

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
October 5, 2011 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: David Barr, Kim Harden, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Members Absent: Gertrude Baker, Carlos Gant, Jim Wagoner, and Barja Wilson.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, Keri Coumanis, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Oswalt moved to approve the minutes of the September 21, 2011 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Oswalt moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff as changed to reflect two altered dates. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: David Thomas**
 - a. Property Address: 263 South Cedar Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/14/11
 - c. Project: Make repairs to the roof and the façade's dormer. The work will match the existing.
2. **Applicant: Gregory Ball and Tommie Angel**
 - a. Property Address: 1221 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/13/11
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with shingles matching the existing. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
3. **Applicant: Tony Jones**
 - a. Property Address: 221 South Dearborn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/16/11
 - c. Project: Re-issue of two COA dating from 10/7/11 and 10/21/11. The first COA calls for the construction of a garage and a wall. The second COA calls for the construction of a second story atop an existing porch; Additional work approved also includes the repair and replacement of woodwork to match the existing. Touch up the repaired areas to match the existing color scheme.
4. **Applicant: Harris Oswalt, Jr.**
 - a. Property Address: 1562 Monterey Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/16/11
 - c. Project: Repair and replace woodwork to match the existing. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
5. **Applicant: Michael Walch**
 - a. Property Address: 1213 New Saint Francis Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/16/11
 - c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.
6. **Applicant: Charles McLeod**
 - a. Property Address: 19 Common Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/19/11

- c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted color scheme. The body will be Salisbury green by Benjamin Moore. The trim will be Brilliant White by Sherwin Williams. The shutters will be Dark Spruce. Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing.
7. **Applicant: Ron Kraus**
 - a. Property Address: 59 North Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/19/11
 - c. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain a six foot high interior lot fence extending between the house and the adjoining house to the south.
 8. **Applicant: Paul Howen**
 - a. Property Address: 59 North Reed Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/21/11
 - c. Project: Repaint the house in the existing color scheme.
 9. **Applicant: Tom and Sherie Hewitt**
 - a. Property Address: 170 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/21/11
 - c. Project: Rebuild an existing deck at rear of house.
 10. **Applicant: Bryan Blackwelder**
 - a. Property Address: 101 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/21/11
 - c. Project: Retain an existing front sign which hangs from canopy.
 11. **Applicant: Larry Haddock**
 - a. Property Address: 1410 Brown Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/22/11
 - c. Project: Rework a nonconforming balustrade to match a Mobile Historic Development Commission stock plan (Balustrade #1 but with 1 1/2" balusters).
 12. **Applicant: Gregory Ball**
 - a. Property Address: 1221 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/26/11
 - c. Project: Connect two sections of fencing in the backyard. The connecting section of wooden fencing will match the height and materials of the existing.
 13. **Applicant: Avery Fick**
 - a. Property Address: 1319 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/21/11
 - c. Project: Remove chain link and place six foot dog-eared privacy fence in the location of the former. Some trim painting on house.
 14. **Applicant: Daniel Morris Roofing & Construction Company, Inc.**
 - a. Property Address: 1769 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/23/11
 - c. Project: Reroof using 30 year GAF Timberline roof - Weatherwood. Repair fascia and eave as needed matching the original in profile, dimension and material. Paint the repairs.
 15. **Applicant: Alec Glenn**
 - a. Property Address: 20 South Catherine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/28/11
 - c. Project: Repaint exterior body cream and trim white, porch ceiling sky blue.
 16. **Applicant: John & Cheryl Hall**
 - a. Property Address: 161 Macy Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/27/11
 - c. Project: Paint porch deck and foundation piers black.

17. Applicant: Donald Dreaper

- a. Property Address: 61 South Catherine Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/28/11
- c. Project: Install a wooden storage shed atop an existing concrete slab. The wooden building will be painted to match the main house's color scheme.

18. Applicant: Bert Eichold

- a. Property Address: 165 South Georgia Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 9/28/11
- c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.

