

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

October 18, 2017 – 3:00 P.M.

Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Harris Oswalt, Robert Brown, Bob Allen, John Ruzic, Nick Holmes III, Catarina Echols, Carolyn Hasser, Craig Roberts and Jim Wagoner.
Members Absent: David Barr, Steve Stone, and Kim Harden.
Staff Members Present: Shayla Beaco, Cartledge W. Blackwell, Bridget Daniel, and Paige Largue.
2. Ms. Largue, responding to Mr. Oswalt, noted a correction was made to Board approval noting the application did not impair the building or landscape in the minutes of October 4th, 2017 under 1164 Fry Street. Mr. Brown moved to approve the minutes for the October 4th, 2017 meeting. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.
3. Ms. Echols asked for clarification on Midmonth No. 10, 1134 Montauk Street. Mr. Blackwell clarified Ms. Echols concern. The motion received a second and was approved with one in opposition, Mr. Robert Allen.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: Daniel Clark**
 - a. Property Address: 9 Common Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/25/2017
 - c. Project: Replace four column bases and repair/replace deteriorated wood to match original in dimension, profile and material. Repaint house to match.
2. **Applicant: Charles Sessions of CWS Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 1561 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/25/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof main dwelling and carriage house with architectural shingle sin charcoal gray.
3. **Applicant: Deborah Murphy**
 - a. Property Address: 310 S. Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/25/2017
 - c. Project: Replace portions of existing fence to match.
4. **Applicant: David Miller**
 - a. Property Address: 1204 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/25/2017
 - c. Project: On ancillary building: paint exterior to match; repair and reroof with asphalt shingles to match; repair garage door and steps.
5. **Applicant: Matthew LeMond**
 - a. Property Address: 10 Houston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/25/2017
 - c. Project: Replace door with new wood door to match existing.
6. **Applicant: Harold and Jean Dodge**
 - a. Property Address: 305 S. Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/25/2017
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten wood on port cochere and repaint to match.

7. **Applicant: Noel Hanley**
 - a. Property Address: 10 S. Conception Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/26/2017
 - c. Project: Install 3'0"H x 2'0"W sandwich board sign constructed of wood, metal, wood composite, or metal composite..
8. **Applicant: Benjamin Murphy on behlf of Ben Murphy Co., Inc.**
 - a. Property Address: 1561 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/26/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in brown. Repair and replace deteriorated soffit or fascia board to match eixsiting in dimension, proifile, and material. Repaint to match.
9. **Applicant: Samuel Reid III**
 - a. Property Address: 1569 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/27/2017
 - c. Project: Repair woodwork to match existing, repair/replace windows to match existing, repaint to match, reconstruct steps..
10. **Applicant: Caldwell Whistler**
 - a. Property Address: 1134 Montauk Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/05/2017
 - c. Project: Remove later infill reconstruct original porch posts, railings, and roof structure to match existing conditions, physical evidence, and pictorial evidence.
11. **Applicant: Chrissi Moore**
 - a. Property Address: 113 Garnett Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/05/2017
 - c. Project: Replace chain link fence with six foot dog eared privacy fence.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2017-49-CA: 250 Saint Anthony Street**
 - a. Applicant: Nicholas H. Holmes, III, of Holmes & Holmes Architects on behalf of FFH, LLC
 - b. Project: Demolition an ancillary building and fill in a non-historic pool.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERITFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. **2017-50-CA: 613 Dauphin Street**
 - a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Wendell Quimby
 - b. Project: Addition Related - Construct a front gallery.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERITFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. **2017-51-CA: 457 Conti Street**
 - a. Applicant: Stephen Carter
 - b. Project: Restoration, Partial Demolition, and Redevelopment – Restore historic fabric, demolish a later rear wing, and construct a new addition.

APPROVED. CERITFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. **2017-52-CA: 1750 Old Shell Road**
 - a. Applicant: Pace Burt and Associates
 - b. Project: New Construction - Construct four three-story multi-family buildings.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERITFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-49-CA: 250 Saint Anthony Street
Applicant: Nicholas H. Holmes, III, of Holmes & Holmes Architects on behalf of FFH, LLC
Received: 10/2/17
Meeting: 10/18/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Contributing Main building (not impacted) and Non-Contributing Ancillary (subject of application).
Zoning: T-4
Project: Demolish non-contributing ancillary structure and infill of pool.

