

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

October 19, 2016 – 3:00 P.M.

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

### A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The chair, Harris Oswalt, I, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:  
**Members Present:** Robert Allen, Nicholas Holmes III, Kim Harden, Craig Roberts, Harris Oswalt, Catarina Echols, and Steve Stone  
**Members Absent:** Carolyn Hasser, Jim Wagoner, and Robert Brown.  
**Staff Members Present:** Cart Blackwell and Paige Largue
2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes from the Spetember 21, 2016 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.
3. Mr. Oswalt asked for clarification of Midmonth as per application number. Mr. Blackwell explained this application had been previously approved by the ARB, and since the new materials were on a different plane it was in keeping with the guidelines. Mr. Allen asked for further clarification. Mr. Blackwell noted the new materials would not be piecemealed with historic materials on the same plane. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the midmonths COA's as granted by staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

### B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant:** Jake and Jennifer Roberds
  - A. Property Address: 60 North Reed Street
  - B. Date of Approval: 9/13/2016
  - C. Project: Renewal of a CoA dating from 21 May 2015 - Construct a deck and ancillary building per submitted plans. The work will not visible from the public. The deck will feature a simple picketed railing. The ancillary building will be detailed to match the house.
2. **Applicant:** Johnna Rogers
  - A. Property Address: 204 Roper Street
  - B. Date of Approval: 9/13/2016
  - C. Project: Gently powerwash exterior, repaint as needed, and replace wood components such as siding to match in dimension, size and material.
3. **Applicant:** Donald Manning
  - A. Property Address: 909 Government Street
  - B. Date of Approval: 9/14/2016
  - C. Project: Temporary display of sandwich board. Installation of wooden directional parking sign.
4. **Applicant:** Chris Rainosek
  - A. Property Address: 201B Dauphin Street
  - B. Date of Approval: 9/15/2016
  - C. Project: Apply two vinyl decals 42"W x 20" H to inside windows.
5. **Applicant:** SBA Communications Corporation
  - A. Property Address: 660 Springhill Avenue

- B. Date of Approval: 9/15/2016
  - C. Project: Place a small cell on roof of building close to stage temporarily from 9/22/16 to 10/6/16. Cell will be composed of single antenna mounted on tripod pole situated on sled mount.
- 6. Applicant:** Jim Walker
- A. Property Address: 602 Church Street
  - B. Date of Approval: 9/16/2016
  - C. Project: Repair an existing rear deck.
- 7. Applicant:** Leigh Hill
- A. Property Address: 63 LeMoyne Place
  - B. Date of Approval: 9/20/2016
  - C. Project: Remove burglar bars, remove storm door, replace wood as necessary to match in dimension, profile, and material. Repaint trim in a neutral scheme.
- 8. Applicant:** Identity Signs on behalf of Lee Pierce
- A. Property Address: 72 S. Royal Street
  - B. Date of Approval: 9/20/2016
  - C. Project: Replace a sign to match the existing - black ½” cut aluminum lettering and logo at 36” high and 121” wide saying “Royal Scam”.
- 9. Applicant:** Patricia Woolf
- A. Property Address: 1115 Church Street
  - B. Date of Approval: 9/21/2016
  - C. Project: Repaint to match existing. Install wooden arbor over to connect with picket fence.
- 10. Applicant:** Phoenix Restoration Services on behalf of William Tidwell
- A. Property Address: 169 S. Georgia Avenue
  - B. Date of Approval: 9/22/2016
  - C. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in charcoal; and replace rotten boards as necessary to match existing.
- 11. Applicant:** Cedric Brooks and Nadine Andrews
- A. Property Address: 552 Eslava Street
  - B. Date of Approval: 9/22/2016
  - C. Project: Replace and repair wood as necessary including fascia, soffit, lap siding and foundation boards to match existing in dimension, profile and material. Repair existing columns. Repair or replace (1) column on westernmost portion of porch to match existing. Repaint to match existing color scheme.
- 12. Applicant:** Karen Smith
- A. Property Address: 33 S. Lafayette Street
  - B. Date of Approval: 9/22/2016
  - C. Project: Install metal handrail located at southernmost side of porch steps per approved design.
- 13. Applicant:** E. Bradford & Francie Ladd
- A. Property Address: 2301 DeLeon Avenue
  - B. Date of Approval: 9/22/2016
  - C. Project: Switch the location of a door and a window on a previously approved addition (approved on 17 June 2015 and renewed on 28 June 2016).