19. Applicant: Chris McGough

- a. Property Address: 908 Charleston Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/28/11
- c. Project: Reinstall a railing. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2011-65-CA: 1250 Old Shell Road

- a. Applicant: Jonathan Carrigan for Sam Franks
- b. Project: Fenestration and Fencing - Replace a door. Install fencing.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2011-66-CA: 1113 Palmetto Street

- a. Applicant: Cristina Rodgers
- b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approvals and Repair and Replacement – Retain security bars installed on the front and side elevations fenestration; Retain foundation screening; Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing; Install screening on the rear porch; and Paint the house.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2011-67-CA: 970 Oak Street

- a. Applicant: Bill Partridge for the Gulf Coast Federal Credit Union
- b. Project: Demolition and Redevelopment – Demolish five buildings and landscape the site; Construct a canopy at 1101 Spring Hill Avenue.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Design Review Committee - 1501-1503 Government Street

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-65-CA: 1250 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Jonathan Carrigan for Sam Franks
Received: 9/9/11
Meeting: 10/5/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fenestration and Fencing – Replace a door. Install fencing.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house dates from the 1890s. By combining a traditional center hall plan and an asymmetrical façade, the house is a marriage of a customary planning approach and a then fashionable formal composition.

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 2, 2010. At that time the Board approved the restoration of the façade and the alteration of the side elevation’s fenestration. The new owner/applicant proposes the removal of the original front door and the installation of a front yard fencing enclosure.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building.”
 - 2. “Doors with leaded or art glass may be appropriate when documentation exists for their use, or when they are compatible with the design and style of the structure.”
 - 3. Fencing “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with the relationship to the Historic District.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):
 - 1. Remove the house’s original glazed and paneled front door.
 - 2. Install a paneled wooden door.
 - 3. Enclose the front yard with a 4’ high aluminum fence.
 - a. The fence will be painted black.
 - b. The fence pickets will feature crimped tops.
 - c. The fence will commence at southwest corner of the house and will then extend in a southerly direction along the western lot line. The fence will extend the length of the southern property

- line and wrap around to the eastern lot line. The fence will terminate at the southeast corner of the house.
- d. The enclosure will feature a pedestrian gate of the same design as the fencing. Said gate will be located at the end of the front walk.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the replacement of an original door and the installation of front yard fencing.

This house was rehabilitated by the Restore Mobile, a Mobile Historic Development Commission Revolving Fund. During the course of the exterior restoration, the house's original door including its original locking mechanism was removed, repaired, and reinstalled. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that original doors and openings should be retained. Staff believes the removal of the original front door would impair the architectural integrity of the building and the district.

With regard to the proposed fencing, four foot aluminum fencing is routinely approved by the Board. While the proposed fence's height and location do not impair the architectural or historical integrity of the property or the district, crimped top metal fencing is not approved by the Board.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does believe the removal of the original front door would impair the architectural and historical character of the building and the district. The original door was restored during the recent rehabilitation. Staff does not recommend approval of the removal and replacement of the original door.

Based on previous Board rulings, Staff does not recommend approval of the fencing on account of the crimped tops. Crimped tops are not historically accurate in terms of their manufacture and their appearance. Said treatment is not historically appropriate for Mobile's historic districts. Staff recommends the use of either a true finial or a flat top as alternative finial treatments.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Sam Franks was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. The retention of an unauthorized satellite dish was added to the application.

Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Franks if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Franks addressed the Board. With regard to the satellite dish, Mr. Franks said that he simply wanted television access. When the installer arrived on the property, a discussion ensued as to the location of the satellite dish. Mr. Franks told the Board that the installer told him that the dish could only be installed on the location which it is currently placed. He said that he thought the location unsightly. Mr. Ladd suggested to Mr. Franks that Mr. Blackwell write the satellite company with regard to the relocation of the dish.

Mr. Franks addressed the proposed door. He told the Board that the door is in bad condition, noting in particular the condition of the plates and weather stripping. Mr. Franks said that he went to Lowe's to investigate replacements. He stated that he was directed to a "Mobile Historic Door." Mr. Franks said that he thought that the door would look nice.

Mr. Karwinski told Mr. Franks that a good carpenter could install a threshold and weather stripping for less effort and expense than installing a new door. He said that by taking this approach the original historic door, which is better made than the proposed one, could be retained.

Mr. Franks said that he liked and wanted to use the proposed door.

A discussion of the original and proposed doors ensued.

Mr. Roberts reiterated Mr. Karwinski's recommendation.

Mr. Franks asked for assistance regarding craftsmen. Mr. Blackwell agreed to assist Mr. Franks by providing a list of carpenters.

Mr. Franks brought up the subject of the proposed fence. A discussion of fencing heights, tops, and materials ensued. Mr. Karwinski suggested a 3 ½' high fence. Mr. Blackwell agreed to speak with Mr. Frank's fencing representative regarding the fence tops.

Mr. Ladd asked if any other Board member had any comments to make or questions to ask. No comments were made and no questions were asked.