BUILDING HISTORY

This highly significant edifice dates circa 1850. An artful blending of Greek Revival and Italianate impulses and elements, the building was constructed a private residence. It is one of less than forty of what once numbered over six hundred side-hall with wing houses. The aforementioned typology was the preferred housing type of Mobile’s civic-commercial elite in the decade before and into the decade after the Civil War.

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 xx. On the aforementioned date, the Board approved xyz. The application up for review calls for the demolition of an ancillary and the removal of fencing constructed after the original date of the main dwelling.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “When considering demolition of later portions of a building, the following criteria are taken into account “significance, condition, impact on the street and the district, and nature of proposed development.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted plans):**
 - 1. Demolish a non-contributing ancillary building located at the very rear of the property’s side yard.
 - 2. Infill a swimming pool and affiliated hardscaped spaces.
 - 3. Plant grass on the subject location.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application entails the removal of a non-contributing ancillary building and the infill of non-historic swimming a pool.

When reviewing applications for the demolition of buildings, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts take into account four criteria. The aforementioned criteria are as follows: significance, condition, impact on the street and the district, and nature of proposed development (See B-1.).

The ancillary building falls not within either the property's or the district's periods of significance. Dating from after the issuance of the 1955 Sanborn Map, the building is not of the same historical nature, architectural importance, and construction quality as the main principle building defining the property. While the exterior of this secondary structure is in a good state of repair, the interior is a vacant shell. Located at the very rear of the building's side lawn behind two landscapes areas and intermediate fencing, the structure, while visible from the public view, neither engages the street nor conveys substantive density of the streetscape. The site would be leveled for possible future development at a later date.

The pool is not one of a historic nature. Said pool would be infilled, affiliated hardscaping would be removed, and grass would be planted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff does not believe this application would impair either the architectural or historical character of the property or the historic district. Staff recommends approval of the application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Holmes recued himself from the discussion.

Mr. Thomas Latham was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Largue introduced the item and explained that the demolition of the ancillary building was withdrawn from the application. The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Latham and asked if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Latham explained that Ms. Largue had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow Board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Latham.

Mr. Wagoner suggested amending the application to reflect the revised application for the infill of the pool only. No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the

application, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Wagoner moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as amended by the Board to note to note only the removal of the pool alone as the scope of work.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration: October 19, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-50-CA: 613 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Wendell Quimby
Received: 9/26/2017
Meeting: 10/18/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.1
Project: Addition: Construct a front gallery.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to materials located within this property’s MHDC vertical file, the two-story eastern portion of this property dates circa 1870 and the later one-story western portion dates from circa 2002.

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 April 19, 2017. At the aforementioned time, the Board approves changes to an altered ground floor storefront and the reconfiguration of the courtyard. With the application up for review, there is proposed the construction of a gallery within the right of way.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New galleries will be considered on a case-by-case basis. The ARB will consider a modern balcony (or gallery).”
 - 2. “Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site (site topography, character-defining features, trees, and significant vistas and public views) are retained.”
 - 3. “...Design it to reflect the time period of the historic structure.”
 - 4. “When (re)constructing a porch, pay particular attention to matching the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/ columns, proportions, and decorative details.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):

1. Remove a later single-story wooden gallery projecting from the North (facade) Elevation.
2. Construct a gallery.
 - a. The gallery will be 24' in length and between 5' 4" and 6' in depth.
 - b. The iron gallery will be four bays in length.
 - c. Four iron posts featuring faceted bases and molded & sculpted capitals.
 - d. The posts will be surmounted by a decking structure with enclosing iron railings.
 - e. The railing will be of picketed design with a meander surmount.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the construction of an iron gallery. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that new galleries will be considered on a case-by-case basis (See B-1.). Galleries and balconies, particularly those featuring cast and wrought ironwork, constitute a defining characteristic of Mobile's historical, architectural, and literary heritage. Dauphin and Royal Streets were defined by galleries during last three quarters of 19th Century and first third of the 20th Century. In recent decades, there has emerged a resurgence in the tradition of gallery construction. The Design Review Guidelines even authorize the construction of galleries or balconies, given certain conditions, where they never existed. Varying umbrages (a balcony, then a gallery, and then another gallery) informed the façade of the subject building. The current example was approved by the Board in the early 2000s. While Design Guidelines state that modern designs are among the solutions encouraged, they encourage in equal measure the construction of galleries and balconies that reflect the time period of the historic structure (See B 1 & 2.). Though the exacting details of the buildings earlier umbrages are not known, the full-length expanse of the proposed gallery preserves the appearance and recaptures their experience (See B-2.). The detailing of the proposed gallery's columnar posts and railings is responsive to the period of the building's construction and the proportions & design of the building so work in concert with larger massing and streetscape conditions in recapturing a lost sense of place (See B-4.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-4), Staff does not believe that this application would impair either the architectural or the historical character of the property or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Kearley and asked if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Kearley explained that Ms. Largue had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow Board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Kearley.