- 14. Applicant:** Patricia Pettway  
A. Property Address: 714 Monroe Street  
B. Date of Approval: 9/26/2016  
C. Project: Install canvas awning over side rear porch. Replace rotten siding to match in dimension, profile and material. Repaint house in existing color scheme.
- 15. Applicant:** Moffatt and Nichol  
A. Property Address: 5 Dauphin Suite 100  
B. Date of Approval: 9/26/2016  
C. Project: Install 4'0" x 1'6" single face wall mount metal sign with adhesive 6'8" above ground level.
- 16. Applicant:** Camilo Contracting  
A. Property Address: 1101 A and B Government Street  
B. Date of Approval: 9/27/2016  
C. Project: Replace roof with architectural shingles in weatherwood. Replace fascia and eaves to match existing in dimension, profile, and material as needed and repaint to match. Replace gutters as needed.
- 17. Applicant:** Stacy Meeks  
A. Property Address: 262 S. Monterey Street  
B. Date of Approval: 9/27/2016  
C. Project: Infill a small section of porch (retaining piers) per submitted plans. The work is not visible from the public view.
- 18. Applicant:** Restore Mobile  
A. Property Address: 1008 Texas Street  
B. Date of Approval: 10/4/2016  
C. Project: Renewal of previously issued Certificate from May 2015. Said CoA calls for the restoration and refitting of relocated dwelling.
- 19. Applicant:** Jeanette Shaw  
A. Property Address: 456 Charles Street  
B. Date of Approval: 9/29/2016  
C. Project: Repaint in existing color scheme.
- 20. Applicant:** Conde Charlotte Museum  
A. Property Address: 104 Theatre Street  
B. Date of Approval: 9/29/2016  
C. Project: Install double face yard sign. Sign is to be painted metal face no more than 5 square feet.
- 21. Applicant:** Ashley Griffin  
A. Property Address: 164 Houston Street  
B. Date of Approval: 9/29/2016  
C. Project: Repaint house, body light gray, others existing.
- 22. Applicant:** Wendell Quimby  
A. Property Address: 7 N Cedar Street  
B. Date of Approval: 9/30/2016  
C. Project: Replace 6 x6 support beams around support of structure and ½" x 6" lap siding, and 1" x 4" tongue and groove wood on porch to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Repaint to match existing color scheme.

- 23. Applicant:** John & Joy Klotz  
A. Property Address: 350 Dauphin Street  
B. Date of Approval: 10/3/2016  
C. Project: Repaint the building per the submitted color scheme.
- 24. Applicant:** Terry and Courtney Stanfield  
A. Property Address: 256 Stocking Street  
B. Date of Approval: 10/3/2016  
C. Project: Install balustrade on balcony matching submitted plans. Reconstruct front porch steps using formed concrete with brick veneered CMU block parapet wall flanking steps. Remove existing front porch columns and install round fiberglass columns.
- 25. Applicant:** Preston and Virginia Reeder  
A. Property Address: 1005 Augusta Street  
B. Date of Approval: 10/3/2016  
C. Project: Repaint door to match shutters.
- 26. Applicant:** Allan & Christy Gustin  
A. Property Address: 354 South Broad Street  
B. Date of Approval: 10/3/2016  
C. Project: Repoint foundation piers using the appropriate type mortar. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork as per profile, dimension, & material. Reconstruct original railings as per surviving fragments, ghost marks, etc... Repair and when necessary replace planks constructing columnar piers. Repair and reinstate wooden tongue-and-groove porch decking. Repair and when necessary replace (at least one sash) wooden windows to match the existing as per construction, light configuration, and muntin profile. Reroof the house with either a standing seam metal roof, 5-V Crimp metal roof, or asphalt shingles. Remove later infill from a porch. Reinstall columnar piers. Expose original doors and windows on said re-exposed porch.
- 27. Applicant:** Sydney Betbeze representing Restore Mobile  
A. Property Address: 1008 Texas Street  
B. Date of Approval: 10/4/2016  
C. Project: Install hardiboard siding on a relocated building's side and rear elevations. Install wooden siding on the façade.
- 28. Applicant:** Laura B. Ratledge  
A. Property Address: 316 N. Conception Street  
B. Date of Approval: 10/4/2016  
C. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repair deteriorated windows as per construction, light configuration, and muntin profile.
- 29. Applicant:** Mary Beth Harris  
A. Property Address: 31 McPhillips Avenue  
B. Date of Approval: 10/4/2016  
C. Project: Construct 12 by 12 foot deck with 24 by 36 lattice fence.

