii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 1. Located on what was one of the most evocative sections of Spring Hill Avenue, the once tranquil early suburban context informing the subject area has been drastically altered over the course of the latter half of the 20th Century. While four contributing buildings and a contributing landscape (Vincent House, Ronald McDonald House, Magnolia Manor, Deshon House, and Lyons Park) survive in the block located on the opposite side of Spring Hill Avenue, only one contributing building survives from the subject block's Spring Hill Avenue frontage. All of the contributing buildings (fronting Spring Hill Avenue) on the two blocks to the east and one to the west have demolished. The subject lot formed part of the grounds of the Sanford-Ingate-Thompson estate, one of the grandest suburban villas to have been constructed in Mobile.
 - iv. 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.
 - v. 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. One-story office complexes with plans and elevations similar to that of the subject building can be found on commercial arteries located across the United States.
 - v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 1. If granted demolition approval, the applicant would demolish the building, level the lot, resurface existing paved surfaces, extend hardscaping onto unpaved parking areas, install fencing around the compound, plant landscaping on the perimeter and within the lot, and other improvements involved in the extension of an existing parking enclosure.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The property is in the process of being purchased by the institution making the application. The appraised value of the property is \$355,000.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. While the educational institution purchasing the property initially considered adaptively reusing the building, the condition of the structure, lack of specific use, and attention to the inner campus resulted in submission of the application up for review. The institution will lose parking spaces on account of the construction of a previously approved student center to be constructed on North Lafayette Street. The improvements to and expansion of the parking areas on the subject lot would recapture additional spaces for vehicular parking.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. The property has been for sale for several years.

- 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 application.
 - 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.”
 3. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state in pertinent part:
 - i. “Parking areas should be screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences or landscaping.”
 - ii. “The appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design.”
 - iii. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location, and materials be compatible with the property.”
 - iv. “Ordinances relating to parking and landscaping will be enforced by the City of Mobile Urban Development Department in reviewing requests for parking lots.”
 - v. “Proposed lighting should be designed to avoid invading surrounding areas.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Demolish a non-contributing commercial strip development
2. Remove debris.
3. Remove trees (none of which are heritage trees).
4. Level the lot.
5. Install hardscaping.
 - a. Repave locations featuring existing hardsurfacing and extend hardsurfacing for parking.
 - b. The asphalt hardsurfacing will feature a total of 217 parking spaces.
6. Remove fencing extending between the site and the adjoining property facing Old Shell Road.
7. Install fencing
 - a. The fencing will match the fencing enclosing the parking lot to the south of the site.
 - b. The six foot tall metal fencing will extend from and in plane with the existing fencing located on Kilmarnock Street.
 - c. The fencing will turn in westerly direction behind 1557 Spring Hill Avenue.
 - d. The fencing will extend along the western lot line of the aforementioned address.
 - e. Fencing and an inward opening vehicular gate will be located off of Spring Hill Avenue.
8. Remove a curbcut.
9. Install a new curbcut.

- a. The inner edge of the curbcut will measure approximately 25' 9³/₄".
 - b. The outer edge of the curbcut will measure approximately 64' 10 ³/₈".
10. Landscaping will be installed around the perimeter of the parking area (just within the fencing) and in landscape islands.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a non-contributing building and redevelopment of the site – extension and paving of existing parking lots.

With regard to demolitions, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts take into account the following: 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. The building proposed for demolition is a non-contributing commercial building. An inward oriented strip-type development, the building and its parking lot do not engage the streetscape. Buildings informed by the same suburban mentality and design ethos are found across the United States. While the exterior walls of the building are in good repair, the building's roof is beginning to exhibit interior and exterior signs of failure. If granted demolition approval, the education institutional submitting the application would demolish the building, level the lot, install fencing around, and plant landscaping on an expanded parking lot.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that "parking areas should be screened from view by the fences or landscaping and that that the appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design (See B-3-i and ii.). Paved and unpaved parking already inform the site. An existing parking lot located on the adjacent property to the South of the subject lot will inform the design and treatment of the property up for review. The latter property is enclosed by a six foot tall aluminum fence. Said fencing would extend in northerly fashion along the western side of Kilmarnock Street, wrap behind the medical office complex located at the southwest corner of Kilmarnock Street and Spring Hill Avenue, extend along Spring Hill Avenue (set back from the street), and the terminate at southern end of the West lot line. A recessed and inward opening vehicular gate would provide access to Spring Hill Avenue. Existing curbcuts would be removed. A new concrete curbcut and drive will allow be installed. The Design Review Guidelines state that modern paving materials are at times acceptable in the historic districts. Any and all proposed lighting will design to avoid invading surrounding areas and coordinated with Urban Development (See B-3-iv.).

