

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

September 16, 2015 – 3:00 P.M.

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Bob Allen, David Barr, Robert Brown, Kim Harden, Nick Holmes, Bradford Ladd, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, and Jim Wagoner.
Members Absent: Carolyn Hasser and Harris Oswalt.
Staff Members Present: Cartledge W. Blackwell and Melissa Mutert.
2. Mr. Stone moved to approve the minutes for the September 2, 2015 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. Mr. Wagoner moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: Edward Inge with Phenix Restoration Services**
 - a. Property Address: 1554 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/26/15
 - c. Project: Make repairs to a dwelling damaged by the fall of a tree. Repair roofing, eaves, siding, etc... to match the existing as per profile, design, and composition. Touch up the paint on impacted locations.
2. **Applicant: Sondra Dempsey**
 - a. Property Address: 261 North Jackson Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/26/15
 - c. Project: Install a four foot iron fence across front of property and down north side matching height of neighboring wall. Said fence will end just past the front corner of house.
3. **Applicant: Ricky & Sharon Dixon**
 - a. Property Address: 1327 Spring Hill Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/1/15
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork, siding, and detailing to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Reroof the house with asphalt shingles. Repaint the dwelling. Remove a collapsed section of infill occupying the southwest corner of the house (rear elevation). Re-expose and when necessary replace sidings. Install two period appropriate doors (one on the West and second on the South – Rear – Elevation). Repair windows and when necessary replace components or units to match with regard to light pattern and construction.
4. **Applicant: Sharon Laird**
 - a. Property Address: 55 Bradford Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/1/15
 - c. Project: Install wooden interior lot fencing.
5. **Applicant: Macio Simao**
 - a. Property Address: 352 South Broad Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/3/15

c. Project: Repair foundations, sills, joists, sub floor, and piers to match the existing. Repair wall, framing, roof, rafters, joists, decking, and faming. Repair and when necessary replace siding to match the existing. Reroof the house with Architectural shingles. Reframe the front door to match the existing. Replace windows to match the existing as per light configuration, construction, and material.

6. Applicant: Samuel Brooks

- a. Property Address: 17 South Pine Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/15/15
- c. Project: Reroof with 30 year architectural shingle, weather wood color.

7. Applicant: Ryan Fendt for ANR Hospitality

- a. Property Address: 255 Church Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/9/15
- c. Project: Reroof and repaint the building to match the existing.

8. Applicant: Jacqueline L. Brown

- a. Property Address: 117 Garnett Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 9/9/15
- c. Project: .Reroof the building employing asphalt shingles.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2015-33-CA: 360 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Phillip Owen with Coastal Architects
- b. Project: Fenestration and Railings – Install windows & doors in the fenestrated bays of a former shell of a building and replace railings.

HELDOVER (NO REPRESENTATIVE PRESENT). CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2015-34-CA: 403 Conti Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley of Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Pelican Coast Conservancy
- b. Project: Construct a gallery, alter an entrance, alter a window, box eaves, and construct new enclosures.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2015-35-CA: 104 Theatre Street

- a. Applicant: Mrs. Schley Rutherford on behalf of the Alabama Chapter of the National Society of the Colonial Dames
- b. Project: New Construction – Construct an interpretive center.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2015-36-CA: 255 Church Street

- a. Applicant: Ryan Fendt on behalf of ANR Hospitality Management
- b. Project: Fenestration – Remove and replace the building's main entrance.

DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

5. 2015-37-CA: 10 South Ann Street

- a. Applicant: Sandra Whistler on behalf of Caldwell C. Whistler and Jane. L. Whistler
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a single-family residence located within a larger family complex.

HELDOVER CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

6. 2012-31-CA: 911 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: K.I.M. Kearley on behalf of the Restoration Society
- b. Project: Property Revitalization and Redevelopment – Construct additions to a contributing building, construct a new building on the expanded property, and instigate site improvements.

CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-33-CA: 360 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Phillip Owen with Coastal Architects
Received: 8/24/15
Meeting: 9/16/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5-1
Project: Fenestration and Railings – Install windows & doors in fenestrated bays of a former shell of a building and replace railings.