Mr. Roberts noted that the proposed gallery had three bays. Mr. Kearley confirmed. Ms. Largue stated that the clarification will be noted in the minutes and corrected in the "Scope of Work."

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt 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 amended to reflect the correct number of gallery bays.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration: October 19, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-51-CA: 457 Conti Street
Applicant: Stephen Carter
Received: 10/2/2017
Meeting: 10/18/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: T5.1
Project: Restoration, Partial Demolition, and Redevelopment – Restore historic fabric, demolish a later rear wing, and construct a new addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

The National Register nominations (and 1990s update) date this building to the 1960s. The building is in fact the remaining first floor of what was originally a two-story brick townhouse dating from the mid-19th Century. The building was converted to an educational use during the middle third of the 20th Century. An extremely large addition that connected it to another (now lost) building on Hamilton Street was constructed to the rear of the building. Sometime after 1955, the second-story of the building was removed and the present rear addition constructed.

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 March 4, 2015. At that time, the Board approved an application calling for a similar scope of work. A revised application calling for partial demolition, restoration of historic fabric, and rear wing construction appears before the Board in the proposal up for review.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.”
 - 2. “Replace exterior finishes to match original in profile, dimension and materials.”
 - 3. “Use materials that are consistent with the architectural style of the structure.”
 - 4. “Replacements should reflect the age and style of the building.”
 - 5. “Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.
 - 6. “Replace a historic porch element to match the original.”
 - 7. When reviewing applications for partial demolition, the following criteria are taken into account: “historical significance; physical condition; impact on the streetscape; and nature of any proposed redevelopment.”

8. “Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site (site topography, character-defining features, tree, and significant district vistas and public views) are retained.”
9. “Design an addition to be compatible with the character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.”
10. “Design the building components (roof, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
11. “Maintain the relationship of solids and voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as established by the historic building.”
12. “Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color, and/or wall plane.”
13. “Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.”
14. “Size, place and space a window for an addition to be in character with the original historic building.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Restore existing features, along with certain instances of alteration to existing fabric.
 - A. North Elevation (façade)
 - i. Repair, reengage, and repaint cast-iron gallery railings.
 - ii. Scrape, clean, prime, and repaint cast-iron gallery posts.
 - iii. Remove the deteriorated gallery roof.
 - iv. Reconstruct the gallery roof with the same configuration (hip), material (standing seam metal), and dimensions.
 - v. Repair and if necessary replace the existing front doors to match in terms of material, design, profiles, and dimensions.
 - vi. Reroof with architectural shingles (“Cambridge Slate”). *Applies to the whole of existing building.
 - vii. Repair and when necessary replace woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. *Applies to whole of the whole of the existing building.
 - viii. Prime and (re)paint the aforementioned. *Applies to the whole of the existing building.
 - ix. Rebuild a six-over-six wooden window to match the existing as per light configuration, muntin profile, overall dimensions, and material composition.
 - x. Install new flashing atop parapet wall(s).
 - B. West (a side) Elevation
 - i. See C-1-A for work on the front gallery.
 - ii. Relocate existing electrical/mechanical equipment.
 - iii. Alter fenestration in the upper-story.
 - iv. In the aforementioned location construct a door in the location of the central window and construct new windows to either side.
 - v. The aforementioned door will be glazed and paneled in design with an insulated transom panel and surmounting lintel atop the whole.
 - vi. The aforementioned windows will be wooden six-over-six windows matching the existing in light configuration, muntin profiles, overall dimension, and material composition. The southernmost window will now feature a lintel.