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

No further discussion ensued from the Board.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that Staff would work with the applicant regarding the relocation of the satellite dish.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Oswalt 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 on for the installation of fencing featuring appropriate tops and the repair of the existing door.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/5/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-66-CA: 1113 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Cristina Rodgers
Received: 9/19/11
Meeting: 10/5/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: After-the-Fact-Approvals and Repair and Replacement – Retain security bars installed on the front and side elevations; Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing; Install screening on the rear porch; and Paint the house.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story residence originally stood in Chickasaw. Built in 1918, the house was moved to the present site in 1929.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on May 7, 2008. At that time the Board approved the construction of a rear addition and an ancillary structure.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Foundation screening should be recessed from the front of the foundation piers. Lattice, if used, should be hung below the skirt board or siding, between the piers and framed with trim. Lattice secured to the face of the building is inappropriate. Solid infill should be recessed and screened.”
 - 2. “Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
 - 3. With regard to porches “materials should blend with the style of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted application):
 - 1. Retain security bars installed on the front and side elevations. Those sections of the security bars that extend above the top rail will be removed. The security bars will be repainted white.
 - 2. Retain the boxed, framed, and suspended foundation skirting.
 - 3. Repair and replace any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile and dimension.
 - 4. Screen the back porch with vinyl screening.

5. Paint the house per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme. The body will be Banana Cream. The trim and decorative features will be White. The porch deck and accent areas will be Hopsack.

Clarifications/Requests

1. How will the screening be secured and/or framed?
2. Provide a sample of the screening.
3. How will the screening be installed or framed?
4. What is the composition of the framing material?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the after-the-fact-approval of security bars, the installation foundations skirting, the repair and replacement of deteriorated woodwork, the screening of the porch, and, the painting of the dwelling.

The security bars were installed without the issuance of either a Certificate of Appropriateness or a building permit. While not specifically addressed in the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the Board generally denies requests for security bars on account of both the effect their installation has on the historic building fabrics and their aesthetic impact on the historic environment.

Foundation skirting was commonly employed on residential buildings that rest atop raised foundation piers. In accord with Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the lattice skirting is boxed, framed, and suspended between the foundation piers. Staff does not believe the foundation screening will impair the house or the surrounding district.

Southern houses of this period and style often featured screened porches. Many rear porches featured metal or lattice screening. Pending provision of a sample of the proposed screening and its manner of installation (how it will be framed and appear), Staff does not believe the screening of the porch will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the house or the surrounding district.

All of the repair and replacement of deteriorated woodwork will match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. The proposed earth-toned color scheme is appropriate to the style and period of the house. Staff does not believe the in kind repairs and subsequent painting will impair the architectural integrity of the house or the surrounding district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval in part and denial in part.

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe the foundation skirting, wood replacement, painting, and screening will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the historic district. Pending clarification of the framing and/or installation of the screening, Staff recommends approval of the aforementioned work.

Based on previous Board rulings, Staff does not recommend approval of the unauthorized security bars. Staff believes the proposed security bars will impair the architectural and the historical character of the building. Staff recommends that the security bars be relocated to the inside of the building.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Cristina Rodgers was present to discuss the application

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd asked Ms. Rodgers if she had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Ms. Rodgers answered no.

Mr. Roberts asked Ms. Rodgers when the security bars were installed. Ms. Rodgers told the Board that the burglar bars had been installed roughly four months earlier in effort to be green and save energy. She elaborated by saying that the security bars made it possible to open the windows without sacrificing security. Ms. Rodgers acknowledged that she should have received approval before installing the units but did not do so.

Mr. Roberts asked for clarification regarding the color scheme. Ms. Rodgers addressed Mr. Roberts query.

Mr. Roberts asked for clarification regarding what work had been done without issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Blackwell explained the scope of work.

Ms. Rodgers and Mr. Blackwell discussed the screening of the rear porch. Ms. Rodgers said that the screening would be traditional metal screening.

Mr. Karwinski said that while he thought the security bars inappropriate for the building, he understood the concern over security. He said that security bars raise several issues, egress in case of fire being among the most important. Mr. Karwinski suggested that security bars be relocated to the interior, painted white, and installed in an operable fashion.

Ms. Rodgers said that while she was amenable to painting the bars, she was not inclined to relocating them. She said that it was her understanding that she was in compliance with ingress and egress requirements.

Mr. Karwinski told Ms. Rodgers that the exterior placement of the security bars was a material impairment.