**30. Applicant:** Sign Pro on behalf of China House Restaurant, Long Ngyen

- A. Property Address: 966 Government Street
- B. Date of Approval: 10/4/2016
- C. Project: Install wall mounted painted metal 4' x 16' sign on mansard roof.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2016-22-CA: 1006 ½ Caroline Avenue**

- A. Applicant: Ms. Debbie Coleman of Sun Plans Inc. on behalf of Ms. Laura Zacher
- B. Project: Side Addition - Construct a side Addition onto a shotgun dwelling according to one of two sets of submitted designs. The first option features a shed roof addition. The second option features a gabled roof.

**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**2. 2016-23-CA: 516-522 Dauphin Street**

- A. Applicant: Mr. Trey Langus on behalf of BJE Properties
- B. Project: Preservation Intervention responsive to continued Structural Assessment of a Structurally Impaired Contributing Building - The rehabilitation effort will be informed by EITHER 1.) the continued implementation of structural stabilization efforts (pending results a second structural analysis) & restoration of the building per said report OR 2.) the reconstruction of the building (using salvaged materials) as based on site conditions and measured drawings so as to achieve exacting replication of profiles, dimensions, planes, and other design considerations.

**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

- 1. Discussion.
- 2. The Board recognized the service of long time chair E. Bradford Ladd, II.

3.

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

**2016-22-CA: 1006 ½ Caroline Avenue**

**Applicant:** Ms. Debbie Coleman of Sun Plans Inc. on behalf of Ms. Laura Zacher

**Received:** 9/17/2016

**Meeting:** 10/19/2016

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: B-2

Project: Side Addition - Construct a side Addition onto a shotgun dwelling according to one of two sets of submitted designs. The first option features a shed roof addition. The second option features a gabled roof.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

1006 ½ Caroline Avenue dates from circa 1900. The shotgun dwelling type, which features, single room width and multiple room depth with doors arranged in fill, represents a vernacular form common throughout the Southeast. Shotguns were typically constructed in urban areas for rental or speculative purposes. They often occur in rows. Many were constructed as part of the mill or manufacturing housing developments.

**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. According to the MHDC vertical files, this property has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review calls for the construction of an addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Design an addition to be compatible with the color and character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.”
  - 2. “Design the building components (roof, foundation, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
  - 3. “Maintain the relationship of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building.”

4. "Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color and /or wall plan and be subordinately scaled."
5. "Alternative materials such as cement fiberboard, are allowed when the addition is properly differentiated from the original structure."
6. With regard to door and window materials, "aluminum clad" is listed as acceptable material selection.
7. "Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building."
8. "Design a roof shape, pitch, material, and level of complexity to be similar to the existing historic building."