CLARIFICATION/REQUEST

1. Address landscaping.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (2 and 3 i-iv), Staff does not believe this application in concept will impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district. Pending clarification of landscaping and approval by the Board of Zoning Adjustment, Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Father Bry Shields and Ben Cummings were 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 if Father Shields and Mr. Cummings had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Cummings informed the board that the subject building was not a contributing building.

Ms. Harden asked for clarification regarding the properties abutting the subject lot. She recommended breaking up the expanses of parking. Mr. Cummings stated that the plan calls for the installation of landscape islands.

Father Shields and Mr. Cummings stated that Kent Broom, the project's landscape architect, would address landscape and tree calculations. Mr. Blackwell stated that Urban Development would require the continuation of the green buffer which extends along the eastern side of the adjacent parking lot to continue along Kilmarnock Street side of the site.

Mr. Bemis encouraged the retention of existing trees.

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. Holmes 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. It was noted landscaping and lighting plans would be required for final approval.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Holmes moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the demolition of the non-contributing building does not impair the historic integrity of the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for the aforementioned portion of the application.

Mr. Holmes moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the remainder of the application (paving, fencing, landscaping, etc...) does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness in concept form for the proposed work. Submission of landscaping and lighting would be required for final approval.

Both motion received a second and was approved. Mr. Stone voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/15/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-49-CA: 101-103 Dauphin Street
Applicant: David Anderson with SBA Communications for the Retirement System of Alabama
Received: 9/30/14
Meeting: 10/15/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: SD-WH Special District
Project: Mechanical/Technological – Upgrade cellular antennae (3) atop a multi-story building.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Van Antwerp Building (101 Dauphin Street) holds a point of distinction in that it is Mobile’s first skyscraper. The ten-story building was built between 1904 and 1908 according to the designs of architect George B. Rogers. The three part division of the building into a base (ground floor and mezzanine), shaft (office stories), and cornice serves as illustration of Rogers’ awareness of contemporary theories animated the design of tall office buildings.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on September 18, 2014. At that time, the Board approved the reconstruction of the building’s historic cornice and the installation of signage. The application up for review calls for the reinstallation of upgraded and relocated cellular antenna atop the buildings penthouse.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, the Design Review Guideline for Mobile’s Historic Districts, and state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize a property.”
 - 2. “Accessory roof elements not original to the structure; such as vents, skylights, satellite dishes, etc. shall be located inconspicuously.”
 - 3. “Rooftop equipment such as turbine vents, skylights, satellite dishes, and T.V. antennae shall not be visible from the street.”

Scope of Work (per submitted materials):

- 1. Install satellite antennae atop the newly constructed mechanical “penthouse” of the Van Antwerp Building.

- a. The antenna will measure six feet in height
- b. The antenna shall not extend beyond the wall surface.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the reinstallation of mechanical equipment, more specifically cellular antennae, atop the newly constructed technological/mechanical “penthouse” of the RSA/Van Antwerp Building. Four taller antennae stood atop an earlier mechanical construction that was demolished on account of the building’s restoration/renovation. Three new antennae will be positioned atop the new penthouse. Said technological devices will not extend over the wall of the so-called penthouse. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards state that new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize a property (See B-1.). The so-called penthouse is new construction. No historic materials are impacted.

The Design Review Guidelines state that accessory roof elements not original to the structure shall be located inconspicuously (See B-2.). The proposed reinstallations will be lower in height and less visible than the previous constructions. The Board and Staff have reviewed numerous applications of the proposed nature over recent decades. Within the past five years, the Board has authorized Staff to review and in applicable cases approve such reversible interventions. Considerations include: the impact to historic fabric; the location of the interventions; the height of the devices; and visibility of the constructions. As previously accounted, no historic fabric will be impacted. The interventions will not extend onto the wall of the building, a location-informed consideration important to visual and structural integrity of the building. The height of the antennae is lower than others reviewed and approved. While visible from certain locations, the installations will not take away from historical and architectural character of the building.

The Downtown Development District (DDD) Code states that rooftop equipment such as turbine vents, skylights, satellite dishes, and T.V. antennae shall not be visible from the street (See B-3.). Taking into account criteria of all of the aforementioned standards, guidelines, and codes, the City of Mobile’s Urban Development Department is in the process of developing procedures addressing technological interventions which impact existing buildings located within the Downtown Development District. The Staff of Urban Development recommended approval for new cellular devices to be located at 106 Saint Francis Street. The Board of Zoning Adjustment upheld the staff recommendation at their September 8, 2014 meeting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the B (1-2) and taking into account the Board of Zoning Adjustment’s ruling, Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding districts. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Coumanis apprised the Board of discussions, proposals, and mediations affecting technological interventions. She reminded the Board of the form based code guidelines.