Ms. Harden, Mr. Karwinski, and Mr. Roberts discussed code requirements.

A discussion of porch screening ensued. Ms. Harden recommended that the screening be recessed behind the porch posts and railings.

Mr. Ladd encouraged Ms. Rodgers to relocate the security bars.

A discussion ensued. Mr. Rodgers asked if funding was available. Mr. Bemis answered no. Citing 251 Roper Street, Ms. Rodgers's asked about other security bars in the area. Mr. Blackwell explained that the bars in question were installed prior to the creation of the Oakleigh Garden District. Mr. Roberts told Ms. Rodgers that many such instances of "grandfathered" or pre-existing security bars can be seen across the historic districts.

The 311 system was discussed.

The responsibilities of living within the historic districts were discussed.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that the security bars would be relocated to the interior and the porch screening would be located behind the porch posts and railings.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/12/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-67-CA: 970 Oak Street and the Oak Street Cul de Sac
Applicant: Bill Partridge for the Gulf Coast Federal Credit Union
Received: 9/13/11
Meeting: 10/5/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: (970 Oak Street) Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Demolition – Demolish five buildings; Construct a canopy at 1101 Spring Hill Avenue.

BUILDING HISTORY

This application involves the proposed demolition of five buildings. According to the 1955 Sanborn Maps, the building currently occupying the lot identified as 970 Oak Street was not present. This metal industrial building dates from 1970s or 1980s. Several buildings under the identification of Oak Street Cul de Sac were included in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. These buildings include a late 19th-Century tenement building and a single story wooden building. In addition to the metal industrial building currently occupying 970 Oak Street and the two buildings located within the property known as the Oak Street Cul de Sac, the parcel includes a two story wooden & brick building and a single story wooden building. These additional buildings are part of a recent re-subdivision combining 970 Oak Street, the Oak Street Cul de Sac, and 1001 Spring Hill Avenue into one parcel. The four older buildings located on this property comprise one of the City's last remaining examples of an unaltered building trades complex dating from the first half of the early 20th-Century.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. These properties have never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. As a result of a recent re-subdivision these two properties will be combined with 1001 Spring Hill Avenue. The redevelopment plan calls for the demolition of five buildings, four of which would now be qualified as contributing structures.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district

unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:

- i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
- ii. Five buildings are proposed for demolition. Of the five buildings, four are of historical significance. The historic buildings are as follows: a two-story wooden tenement building dating from the late nineteenth century (labeled A in the Planning Commission Vicinity Map of Existing Zoning); a single story wooden building (labeled B); a two-story wooden and brick building dating from the late 1920s (labeled C); and a single wooden building dating from the 1920s (labeled D). The fifth building, a non-contributing metal industrial building (labeled E) is situated at 970 Oak Street. Buildings A, B, and possibly part of C located are part of the “Oak Street Cul de Sac.” Buildings A – D constitute one of the City’s few extant early 20th-Century, small scale building trades complexes. Developed from the mid 1920s through the late 1930’s, they represent a crucial link in the historical evolution of Spring Hill Avenue from a residential thoroughfare to a commercial/business corridor. Building A is one of the city’s few remaining intact tenement buildings.
- iii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 1. These five buildings are located in the northernmost section of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. Situated at the eastern terminus of three block long Oak Street, the four historic buildings contribute to the architectural or the historical character of the area. They enhance the physical density and enhance the visual character of the area.
- iv. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 1. Most of the materials are capable of being reproduced. Some are of exceptional quality and construction.
- v. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 1. Mobile possesses few remaining small scale, early 20th-Century building trades complexes. This complex is unique surviving example of that genre. Of particular importance is Building A, one of Mobile’s last remaining late 19th-Century tenements.
- vi. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 1. The applicant proposes leveling the lot, laying sod, and planting trees. See the submitted plan.
- vii. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The applicant purchased the property on May 12, 2011.
- viii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. Not considered.
- ix. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. No. The applicant purchased the property for redevelopment.
- x. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;

1. NA.
- xi. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 1. See submitted materials.
- xii. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and
 1. Application submitted.
- xiii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the Board.
 1. See submitted materials.
 2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

- C. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
1. “Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting.”
 2. Fencing “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fencing usually restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face toward the public view.”

- D. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Demolish five non-contributing buildings.
 2. Level the lot.
 3. Plant grass.
 4. Plant trees.
 5. Install fencing.
 - a. A 6’ high wooden fence will extend along the property’s southern lot line.
 - b. Said fence wrap around to the western lot line.
 - c. The fence will drop down in height to 3’ in height upon reaching the front plane of the house located just west of the property (1001 Oak Street).