**C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):**

1. Construct a side addition. Both options of the application include the following:
  - A. The addition will measure approximately 30' in depth and 12' in width.
  - B. A 5' x 16' deck will be situated of the West side of the addition.
  - C. The addition will rest atop brick-faced foundation piers that will match those supporting the body of the house.
  - D. Boxed, framed, and recessed lattice skirting panels will extend between the brick-faced foundation piers.
  - E. The aforementioned roofing treatment will also employed over the body of the house.
  - F. 6" wooden drop lap siding (Haridboard) will clad the walls as it does the body of the house.
  - G. 4" corner boards will be employed. Said corner boards will match those found on the body of the house.
  - H. Six-over-six aluminum clad wooden windows will be employed so to match the window type (sash) and light configuration (6/6) those found on the body of the house.
  - I. The windows will be cased to match the treatment found on the body of the house
  - J. The Wood fascia board shall be 2.5" inches so to match that found on the body of the house.
  - K. Rafter tails matching those found on the body of the house will extend around the addition.
  - L. 5V Crimp Galvalume (traditional metal color) roofing panels will surmount the addition so as to match the roofing treatment found on the body of the house.
  - M. South Elevation (street-oriented)
    1. The South Elevation will feature two six-over-six windows.
    2. The South Elevation will feature the end bay of a side deck at its western termination.
    3. A flight of wooden steps will access the deck.
    4. Picketed wooden railings will be employed on the aforementioned steps.
  - N. West Elevation
    1. The West elevation will feature a double French door, a six-over-six window matching the dimensions of those found on the body of the house and elsewhere on the addition, and a smaller kitchen height six-over-six window.

2. The wooden deck mentioned in C-1-K (2-4) will extend along the portion of the West Elevation situated beneath the aforementioned fenestrated units. The deck expanse will measure
  3. The deck will be supported by wooden piers which will be interspersed with boxed and recessed lattice foundation skirting.
- O. North (rear) Elevation
1. The North Elevation will feature a single six-over-six window.
  2. The North Elevation will feature the end bay of a side deck at its western termination.
  3. A flight of wooden steps will access the deck.
  4. Picketed wooden railings will be employed on the aforementioned steps.
2. Construct the addition employing a shed roof.
  3. Construct the addition employing a gable set perpendicular to the gable surmounting the body of the house. The West Elevation of the gable will feature a louvered vent.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a side addition off a side of a shotgun dwelling. The dwelling is located in the rear of a deep lot and behind another dwelling so is minimally visible from the public view. As initially presented, the application called for a shed roof to surmount the addition. On the encouragement of MHDC staff, the applicant revised the roof structure in an additional submittal so as to feature a gable roof structure. The application up for review presents both applications for the Board's consideration:

- A.) Addition to the side of a shotgun dwelling utilizing a Shed Roof
- B.) Addition to the side of a shotgun dwelling utilizing a Gable Roof

In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, both of the schemes for the proposed addition (the same below roof level) have been designed so as to be differentiated in plan and elevation from the body of the main dwelling (See B-3.). In being setback or recessed in placement from the front plan of the body of the house, the addition would "read" as distinct, albeit complementary, to a larger whole. Compatibility is assured by building elements and solid to solid to void relationships, most notably observed on the side and rear elevations (See B-2.). The light configuration of windows, profiles of sidings, material of roof roofing, and articulation of details will match the existing. Hardiboard siding and aluminum clad windows are alternative approaches which are allowed for additions (See B 4-5.). The design is positioned and proportioned in manner which that is compatible with the property, neighborhood, and environment (See B-1.).

With regard to roof structures, the Design Review Guidelines state that the roof of an addition should be compatible with the existing historic building with regard to shape, pitch, material, and level of complexity of the existing historic building (See B 7-8.). Many shotguns feature shed roofs on rear additions, but rarely on side elevations. A nearby example was approved prior to the Architectural Review Board being active in the subject area. While the shed roof option for side addition is sensitive in nature to materials and elements to the main body of the dwelling,



the large size of the shed roof (See B 1-2, 4, & 7-8) is not compatible with historic form of the main structure.

The second option, one featuring a gable roof surmounting the addition, is compatible with the massing and proportions of the shotgun structure in terms of shape, pitch, material, and level of complexity to be similar to the existing historic building.”