BUILDING HISTORY

360 Dauphin Street dates from 1919. This three-story brick building was one of the first buildings constructed on Dauphin Street after World War I. The structure took the place of two 19th-Century brick buildings. The facade bears a strong resemblance with regard to material and articulation to 457 Dauphin Street and 259 St. Francis Street, both designs of Mobile architect C.L. Hutchisson, Sr.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on September 4, 2013. At that time, the Board approved new construction off the rear elevation of the long burned out building’s shell. The interior volume of the upper-stories is nearing the final stages of being reclaimed for residential use. The application up for review calls for the installation windows & doors within the façade’s fenestrated bays and the installation of new balcony railings.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.”
 - 2. “The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of a building.”
 - 3. With regard to galleries, “particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, etc...”

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

1. Remove replacement door and window units from a former burned out shell of a building.
2. Install new door and window units.
 - a. The door bays will be tripartite in construction and appearance.
 - b. Double French doors with flanking sidelights will constitute the configuration.
 - c. Said doors will and sidelights will be constructed of and framed in wood.
 - d. The window bays will receive pairs of one-over-one windows. Said windows will be aluminum clad wood in construction.
3. Remove existing railings.
4. Install new railings.
 - a. The new railings will be of the same design as the earlier railings.
 - b. Said new railings will be taller so to meet code related requirements.
5. Install gooseneck lamps.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the removal of later fenestration, the installation new fenestration, and other alterations to the façade of a commercial building. The building burned in the 1980s. While the ground floor and basement were rehabilitated, the two upper stories were not recreated. Over the past year, the interior volume of those upper stories has been reclaimed. The project has reached a point where street-facing fenestration needs to be addressed (rear elevation already reviewed, approved, permitted, and constructed).

When the building burned, the fenestration was lost. Non-operable framed and dressed installations were constructed within the openings. The Design Review Guidelines state that the size and placement of new windows and doors for alterations should be compatible with the general character of a building (See B-2.). All of the units are sized to fit the reveals. The proposed windows are not only responsive to the character of the building, but also take inspiration from the original fenestration.

In accord with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, the new windows are informed by physical, pictorial, and documentary evidence (See B-1.). As evidenced by photographs located within the property’s MHDC vertical file, the types and configurations of both fenestrations are observed.

With regard to the railings, the Design Review Guidelines state that particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, etc. (See B-3.). The railings are not original to the building, as is evidenced by older photographs. The proposed railings would match the existing in design, but would taller so to meet code-related height requirements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

As no one was present to represent the application and address questions concerning the project, the Board moved to holdover the application.

HELDOVER.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-34-CA: 403 Conti Street
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley of Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Pelican Conservancy
Received: 8/02/15
Meeting: 9/16/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5-1
Project: Construct a gallery, alter an entrance, alter fenestration, box eaves, and construct a new enclosure.

BUILDING HISTORY

Dating from 1882, this two-story brick residence is representative of scores of lost side hall residences that once lined inner arteries of Mobile’s historic core.

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 6, 1991. At that time, the Board denied request to an install a metal awning. With this application, the new owner proposes the construction of a cast iron gallery, the alteration of a door, the alteration of a fenestrated bay, the boxing of eaves, and the construction of a walled enclosure.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, Lower Dauphin Commercial District Guidelines and Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.”
 - 2. “Should documentation exist that a balcony or gallery was originally part of a building façade, the appropriate type of balcony may be added.”
 - 3. “Often one of the most important features of a building, doorways reflect the age and period of a building. Original doors should be retained along with any moldings, transoms, or sidelights. Replacements should reflect the age and style of the structure.”
 - 4. 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 is usually restricted to six feet...”
 - 5. “The size and placement of windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”

6. “Blinds and shutters were integral functional parts of historic buildings. Blinds and shutters shall be sized to fit the reveal of the opening precisely.”
7. “Operable shutters, hung with the correct hinges, are encouraged.”