Clarifications

1. What fencing plan will be employed, that outlined in the plan or that described in the Staff Report?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of five buildings located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. Two of the buildings have become part of the District as a result of a recent re-subdivision. Demolition requests involve the review of the following concerns: the architectural and/ or historical significance of the buildings; the physical condition of the buildings; the effect the demolition or demolitions will have on the surrounding district; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

With regard to the architectural and historical significance of the buildings, four of the buildings comprise one of the City’s few remaining small scale, early 20th-Century building trades complexes, including a plumber’s shop and tenement structure. Staff believes this complex evolved during the 1920s and 1930s.

While 970 Oak Street (metal warehouse) is listed as non-contributing, the four other buildings would now be listed as contributing structures on account of architectural attributes and historical representation. Building A is of particular note. As one of the last extant late 19th-Century tenement buildings, this building features notable interior and exterior treatments. Though this building is not depicted in its current location in the 1904 and 1922 Sanborn Maps, the materials, construction, and detailing indicate an earlier construction date. Similarly, the 1878 City of Mobile atlas indicates there were structures in its vicinity; therefore, it is highly probable that the building was moved from a nearby site.

Buildings B and D utilize salvaged architectural components on additions to the original structures, such as fine doors, that actually predate the buildings. Building C exhibits an interesting mixture of high style decorative elements, such as an elaborate door overhang, and mass produced finishes, in this case asbestos siding. This also uses a very unusual brick in the first floor walls. Building E, the large 1970s metal industrial building, possesses neither architectural nor historical significance.

Though in deteriorated states, the buildings are capable of being restored and adaptively reused.

These five buildings are located within the northernmost portion of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. Oak Street is a small three block street featuring a mixture of contributing residential buildings and non-contributing infill. In addition to being a rare remnant of an early, small scale, mixed-use complex with both a building trades shop and a two-story tenement, the four unit complex contributes to the built density of the streetscape and the historic district's periphery. All too often buildings along the edges of historic districts fall subject to decay and demolition. The further erosion of Old Dauphin, particularly in the vicinity of Spring Hill Avenue would be detrimental to the district as well as the streetscape.

If granted demolition approval, the applicant would level the lot, plant grass, and install trees. The resulting void at eastern terminus of Oak Street would result in the further erosion of area's built and historical landscapes.

As a result of the recent re-subdivision, 1001 Spring Hill Avenue is now part of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The late 20th -Century commercial building located on the site recently underwent an exterior renovation. A proposed canopy would extend from the eastern portion of the remodeled building. The material facing of the canopy's posts and the proposed roofing treatment of the canopy would match that of the body of the building. Staff does not believe the addition of the canopy would impair the building district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval in part and denial in part.

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes the demolition of the four older buildings will impair the architectural and the historical character of the historic district. Staff does not recommend approval of that portion of the application.

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe the demolition of the later metal industrial building located at 970 Oak Street will impair the architectural or the historical character of the historic district. Staff recommends approval of that portion of the application. . Staff also recommends approval of the proposed canopy. Staff does not believe the canopy will impair the architectural or the historical character of the historic district.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

William Partridge and Joe Connick were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Partridge and Mr. Connick if they had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Partridge answered yes. He told the Board that while he recognized that the four older buildings possessed historical and/or architectural merits, the buildings in particular the tenement were beyond renovation. He stated that for reasons of fire safety, rezoning requirements, and neighborhood conditions; the buildings should be approved for demolition. Mr. Partridge said that the buildings constitute a liability for the owners and a threat to the neighborhood. He raised the subject of a reduced number of demolitions and explained the history of the application.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask Mr. Partridge.

Mr. Karwinski said that he thought the buildings were slum-like in appearance. That said he stated that Oak Street should remain residential in character and zoning. He spoke of the streetscape. Mr. Karwinski concurred with Mr. Partridge as to the retention of some buildings. He said the rear portion of the re-subdivided property could be sold off and re-zoned residential.

Mr. Roberts asked if a parking lot was to be installed. Ms. Harden answered no.

Mr. Roberts suggested to the applicants that the buildings be moved to another location.

Mr. Ladd brought up the subject of the street scene and street life. That said, he urged the protection of the tenement structure.

Mr. Roberts asked for clarification as to how and when the various buildings entered the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.