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

### **Option I – Shed Roof**

Based on B (7-8), Staff believes this scheme would impair the architectural and historical character of the building or the district. Staff does not recommend approval this alternative on account of the roof design.

### **Option II – Gable Roof**

Based on B (1-2, 4, & 7-8), Staff believes this scheme would not impair the architectural and historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval this proposal.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Ms. Debbie Coleman was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant’s representative and asked if she had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address. Ms. Coleman responded no.

Mr. Roberts asked the Ms. Coleman if she wanted to add shutters to the house, specifically the South elevation windows. Ms. Coleman responded there was not enough space. Mr. Roberts asked if the applicant would consider narrowing the windows to allow for shutters. Ms. Coleman stated narrowing the windows or placing one large window would not allow enough light into the space.

Mr. Roberts then noted the French door on the West elevation of the house was not historically responsive to a shotgun style dwelling and needs an overhang to protect from the elements. Ms. Coleman responded she needed to be watchful of setback requirements, and therefore did not cover the side deck. Mr. Roberts noted a canvas awning would be an appropriate alternative to cover the door.

Mr. Holmes inquired on how the deck was possible to be built so close to the lot line. Mr. Blackwell explained that if there is historic precedent for a setback then that is allowed to be used as a guide in a historic district. Mr. Blackwell also clarified that an awning can be approved administratively at staff level.

Mr. Oswalt turned the discussion to the audience. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

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

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

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

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

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/19/2017**

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

**2016--CA:** 522 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Mr. Trey Langus on behalf of BJE Properties  
**Received:** 10/5/2016  
**Meeting:** 10/19/2016

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: T5.1  
Project: Preservation Intervention responsive to continued Structural Assessment of a Structurally Impaired Contributing Building - The rehabilitation effort will be informed by EITHER 1.) the **continued implementation of structural stabilization efforts** (pending results a second structural analysis) & restoration of the building per said report **OR 2.) the reconstruction of the building** (using salvaged materials) as based on site conditions and measured drawings so as to achieve exacting replication of profiles, dimensions, planes, and other design considerations.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This Antebellum building dates circa 1853. While the overall two-and-one-half-story form that defines 522 Dauphin Street remains intact, the building, as with so many downtown edifices, has evolved over the course of its existence. The exposed brick walls were faced with stucco circa 1900. The ground floor storefront has been altered on multiple occasions. Dormers and galleries were added in 1992. The former existed at an earlier date.

**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. According to materials in this property’s MHDC vertical file, 522 Dauphin last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on August 17, 1992. At that time, the Board approved the reconstruction of dormers, installation of six-over-six windows, construction of a cast iron balcony, and painting of the exterior.

- B. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
1. Accepted interventions for historic buildings include "preservation, restoration, rehabilitation, and reconstruction."
  2. Preservation is defined as "the act of process of applying measures to sustain the existing form, integrity, and material of a building. Some work focuses on keeping a property in good working condition by repairing features as soon as deterioration becomes apparent, using procedures that retain the original character and finish of the features."
  3. Restoration is defined as "the act or process of accurately depicting in the form, features, and character of a property as I appeared in a particular time or period. It may require the removal of features from outside the period(s)."
  4. Rehabilitation is defined as "the process of returning a property to a state that makes a contemporary use possible while still preserving those portions or features of the property which are significant to its historical, architectural, or cultural values. This term is the broadest of the appropriate treatments and is often used in the standards with the understanding that it may also involve other appropriate treatments."
  5. Reconstruction is defined as "the act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features, and detailing of a site, landscape, building, structure, or object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific time and in its historic location."
  6. "Reconstruction will be used to depict vanished or non-surviving portions of a property when documentary and physical evidence is available to permit accurate reconstruction with minimal conjecture, and such reconstruction is essential to the public understanding of the property."
  7. "Reconstruction will include measures to preserve any remaining historic materials, features, and spatial relationships."
  8. "Reconstruction will be based on the accurate duplication of historic features and elements substantiated by documentary or physical evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different features from other historic properties."
  9. "A reconstructed property will re-create the appearance of the non-surviving (or extremely deteriorated) historic property in materials, design, color, and texture."

- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans, reports, etc...):
1. Continue the implementation of structural stabilization efforts pending results a second structural analysis and Proceed to Preservation and Restoration of the building per said report. While the report has not been delivered it would entail:
    - a. Remove cement-based stucco
    - b. Stabilize masonry from without and within.
    - c. Deconstruction of walls.
    - d. Reconstruction of walls using appropriate mortar composition.
    - e. Application of new stucco.
    - f. Construction of substantial interior supports (vertical and horizontal).
  - OR
  2. Reconstruct the building using salvaged materials, based on site conditions, and measured drawings so as to achieve exacting replication of profiles, dimensions, planes, and other design considerations.
    - a. Remove cement-based stucco.
    - b. Carefully remove, pallet, and store brick.
    - c. Stabilize the foundations/underpinnings of the site.
    - d. Reconstruct the building to match the existing.
    - e. The masonry sequence from the outside in will be as follows: true stucco, salvaged bricks (at least one course), and concrete block.
    - f. Use of appropriate mortar composition.
    - g. Reinstate the cast iron gallery, windows, etc...

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This property has been the subject of thoughtful attention by the current owners, the City of Mobile, and independent stakeholder groups, most notably the Downtown Mobile Alliance. The ensuing narrative provides a chronological timeline of meetings, processes, and engagement efforts concerning the property:

Following the recent purchase of the building (within the calendar year), Historic Development staff met with applicant's representative upon the conscientious introduction by a staff member of the Downtown Mobile Alliance. That first city visit occurred in early June of 2016. The owner's representative, contractor, and engineers were present. Structural concerns on the building's western wall (Cedar Street side) were observed and discussed. A tour of the interior followed. The applicant's representative showed Historic Development staff interior conditions related to and independent of the problems related to the exterior condition. MHDC staff familiarized the applicant's representative with the two part design review process for properties located within the Henry Aaron Loop's three historic districts - appearance before the Downtown Development District's (DDD) Certified Review Committee (CRC) and the City of Mobile's Architectural Review Board (ARB). So to better inform members of the CRC, a site visit was arranged in advance of that body's standing Thursday meeting. Said site visit occurred on June 20, 2016. The exterior and interior structure was scrutinized. The property appeared before the CRC on June 23, 2016. A structural report commissioned

by the owner was provided. The application up for called for the demolition of the building. No plans were provided, but reconstruction was mentioned from the onset. The CRC requested more information as to extent of the deterioration. The CRC convened a second site visit. Several structural engineers and a City inspector were in attendance. The building was not deemed a life-safety concern at that time. The Downtown Mobile Alliance and the developer entered into exchanges regarding the securing of reports for the building. A stabilization plan was provided. In the intervening time period, the building's condition worsened. MHDC staff was notified and examined worsening conditions. Senior City staff was alerted. Investigations took place. Emergency stabilization efforts were put in place on October 3, 2016.

The **application up for review** constitutes a preservation approach that is a multipronged in nature and two part in consideration. The application calls for **either the continued implementation of structural stabilization efforts** (pending results a second structural analysis) **& restoration of the building** per said report **or the reconstruction of the building** (using salvaged materials) as based on site conditions and measured drawings so as to achieve exacting replication of profiles, dimensions, planes, and other design considerations.

For purposes of awareness, it should be noted that National Parks Service outlines for four principle preservation strategies. Those interventions are as follows:

**Preservation** - the act or process of applying measures to sustain the existing form, integrity, and material of a building. Some work focuses on keeping a property in good working condition by repairing features as soon as deterioration becomes apparent, using procedures that retain the original character and finish of the features.

**Restoration** - the act or process of accurately depicting in the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared in a particular time or period. It may require the removal of features from outside the period(s).”