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

1. Construct a gallery.
 - a. The gallery will extend the length of the North Elevation.
 - b. The gallery will measure 23’ in length and 6’ in depth.
 - c. Four circular section posts will support the gallery.
 - d. The posts will feature decorative molded bases and capital-like terminations.
 - e. Said posts will be spaced at equidistant intervals.
 - f. The gallery will be enclosed by picketed cast iron railing featuring a boxed skirt band and a scrolling volute shaped upper band.
2. Convert a window into jib door/window.
 - a. The jib opening will feature a lower paneled casement and upper sash.
 - b. The construction and framing will be wooden.
3. Install operable wooden louvered shutters.
4. Remove an existing door and surrounds from the facade.
5. Install a new door and architrave on the façade.
 - a. The wooden single door will feature both solid and glazed panels – six glazed lights will surmount two panels.
 - b. Paneled and glazed sidelights will flank the door.
 - c. A four light transom will surmount the door.
 - d. An eared or raked (pedimented) architrave (surround) featuring battered or sloped sides will encase the opening.
 - e. Said architrave (like all the components of the entrance) will be constructed of wood.
6. Box the exposed eaves.
7. Remove existing fencing and gates.
8. Construct a new walled enclosure and gates.
 - a. The brick wall will extend an existing brick wall that already defines the West lot line.
 - b. The wall will extend along the South or Rear Lot and East Line.
 - c. Install two iron (inward opening) gates that will access the street.
 - i. Both gates will feature chevron or diamond lower sections, picketed intermediate zones, and finale-capped cresting.
 - ii. The gate to the East of the building will be double in form/operation.
 - iii. The gate to the West of the building will be single in form/operation.
 - d. Install a wooden gate with the lot behind, but at a distance from the double gate.
 - e. Said wooden gate will be based on the existing wooden gate opening onto the street.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a cast iron gallery, the alteration of a door, the alteration of a fenestrated bay, the boxing of eaves, and the construction of a walled enclosure.

With regard to the construction of the proposed gallery, this property originally featured a balcony. The project is in accord with the Secretary of the Interior Standards in that documentary and physical should evidence exist as evidence for the recreation for such a feature (See B-1.). The Lower Dauphin Commercial District Guidelines allow for (and the Board has approved) the construction of galleries or where balconies once existed should documentation exist that a balcony or gallery was originally part of a building façade (See B-2.). 60 South Conception Street is a notable example. As with the aforementioned

gallery, the proposed gallery is tailored to the site for its dimensions negotiate the depth of the sidewalk and its treatment respects the formal characteristics of the building. The railing design is one that observed on two nearby historic examples (Elkus House at 50 South Franklin Street and the Chighizola House at 6 South Franklin Street).

The second-story's center window is proposed for conversion into a jib window/door. The Design Review Guidelines state that the size and placement for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building (See B-5.). Fenestrated bays of a jib variety regularly occurred within the middle of a three bay composition. Said location has been observed in the proposal up for review. The lower portions of three upper-story wall expanses bear evidence or changes, as is evidenced by the brick and mortar (physical evidence).

The façade's windows would be flanked by shutters. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, the proposed operable shutters would be sized to fit the reveal of the opening precisely (See B 6-7.).

The existing door is not original to the building. The Design Review Guidelines state that doorways reflect the age and period of a building. Original doors should be retained along with any moldings, transoms, or sidelights. Replacements should reflect the age and style of the structure (See B-4.). Both the door-sidelight-transom configuration and the surrounding architrave selected constitute almost continual design features which animated Mobile's architectural vocabulary from the 1830s into the 1930s. The single glazed and paneled door with flanking sidelights and surmounting transom informs most of Mobile's 19th Century brick detached and attached row houses. Eared architraves informed the doors and windows of Mobile's first and second "Golden Ages" (1830s and 1850s respectively).

The exposed rafter treatment of the eaves is not in keeping with either the period or style of the building. The proposed boxing of the eaves with a fascia board would recapture historic integrity.

The Design Review Guidelines state that 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 (See B-4). The existing wooden fence, while perfectly acceptable, is not an original design component. Brick fences such as that proposed for extension informed the appearance and experience of a significant portion of Mobile's 19th-Century residential compounds located within the downtown core. Such enclosures and their "iron lace" gates are not only documented in numerous historical surveys and artistic renderings, but also surviving examples. Among the extant examples the following examples can be cited: Bush House at 254 St. Anthony Street (rear lot wall); Hallett House at 503 Government Street; and the Cluis-Rubira House at 156 Saint Anthony Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-7), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked if had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or clarifications to address. Mr. Kearley answered no stating that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Wagoner complimented the design. He then queried Mr. Kearley as to the height of the wall to be extended around the complex. Mr. Kearley replied that said wall measures eight feet in height.