- vii. See C-3-B for the construction of gallery embracing both the existing building and the addition.
- viii. Slightly extend the step of the existing parapet.
- C. East (a side) Elevation
 - i. Repair, scrape, and paint existing windows to match in all respects.
 - ii. Install new flashing atop the parapet wall.
 - iii. Slightly extend the step of the existing parapet.
 - iv. Repair bracketed eaves to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
 - v. See C-1-A for the work to be conducted on the front gallery.
- 2. Demolish a later addition.
- 3. Construct a new addition.
 - A. The addition will be constructed of brick.
 - B. Though two-stories in height, the addition will not rise in height about the apex of the one-and-one-half-story body of the main building. The aforementioned allowed, a setback portion of the addition behind a lower one-story portion of the existing building will rise above (at a pronounced recess) that secondary portion of the building.
 - C. The addition will feature six-over-six aluminum clad wooden windows.
 - D. Lintels will surmount the windows.
 - E. Glazed and paneled wooden doors will be employed.
 - F. A dominant gable roof will surmount the body of the addition.
 - G. A hip roof will surmount a secondary portion of the addition.
 - H. Roofing shingles matching those to employed on the existing portions of the building will be employed.
 - I. Aluminum guttering will be employed.
 - J. West (a side) Elevation
 - i. A three bay wooden gallery with associated two-staged stairs (flight-landing-flight in linear fashion) will extend along the southernmost portion of the existing West Elevation and the majority of the addition.
 - ii. The gallery will feature square section wooden posts at ground level and picketed railing on the upper level.
 - iii. Ground floor posts and intermediate baluster-like pickets on upper level will align.
 - iv. The previously mentioned stairs (both flights and landings) feature railings of a more open design (single bottom rails and two upper rails).
 - v. The addition will negotiate and preserve the appearance of the existing parapet's rear slope.
 - vi. New more discretely placed mechanical/electrical devices will be installed.
 - vii. The ground-floor will be five bays in composition.
 - viii. The aforementioned sequence will be as follows: window-window-door-window-window.
 - ix. The upper-story windows will mirror the rhythm, placement, design, and other aspects.
 - x. A doubled soldier course will demarcate the transition between the ground and upper floors. *Said design feature will extend around the South and East Elevations as well.
 - xi. A parapet wall will terminate the West Elevation

- K. South (rear) Elevation
 - i. The South Elevation will be two part in composition.
 - ii. A taller western portion will be surmounted by the stepped and raked parapet of the fronting the dominant gable roof.
 - iii. The eastern recessed portion will be surmounted by a hipped roof.
 - iv. Blind fenestrated bays will inform both portions of the South Elevation.
 - v. Brick cased bays with recessed fields and surmounting lintels will comprise the aforementioned design.
 - vi. Two equidistantly spaced instances of the aforementioned bays will define the westernmost portion.
 - vii. A single instance of the bay design will inform the recessed eastern portion.
 - L. East (a side) Elevation
 - i. The previously mentioned secondary wing of the addition will advance from the East Elevation.
 - ii. Both the body and advanced wing that inform the East Elevation will feature a single window.
 - M. North Elevation (façade)
 - iii. The addition will be two part on the North Elevation.
 - iv. Located behind an existing single-story addition found to the East of the body of the building there will rise the subject portion of the scope of work.
 - v. Two soldier courses (separated) will be provide a sense of transition between the ground and upper-stories.
 - vi. The upper-story will feature a six-over-six window.
 - vii. Situated to the West of the existing building will rise (at a recess) the will previously mentioned gallery and stair sequence.
4. Conduct additional site repairs and improvements.
- A. Repair, reinstate, and repaint ironwork fencing.
 - B. Install 8' (eight) foot tall interior lot fencing.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the restoration (and in certain cases alteration of existing fabric – namely side fenestration), demolition of a later addition, construction of a new addition, and repair & installation of fencing. A similar version of the application was approved in -. Said approval also included the construction of a larger addition that was two-stories. The application up for review takes the form of a single-story addition that involves less intervention into surviving historic fabric.

With regard to the conservation and restoration of historic fabric, this project will address windows, ironwork, and woodwork. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, an overall policy of repair by patching and consolidation will be employed when and where possible (See B-1.). Repairs and replacements would match as per profile, dimension and material (See B-2.). Replacements would be consistent and reflective of the building (See B 3 & 4.). With regard to the windows in specific, repairs and replacements will match the exiting components (and in one instance whole) as per location, light configuration, detail, and material (See B-5.). In keeping the Design Review Guidelines, repairs to the cast-iron gallery would be conducted so as to recapture their original appearance and treatment (See B-6.). A missing section of railing would be replicated to match the existing sections (which are currently in storage).