**Rehabilitation** - the process of returning a property to a state that makes a contemporary use possible while still preserving those portions or features of the property which are significant to its historical, architectural, or cultural values. This term is the broadest of the appropriate treatments and is often used in the standards with the understanding that it may also involve other appropriate treatments.

**Reconstruction** - the act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features, and detailing of a site, landscape, building, structure, or object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific time and in its historic location

See B 1-5.

Review of the aforementioned preservation approaches reveals the nuanced and interrelatedness of all those approved preservation strategies. Any given project might entail multiple forms of intervention. Take for instance that both of the proposed approaches up for review embrace rehabilitation. The first proposal represents a combination of preservation and restoration

interventions, while the second approach includes preservation and restoration in the form of reconstruction.

The first option meets the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts in full. The actions informing this approach would be informed by the structural analysis. The National Parks Service's Historic Preservation Brief addressing Historic Masonry (No. 2 of 48) identifies many of the reasons that cause masonry issues, as well as ways which to mitigate them. The building's masonry failures are not only merely cosmetic, but structural in nature. Examination of exterior and interior structural concerns caused the property to be deemed a life-safety concern by the City. The sidewalk has since been blockaded and temporary stabilization measures have been put in place. The most apparent and pronounced structural maladies impact the building's western wall. The structural and cosmetic problems result from numerous factors. The causes include, but are not limited to the composition of the 1900 stucco which prevents the bricks from breathing, removal of interior supports during 20<sup>th</sup> Century renovations, possible water penetration at an earlier date, etc.... The first option would inevitably entail substantial reconstruction on account of structural issues impacting the building.

Reconstruction, again the act or process of recreating the form, features, and detailing of a site, landscape, building, structure, or object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location of building, is a logical and secure course of action for ensuring the preservation of the of the architectural and experiential character of the building.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that reconstruction will be used in situations when documentary and physical evidence is available to permit accurate reconstruction with minimal conjecture (See B-6.). The three exposed elevations of this corner lot building (Dauphin Street façade, Cedar Street side, and rear/back lot), while endangered at multiple locations, exist and have been measured so to ensure exacting replication. Additionally, historic and later elements that contribute to the streetscape would be preserved in an effort to retain material spatial relationships that define the building and the streetscape (See B-7.). Bay sequences of windows & doors, location & treatment of the galleries, and other elements that comprise the overall design would be recreated. As testified by the drawings and regardless of the two approaches, either partial or complete reconstruction will be based on the a duplication of historic features and elements substantiated by both documentary and physical conditions rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different features from other historic properties (See B-8.). The reconstructed property will re-create the appearance of the non-surviving historic property in materials, design, color, and texture (See B-9.).

Both preservation strategies involve assessment and salvage of historic fabric as a preemptive against structural collapse. The belated engagement with and ultimate loss of the Masonic Building (formerly – Saint Joseph Street) serves an example and a reminder of the time sensitive nature of addressing major structural decay. Mobile has lost significant portions of its 19<sup>th</sup> century building stock, most notably in its downtown and waterfront areas. Reconstruction has saved numerous Mobile landmarks of the same period and construction method. The following examples can be cited:

Trinity Episcopal Church (1900 Dauphin Street)

Phoenix Fire Station/House (203 South Claiborne Street)  
Marx House, Seaman's House (University of South Alabama)  
Telegraph Building (303 South Conception Street)  
Durand Houses (205 Saint Emanuel Street)  
Riley House (315 Chatham Street)

Those aforementioned instances of buildings saved by reconstruction involved relocation to alternative sites. Instances of reconstruction onsite include the following:

Rear Wing of the Spear-Barter House (163 Saint Emanuel Street)  
6 North Jackson Street (NOJA – substantial deconstruction of the first floor and the reconstruction of the lost second floor and garret).