Ms. Harden stated that the buildings were not impeding any development. She suggested another re-subdivision.

A discussion of the individual buildings ensued.

Ms. Harden reminded her fellow Board members that history (architectural and otherwise) is not always attractive. She said that she understood the problems, but despite the location, condition, and requirements, the buildings still constituted a remarkable historical ensemble.

Mr. Ladd reiterated the significance of the tenement. He noted that the continued deterioration of the buildings did raise concerns for the surrounding district.

Mr. Roberts stated that the demolitions should seriously be considered as they jeopardize the Board's mission.

Mr. Connick addressed the Board. He stated that buildings had asbestos and gas problems. Mr. Connick told the Board that \$750,000 had been invested in the renovations to the Spring Hill Avenue property.

Mr. Karwinski recommended selective demolition as a means to retain the historic character of the streetscape.

A second discussion of the individual buildings ensued.

Ms. Harden and Mr. Bemis reminded the Board of the significance of the larger building ensemble.

Ms. Harden asked Mr. Partridge if research had been done regarding the restoration, re-subdivision, and alternative reuse of the rear portion of the property. Mr. Partridge answered that none had been done at this time.

Mr. Karwinski redirected the Board's attention to the proposed canopy. He said that he did not believe the proposed new construction impaired the surrounding district.

Mr. Ladd recommended to Mr. Partridge and Mr. Connick that the application be withdrawn. In doing so they would reexamination their options and approaches.

Mr. Partridge and Mr. Connick conversed with the Credit Union's board.

Mr. Partridge told the Board that the Gulf Coast Federal Credit Union wanted to proceed with the application as proposed.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second. Ms. Harden, Mr. Karwinski, and Mr. Oswalt voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/12/11

Design Review Committee for 1501-1503 Government Street

Mr. Ladd acknowledged unrelated professional involvement with the applicant's representatives. He absented himself from the meeting.

Mr. Bemis addressed the Board, the applicant's representatives, and the audience. He told those assembled that the purpose of a Design Review Committee was to provide direction and not to render a decision.

Mr. Roberts told the applicant's representatives that they should know that according to a local news station, the project would entail the demolition of two houses.

Melissa M. Thomas from the audience asked the purpose of a Design Review Committee.

Mr. Bemis replied saying that a Design Review Committee is intended to provide direction.

Douglas Anderson said that the applicants had recently engaged his services. He stated that he and the applicants' representatives wanted to be clear as to what the Board, neighborhood, and Staff expected of any proposed redevelopment.

Mr. Karwinski pointed out that three architects were present. They could advise the applicants, but much guidance had already been given at the last meeting. He asked if plans reflecting the discussion of the September 9, 2011 had been developed.

Mr. Conlon from the audience raised concerns.

Mr. Oswalt asked for clarification of the application's status.

Mr. Bemis answered that the application had been withdrawn for the convention of a Design Review Committee.

Mr. Cronin provided the Board with site plans showing the building in different location.

Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Cronin if the building's scale and footprint could be changed. He stated that the square footage was one matter, but massing was another. The proposal called for a block-like building. He suggested that the massing be broken down and moved west into the lot.

Mr. Karwinski said the building should be made narrower in width and project further into the lot.

Mr. Roberts suggested the use of more fenestration. He acknowledged that the building required display space, but to improve the design, the windows could be located at the same height or higher than the faux windows. He stated that the windows should feature clear glass instead of spandrel. Building fenestration and shape should be addressed. Mr. Roberts recommended giving the building greater dimensionality and fenestration.

Mr. Anderson asked about site coverage and square footage.

Mr. Roberts said site coverage and square footage were important. He told the applicant's representatives that the layout needed to be changed.

Ms. Harden pointed out that moving the building ten feet further into the lot would be an improvement in some respects, but fenestration would continue to be a problem on account of display practices.

Mr. Roberts reiterated that the way the building was positioned on the lot was important.

Mr. Karwinski asked for revised drawings.

Mr. Conlon addressed the Board primarily concerning site issues such as parking, curbcuts, traffic flow and setback.

Ms. Ralph from the audience suggested that building be oriented to face Government Street. She stated that as proposed, the building faces west therefore positioning the rear elevation to Dexter Avenue.

In summation, the main points of concern as pertinent to the design were outlined as follows:

- Orientation
- Scale
- Shape of the building
- Windows
- Government Street façade
- Parking
- Traffic Flow
- Setback
- Curbcuts
- Buffer