When reviewing applications for partial demolition, four principle criteria are taken into account. The aforementioned criteria are as follows: architectural significant of the subject portion of the building; physical condition of the subject portion of the subject portion of the building; impact on the streetscape; and nature of any proposed redevelopment (See B-7.). With regard to architectural significance, the addition proposed for demolition does not represent original fabric. Additionally, it is not the original rear wing (not even appearing on Sanborn Maps from 1955). Said addition is not of the same architectural and material caliber as the main portion of the building. As per condition, the subject area exhibits signs of deferred maintenance, but could be repaired. Interior conditions are worse than the exterior. While visible from the street at an oblique for reason of a side yard, the impact of the demolition on the streetscape would be minimal. The nature of the proposed redevelopment - the construction of a new more historically attuned addition - is discussed in the ensuing paragraph.

As per the proposed addition, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state additions should be compatible with the character of the property neighborhood, and environment (See B-9.). Gabled additions to one-and-one-half-story buildings are common design solution for expansion in Mobile's historic districts. The body of the addition would not visible from the public view as the dominant gable roof portion is lower than the one-and-one-half-story core of the building so preserves the overall character of the site (See B-8.). While a secondary wing would be visible from a head on view, said portion of the addition would be located behind the existing building's lower-height side wing. The aforementioned portion of the addition is setback within the lot as well. Additionally, camelback informed additions and step-ups in heights are allowed in certain situations. The dominant gable roofed body of the addition would be fronted by a wooden gallery on its West Elevation, which is the most visible and prominent frontage. Wooden galleries are traditional design feature occurring across and beyond all of Mobile's historic districts. The gallery would extend most of the addition's West Elevation as well as a portion of the existing West Elevation. Existing fenestration located within the West Elevation's garret would be altered. The size, placement, designs, materials, and detailing of fenestration impacted – a door with flanking windows is compatible to the architectural character of the building (See B 12-13.). The proposed addition is so designed as to read as a later, albeit sensitive, intervention impacting historic fabric. The way which the distinctive terminal parapet walls are engaged and preserved would allow differentiation and compatibility between the old and the new (See B 9 & 12.). Fenestration types (both doors and windows) take queue from those found the body of the building in terms of material, design, detailing, and placement (See B-10.). The handling of the proposed bay sequencing is to be particularly noted in terms of the mirroring of lower and upper-story placements and the retention of solid-to-void sequences via faux windows so as to maintain a traditional appearance on the exterior while responding to existing site conditions and proposed interior layouts (See B-11.).

Fencing will be reinstated and repaired in accord with the Design Review Guidelines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-14), Staff does not believe this application impairs either the architectural or the historical character of the historic district. Staff recommends approval of this application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Stephen Carter was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Carter and asked if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr.

Carter explained that Ms. Largue had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow Board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Carter.

No discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt 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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Holmes moved that, based upon the facts as written by Staff, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the building and the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration: October 19, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-52-CA: 1750 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Pace Burt and Associates
Received: 10/2/2017
Meeting: 10/18/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing (Vacant Lot)
Zoning: R-3
Project: New Construction: Construct four three-story multi-family buildings.

BUILDING HISTORY

This open space comprises the western portion of a former public school property named Old Shell Road School. The easternmost portion is defined by the presence of the former school buildings, locally significant example of Beaux Arts planning with Arts and Crafts articulation.

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 February 17, 2016. On the aforementioned date, the Board approved the removal of later vinyl windows and mothballing measures and the installation of National Parks Service (NPS) authorized extruded aluminum windows. The replacement of historically non-compliant windows with historically informed and authorized windows represented the most visible exterior enhancement of the building’s restoration, phase one of the redevelopment of the site. The construction of multi-family infill constitutes phase two. With the application and plans provided, this proposal calls for the construction of four multi-family buildings in the westernmost portion of the property.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
1. “Maintain alignment of front setbacks.”
 2. “Maintain the rhythm of buildings and side yards.”
 3. “Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
 4. “Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
 5. “Design piers, a foundation, and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
 6. “Size foundations and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings.”
 7. “Use building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.”
 8. “Design building elements on exterior buildings walls to be compatible with those on

nearby historic buildings. These elements often include but are not limited to: balconies, chimneys, and dormers.”