Mr. Stone noted that the umbrages Mr. Blackwell presented in the PowerPoint were balconies not galleries. Mr. Blackwell explained that the examples provided were intended to illustrate the historical precedent for the railing type. He cited to examples of recently approved gallery replacements for lost balconies. Said approvals were for 60 South Conception Street and 222 Dauphin Street.

No further Board discussion ensued.

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

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

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 unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/16/16

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-35-CA: 104 Theatre Street
Applicant: Mrs. Schley Rutherford on behalf of the Alabama Chapter of the National Society of Colonial Dames
Received: 8/31/15
Meeting: 9/16/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing & Non-Contributing
Zoning: Open
Project: New Construction – Construct an interpretive center

BUILDING HISTORY

Evocatively captured in etchings by Mobile artist Marian Acker Macpherson and rendered by numerous other Mobile artists, the Conde-Charlotte House Museum is one of Mobile’s most iconic landmarks. Constructed atop the vestiges of a Spanish era building, the core of the edifice was first built as a jail. The building was enlarged and embellished in 1845 under the ownership of the Kirkbride family. The super-imposed Greek Revival portico with its expertly carved Corinthian capitals dates from that building campaign. The house remained in the possession of Kirkbride descendants well into the 20th Century. It later served as a boarding house. During World War II, the house and its outbuildings serve patriotic purposes. Following the War, the compound became the headquarters of the Historic Mobile Preservation Society. The House was bought, restored, and remains expertly maintained by the Alabama Chapter of the National Society of the Colonial Dames. House and ancillary buildings function as a house museum celebrating Mobile’s multi-cultural past.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board in some years. The Alabama Chapter of the National Society of Colonial Dames proposes the construction of a new interpretive center. Constructed in honor of the memory and contributions of the late Nell Schley Rutherford, the building is intended to function as visual and function complement to the main house and institutional mission. The interior volumes would house educative and administrative functions, while the exterior is articulated to allude to an ancillary building.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the New Construction Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic material that characterizes a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old

- and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
2. “The appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design. Parking areas should also be screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences, or landscaping.”
 3. “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples. The choice of materials and ornamentation for new construction is a good way for a new building to exert its own identity. By using historic examples as a point of departure, it is possible for new construction to use new materials and ornamentation and still fit into the historic district.”
 4. “Historic buildings feature the use of a variety of materials for roofs, foundations, wall cladding and architectural details. In new buildings, exterior materials – both traditional and modern - should closely resemble surrounding historic examples. Buildings in Mobile’s historic districts vary in age and architectural styles, dictating the materials to be used for new construction. Traditional building materials which are not present on nearby historic buildings or buildings in the area that contains only Victorian-era frame houses, a brick ranch-style house would be conspicuous and disrupt the area’s visual continuity. Modern materials which have the same textural qualities and character as materials of nearby historic buildings may be acceptable.”
 5. “PLACEMENT: Placement has two components: setback, the distance between the street and a building; and spacing, the distance between its property lines and adjacent structures. New construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings. New buildings should not be placed too far forward or behind the traditional “facade line”, a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the facade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape. Current setback requirements of the City of Mobile Zoning Ordinance may not allow the building to be placed as close to the street as the majority of existing buildings. If the traditional facade line or “average” setback is considerably less than allowed under the Zoning Ordinance, the Review Boards will support an application for a Variance from the Board of Adjustment to allow for new construction closer to the street and more in character with the surrounding historic buildings.”
 6. “MASS: Building mass is established by the arrangement and proportion of its basic geometric components - the main building, wings and porches, the roof and the foundation. Similarity of massing helps create a rhythm along a street, which is one of the appealing aspects of historic districts. Therefore, new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.”
 7. “FOUNDATIONS: The foundation, the platform upon which a building rests, is a massing component of a building. Since diminished foundation proportions have a negative effect on massing and visual character, new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings. In most historic residential areas, buildings are usually elevated above a crawl space on a pier foundation. Pier foundations are encouraged for new residential construction. When raised slab foundations are constructed, it is important that the height of the foundation relate to that of nearby historic buildings. For this reason, slab-on-grade foundations are not allowed for single family residences. For multi-family, where slab-on-grade is most practical, other design elements such as water tables and exaggerated bases can be effective in creating the visual appearance of a raised foundation.”
 8. “MAIN BODY AND WINGS: Although roofs and foundations reinforce massing, the main body and wings are the most significant components. A building’s form or