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-9), Staff recommends approval of both forms of historic intervention. If a second structural report now pending completion allows for the piecemeal preservation, Staff encourages that approach. If complete reconstruction should be employed said approved rehabilitative intervention would save the building and preserve the streetscape. Staff does not believe this application would impair either the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Luke Peavy, Mr. Trey Langus, and Ms. Cristin Faircloth were present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant and his representatives, and asked if they had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address. Mr. Peavy, Mr. Langus, and Ms. Faircloth provided a background of the rationale behind the purchase of the property and its intended usages. Mr. Langus explained this project initiated one and a half years ago when Dauphin Street Sound, a recording studio, was opened at 651 Dauphin Street. Instead of housing artists at hotels, the owners would rather the artists to experience a more local, comfortable atmosphere. In 522 Dauphin Street, the second and third stories thereof, would be occupied for boarding; the first floor would be tentatively be leased commercially. The warehouse in the rear of the property would be used as a soundstage for artists to continue work when not in the studio located at 651 Dauphin Street. Mr. Peavy described the location as being not only a “destination” for artists for experiencing Mobile, but ultimately and also artists relocating to Mobile. Mr. Langus expressed that long the rest of the block utilized as multi-use commercial and residential spaces.

Mr. Allen asked if the application was for the authorization of the reconstruction of the West wall or the reconstruction of the West, South, and partial North wall. Mr. Blackwell explained since the release of revised structural reports, staff recommends the partial reconstruction of the West wall and portions of the South wall.

Ms. Harden asked Mr. Blackwell if the Board was allowed to amend the facts to reflect the revised staff recommendation. Mr. Blackwell responded that would be amendable.



Mr. Stone questioned if the would require any elevation that that was demolished would be re-erected as is currently. Mr. Blackwell responded yes.

Per Mr. Roberts request, Mr. Blackwell clarified “reconstruction” in terms of the approved practices and definitions used by the National Park Service to describe the scope of work in this application.

Mr. Harden spoke of the exciting nature of the project. She also mentioned the City of Mobile’s involvement with the property, particularly her division of Architecture. Ms. Harden spoke of the deterioration of the West wall which resulted in the commission of a structural analysis and shoring report completed by Mark Barter.

Mr. Langus further explained the number of people engaged in the stabilization of the structure. This included Ms. Faircloth, structural engineer, and Mr. Anthony Miller, master plasterer. Mr. Faircloth was engaged to assist in expediting the permitting process. It was noted that she had been engaged to commence stabilization efforts. Mr. Harden concurred that moving forward to stabilize the building would be the appropriate path.

Mr. Holmes expressed his concern the West wall would still have more selective demolition than what was drawn in Mr. Barter’s initial plan as provided in the packets, particularly its lack of taking into the conditions impacting the South Wall. He also stated that the shoring plan in Mr. Barter’s stabilization plan, if executed, should be helpful if extended. Mr. Holmes stated before work can begin stabilization needs to occur so to allow for enough selective demolition to discover issues which would inform the extent of stabilization, restoration, and reconstruction.

Mr. Blackwell noted the applicant’s good intentions remained high throughout the project. He also stated that in the event the whole walls need to be reconstructed, detail drawings would come before the Board.

Mr. Oswalt turned the discussion to the audience. Mr. Stephen McNair of McNair Preservation spoke in regards to the National Park Service Historic Tax Credit program. He reiterated that reconstruction is an preservation approach and that the National Park Services would want to see every detail of reconstruction plans.

Mr. Steve Stone asked if the damage on the West wall was caused by interior demolition. Mr. Langus replied that it was demolition executed prior to current ownership, among other determinants. Mr. Harden confirmed that prior interior demolition contributed to the current exterior damage.

Mr. Holmes suggested that in future the applicant might consider a more historically accurate storefront. This could be achieved by placing a door to the upper floors on the Eastern wall.

After asking the applicant, audience, and Board if they had was any more questions, comments, or concerns, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Holmes moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board amends the facts in the Staff report, to allow the applicant to proceed with the stabilization of the building and selective demolition as necessary on the West wall and portions South wall, and if it reaches beyond said scope so as to call for the reconstruction of whole walls for applicant to return to the Board.

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: 10/19/2017**