9. “Use exterior building materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.”
10. “Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic windows.”
11. “Use traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.”
12. “Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.”
13. “Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings.”
14. “When using artificial materials, use a blind or shutter unit that has a thickness, weight and design similar to wood.”
15. “Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.”
16. “Design a fence located behind the front plane to not exceed 72” in height. If the subject property is abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property, a fence up to 96” will be considered.”
17. With regard to front walks “visually connect the building(s) to the street.”
18. “Maintain a historic sidewalk.”
19. “Minimize the visual impact of parking.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Construct four new buildings.
 - A. The four buildings will be arranged in an L-shaped composition.
 - B. Two buildings will front Old Shell Road and two buildings will be perpendicular to said local thoroughfare (and parallel with the historic buildings).
 - C. The front placement of the building will negotiate disparate setbacks to either side.
 - D. The four buildings will be rectilinear in composition, albeit with advances and recesses in plan and plane.
 - E. The composition of the buildings will shield a parking court.
 - F. The Old Shell Road fronting buildings will be set back in stepped manner between the buildings to either side.
 - G. The buildings will be three-stories in height.
 - H. The two lower stories will be faced with brick and the third floor will be faced with hardiboard.
 - I. The two lower stories will be at a slight more advance than the upper-story.
 - J. Though the ceiling heights will be 9’, the floors will be spaced at 11’ intervals.
 - K. Hipped roofs will surmount the buildings.
 - L. Nine-over-nine, six light transom, and six-over-six windows will be employed.
 - M. Lintels will surmount said windows.
 - N. Simple fascias and bracketed eaves matching the historic Old Shell Road School Building (reincarnated as Old Shell Road Lofts).
 - O. Facades (cardinals varying with placement)
 - i. The front elevations (either Old Shell Road -S - or Parking Court – W -) will be six part in composition.
 - ii. Cascading hipped roof forms will surmount the whole.
 - iii. The two outmost sections will be as follows:

- a. Single bay galleries inset from the side elevations will front the innermost portions of said bays.
 - b. Railings will enclose said galleries.
 - c. Square section posts with engaged and opposite (as engaged to wall) brackets will define the galleries.
 - d. Nine-over windows and single fenestrated bays to be clarified will open onto the galleries.
- iv. Working inwardly, the second to end bays will feature tripartite groupings of nine-over-nine windows.
 - v. The two innermost bays will be of a staggered asymmetrical combination.
 - a. One side will feature separate nine-over-nine windows above French doors surmounted by multi-light French doors with overhanging bracket gable-fronted overhands.
 - b. A second side will feature vertically paired nine-over-nine windows above single nine-over-nine windows.

P. Side Elevations

- i. The side elevations will be four part in composition.
- ii. The Façade and Rear Elevation oriented galleried outer bays will feature nine-over-nine windows and doors with the features associated with the aforementioned galleries.
- iii. The innermost portions will be of different designs.
- iv. One portion of the two innermost portions will feature a single six-over-six window and paired nine-over-nine windows.
- v. A second section will feature six-light transom-like windows.

Q. Rear Elevations

- i. The Rear Elevations will be five part in composition.
- ii. Working inwardly, the portions will be as follows:
 - a. Hipped roofed galleries of a previously mentioned design with fronting nine-over-nine windows.
 - b. Second to outmost, there will be tripartite groupings of nine-over-nine windows.
 - c. The innermost/center section will feature a pairing of nine-over-nine windows.

2. Conduct site related improvements.

- A. Repair municipal sidewalks.
- B. Install a network of concrete sidewalks fronting buildings and connecting this portion of the Old Shell Lofts complex to the older historic portion.
- C. Brick plazas will be located between the two pairings of buildings.
- D. Install – tall sections of – interior lot fencing along portions of the West (a side), North (rear), and East (a side) lot lines.
- E. Remove and install curbs.
- F. Pave a parking court within the sheltered landscape created by the L-shaped configuration of the four buildings. The paving will be asphalt and the curbing will be concrete.
- G. Create a retention point the northernmost portion of the lot.
- H. Construct a dumpster/sanitary enclosure.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of four multi-family buildings and related site improvements on the western portion of the Old Shell Lofts property. The project represents the second and final phase of the redevelopment of that larger site. Following on the heels of the restoration of the historic school buildings found on the eastern side of the larger property, the scope of work would occupy a vacuous space formerly occupied by portable class rooms, makeshift playgrounds, and ad hoc parking. When reviewing applications for new construction, five principle criteria are taken into account. The aforementioned considerations are as follows: placement & orientation; massing; scale; façade elements; materials.