shape can be simple (a box) or complex (a combination of many boxes or projections and indentations). The main body of a building may be one or two stories. Secondary elements, usually porches or wings extend from the main building. These elements create the massing of a building. Interior floor and ceiling heights are reflected on the exterior of a building and should be compatible with nearby historic buildings.”

9. “ROOFS: A building’s roof contributes significantly to its massing and to the character of the surrounding area. New construction may consider, where appropriate, roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings. Additionally roof designs of new residential buildings may incorporate eave overhang and trim details such as exposed rafters, soffits, cornice, fascia, frieze board, molding, etc. as those of nearby buildings.”
10. “SCALE: The size of a building is determined by its dimensions - height, width, and depth - which also dictate the building’s square footage. SCALE refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings - large, medium, and small. Buildings which are similar in massing may be very different in scale. To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.”
11. “FAÇADE ELEMENTS: Facade elements such as porches, entrances, and windows make up the “face” or facade of a building. New construction should reflect the use of facade elements of nearby historic buildings.”
12. “Some architectural styles, such as those dating from the Victorian period, featured decorative elements in gables like barge boards and louvered vents. Later styles such as bungalows used decorative cornice brackets or show rafters as design elements. Depending on the character and style of new construction and its relation to surrounding historic structures, similar gable elements should be used.”
13. “The number and proportion of openings - windows and entrances - within the facade of a building creates a solid-to-void ratio (wall-to-opening). New buildings should use windows and entrances that approximate the placement and solid-to-void ratio of nearby historic buildings. In addition, designs for new construction should incorporate the traditional use of window casements and door surrounds. Where a side elevation is clearly visible from the street, proportion and placement of their elements will have an impact upon the visual character of the neighborhood and must be addressed in the design.”
14. “The degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings. Although new buildings should use decorative trim, window casings, and other building materials similar to nearby historic buildings, the degree of ornamentation should not exceed that characteristic of the area. Profile and dimensions of new material should be consistent with examples in the district.”
15. “Materials and ornamentation are important characteristics of a building. A range of decorative motifs can be seen in the historic districts. Both materials and ornamentation are important in creating continuity within the districts. New construction should take these elements into consideration”
16. 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 is usually restricted to six feet...”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plans, floor plans, and elevations):

1. Remove and reinstate portions of a berm occupying the northern portions of the site.
2. Remove portions of a later stuccoed-faced brick wall located to the west of the Conde-Charlotte House Museum.
3. Construct an interpretive center.