With regard to placement, two components are taken into account – setback from the street and distance between buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts state that new buildings should be responsive to and maintain alignment of traditional façade lines (See B-1), as well as the rhythm of side & rear setbacks (See B-2.). The property under review, an inner block situation, is situated within one of the obliques informing Old Shell Road. Two of four proposed buildings would front Old Shell Road. In accord with Design Guidelines, the setbacks respond to the historical character of the contributing aspects of the built landscape and layout as conditioned by the streetscape. The buildings would adopt a stepped relation in response to the angle of the street and abutting buildings. As exhibited by the site plans of the properties on the block opposite to the South, there exists historical precedent for such a staggered placement. When traveling West on Old Shell Road the two street-fronting blocks would be parallel to the street and negotiate the setbacks established by the main body of the old school building and the adjacent sidewalk abutting property to the west. The overall placement of the proposed buildings within the block affords compatibility side setbacks as well on account of regularity of with the whole and situation between existing buildings to either side. As to orientation, the design and detailing of the facades, two of which face Old Shell Road, would maintain a strong orientation to that thoroughfare which the compound engages. A front walk and plaza would serve to connect all four buildings to the street. All four buildings would largely shield a rear parking enclosure thereby maintaining dominance of architecture over asphalt which represents one of the quintessential ingredients of larger Midtown. The proposed placement also negotiates the situational relationships of the two main buildings located to either side of it (some buildings on the lot line and other at varying setbacks). The side setbacks are traditional in dimension. The façade engages the street, while the backward placement of parking follows tradition and allows for screening.

The Design Review Guidelines state that massing - the relationship of the parts of the larger whole comprising a given building - for new construction should be in keeping with arrangement and proportion of surrounding historic residences (B-3). Though the compositions of the four buildings are the same, the front and rear elevations vary according to physical experience from the cardinal directions. All four elevations feature advances in recesses in wall plan. By breaking up the composition, a monolithic block feeling is avoided. Moving from plan to elevation, the two lower-stories will be faced with brick, while the upper-story will be faced with hardiboard. This adoption would serve to further break up the proverbial architectural box. Corner galleries would serve the same effect. Galleries, a salient characteristic of Gulf Coast architecture, and overhangs would also compartmentalize and unit the whole. The scale of the porches is responsive to the building and the context (See B-13.). The overhangs are direct responses to the historic building. The massing of the structure, one informed by 9' ceilings augmented by ample expanses of masonry and wood given the floor level, is compatible with the architectural context of the contributing landscape which it is situated amidst buildings possessing ceiling of heights therein (See B-7.) The dominant hipped roof is enlivened by other hipped roofs. The hipped roofs, as with the eaves and overhangs, are drawn from those found on the old school building that anchors the property. The symmetrical roof composition would serve to further anchor the building and respond to the symmetry of the school (See B-15.).

Scale refers to a building's size in relationship to other buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction state that new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings (See B-4.). As mentioned in the preceding paragraph addressing massing, the proposed elevations are compartmentalized in nature so as to avoid an unresponsive block-like feel. On grade foundations have precedent in the area, there are two historic examples (See B 5-6.). One is on the block opposite and a second is one block beyond. While the ceiling heights are nine feet, the space between floors is generous. The on-grade elevation would allow the three-story height to be more responsive to the height of the two-story school building that defines the property. That building features institutionally attuned ceiling heights, so the heights and consequently scale of old and new within the compound would be comparable.

With regard to building components, the Design Review Guidelines call for responsiveness to traditional design traditions. Variety is not ruled out, but compatibility is the goal. The Guidelines go on to state that the architectural vocabulary of the immediate vicinity and surrounding district should form the basis for new construction (See B-8.) Minus the asymmetrical pairing of the two innermost portions of the facades' six bays, overall symmetry of those principle elevations builds upon balanced nature of the old school building. Proposed window constructions, eave treatments, roof forms, and other attributes are drawn from school. As previously mentioned, galleries that enliven every corner of the proposed building speak to the umbrages that inform most residences in the area. The brick wall facings proposed for the two lower-stories hark to the School, while the hardiboard board of the upper-story draws from the bulk of surrounding residential housing stock (See B-9.). Going further into building components, the building employs sash window types (sash) and wall treatment (siding) that inform the immediate and vast majority of the surrounding architectural and historical context (See B-11). Both the proposed window types and their placement exhibit awareness and responsiveness to the larger site and surrounding district (See B 10-11.).

In accord with the Design Guidelines for New Construction, the building materials, while of the present day, blend with those employed in the past and in immediate surroundings (See B 9 & 14.). Hardiboard siding and aluminum clad windows are approved for new construction within Mobile's Historic Districts.

With to site improvements, these interventions take the form of hardscaping, parking, and fencing. The proposed hardscaping takes two forms – sidewalks/walkways/plazas and a parking lot. The grouped category of sidewalks, walkways, and plazas would serve to connect the four blocks amongst themselves, to the remainder of the complex, and to the surrounding landscaping. This interconnectivity is best illustrated by the front walk which directly connects with the streets cape through its very nature and placement (See B-17.). The sidewalks in the right of way would be repaired/reconstructed (See B-18.). Existing trees, which inform the placement of the buildings, would be respected in any hardscaping endeavors. As per the parking lot, that hardscaped area would be situated to the rear of the property and largely obscured by virtue of its placement on the lot and the situation of the proposed buildings impact of vehicular storage is minimized (See B-19.). A six (6) or eight foot tall interior lot privacy fencing set behind the façade lines would serve to further define the parking zone. Intermediate landscaping stations would function in similar and additional fashions.

RECOMMENATIONS/CLARIFICATIONS

1. Indicate the setback from Old Shell Road on the site plan.
2. Note the widths of the curbcut on the site plan.
3. Provide the height and composition of interior lot line fencing.
4. Illustrate the design (dimensions and materials) of the dumpster enclosure on the site plan.
5. Indicate compositions of materials and constructions on the elevation drawings.
6. Change the fenestration on galleries to show what form of access will be employed.
7. Specify the height of the interior lot fencing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based B (1-19), Staff does not believe this application would impair the architectural or the historical character of the property or the surrounding districts. Pending clarifications (1-6), Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Taylor Atchison was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Atchison and asked if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Atchison explained that Ms. Largue had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow Board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Atchison.

Mr. Holmes inquired as to landscaping plans. Mr. Atchison responded that there will be more landscaping other than the trees seen on the site plan to Mr. Holmes. Mr. Holmes stated that the Board would like to see the landscape plans. Mr. Atchison commented that the applicant is currently working through the site plan, and that several revisions had been made to the plans of the multi family units.

Mr. Atchison clarified for Mr. Ruzic that unit #3 rear elevation would face Old Shell Road.

Upon being queried by Mr. Roberts, Mr. Blackwell stated that staff could approve minor changes to ARB approved plans. He further explained the minor changes would appear in the midmonths.

Mr. Atchison inquired as to what was necessary to bring back to the Board. Mr. Allen noted lighting should be included in the site package as well. Mr. Blackwell asked if the Board would be comfortable with staff approving the landscape plans. Mr. Roberts said he would be amenable. Mr. Atchison stated the same light fixture at Old Shell Road Lofts Phase I would be employed in Phase II.

Upon being asked by Mr. Atchison, Mr. Roberts clarified that the ARB reviews everything on the exterior of buildings and landscaping features in historic districts.

After being queried, Mr. Blackwell explained to Mr. Roberts state the Old Shell Lofts Phase I project had landscaping in place allowing for staff approval of minor landscaping.

Mr. Blackwell suggested sending the revised landscaping plans by email for the Board to review. Mr.

Roberts did not prefer to review by email.

Mr. Roberts explained that the Board reviews design, aesthetics, and placement.

Mrs. Echols inquired as to the seven trees called out on the site plan. Mr. Atchison clarified that no trees were being removed.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mrs. Hasser 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 by the Board noting landscape and lighting plan shall be approved later by the Board.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration: October 19, 2018