- a. The building will be located on a site to the southwest of the Conde-Charlotte House Museum.
- b. The building will be situated on the site so to address the angle of Theatre Street and the inner lot lines of an urban renewal impacted lot.
- c. The building's irregularly-shaped rectangular form (a consequence of the lot) will be set back 5' from the property line.
- d. The building's plan will be informed by the following dimensions: 40' (approximately) for the South Elevation; 50' 1 5/8" for the East Elevation; 40' 8" for the North Elevation; and 38' 1 1/2" for the West Elevation.
- e. The building will feature stuccoed walls.
- f. The stucco treatment will match that employed on the Conde-Charlotte House Museum, the structure which the proposed building is intended to support and complement.
- g. A continuous water table articulated by a fillet-like molding will extend around the building.
- h. The building will feature aluminum clad wooden windows.
- i. The wooden windows will be sash in construction and four-over-six in configuration.
- j. Louvered wooden shutters will flank the building's windows.
- k. The building's North-South oriented gabled roof will be sheathed with Architectural shingles.
- l. South Elevation (Theatre Street facing and oriented)
 - i. The South Elevation will be defined by a raked and stepped parapet wall that is informed by the parapet wall distinguishing the side elevations of the Conde-Charlotte House Museum.
 - ii. Three faux openings emulating carriage door openings will comprise the South Elevation's fenestration.
 - iii. The arched bays will feature fixed wooden doors with iron hinges.
 - iv. The open and terminal bays of shed roofed porches fronting the East and the West Elevations will extend from the body of the South Elevation.
 - v. The roof ends of both porches will be faced with wooden siding.
 - vi. The South-facing bay of the aforementioned West Elevation porch will feature concrete steps with decorative iron railings.
- m. East Elevation
 - i. A full-length gallery will extend the length (though slightly setback to the South) of the East Elevation.
 - ii. The gallery will feature a two part entablature.
 - iii. The seven bay gallery will be supported by eight chamfered porch posts.
 - iv. The aforementioned posts will feature both bases and capital/necking moldings.
 - v. Articulated foundation piers will be centered upon each porch post.
 - vi. The porch will be paved in concrete.
 - vii. A dogleg-shaped handicap access ramp will occupy the porch's three northernmost bays.
 - viii. A simple iron railing will be installed about the railing handicap access ramp.
 - ix. The porch will front a five bay sequence of fenestration.
 - x. A flight of concrete steps surmounted and flanked by simple iron railings will afford entry to and exit from the porch's centermost bay.

- xi. A four-paneled wooden door with flanking paneled & glazed sidelights and surmounting glazed transom will comprise the centermost fenestrated bay.
- xii. Two floor length four-over-six aluminum clad wooden sash windows with flanking wooden louvered shutters will be located to either side of the aforementioned door.
- n. North Elevation
 - i. The North Elevation will be defined by a raked and stepped parapet wall that is informed by the parapet wall distinguished the side elevations of the Conde-Charlotte House Museum.
 - ii. The North Elevation, one engaging a berm and facing a service alley not visible from the public view, will not feature fenestration.
- o. West Elevation
 - i. The West Elevation will feature four fenestrated bays.
 - ii. The Northern and central portions of the West Elevation will feature three four-over-six aluminum clad wooden sash windows with flanking wooden louvered shutters.
 - iii. The southernmost portion of the West Elevation will feature a four paneled door.
 - iv. A single bay porch surmounted by a shed roof will front the aforementioned doorway.
 - v. Articulated piers on foundation level will be located beneath the porch's two chamfered porch posts. Said porch posts will match those employed on the East Elevation's gallery.
- 4. Install fencing.
 - a. The wooden picket fence fronting the Conde-Charlotte House will extend in front of and beyond the courtyard created by the construction of the interpretive center.
 - b. Said South lot line fence will halt just short of the southwest corner of the interpretive center.
- 5. Install hardscaping around the interpretive center.
 - a. Brick or concrete walkways will be laid in front of the building and within the courtyard created between the building and Conde-Charlotte House Museum.
 - b. The walkway fronting the building will provide access to the West Elevation's porch and extend into the courtyard.
 - c. The courtyard paving access the East Elevation's porch and be located on axis with existing paving.
- 6. Sod will be planted to the east and west of the building (See the Site Plan).
- 7. Construct a parking lot.
 - a. A seven space parking lot will be located to the southwest of the building.
 - b. The parking lot will be accessed by two curbs.
 - c. The parking surfaces and curbs will be paved with brick or concrete.
 - d. The parking lot will be curbed in concrete.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of an interpretive center. The building is designed and conceived to respond to the institutional needs of a patriotic organization and respect the historic context of one Mobile's most notable architectural landmarks. In addition to being informed by both institutional and historical contexts, the proposed building responds to the conditions of irregularly-shaped site that was adversely impacted by Urban Renewal. Conceived as a literal and figural dependency to the historic building, the building draws upon design features of traditional ancillary, residential, and warehouse

construction. The New Construction Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that the goal for new construction should be to blend into the historic district without creating a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples (See B-3.). Successful new construction or infill redevelopment should take into account placement, mass, scale, material, and historical context. The proposed building's design takes into account the layered contexts informing successful urban infill of the historical attuned variety.

The New Construction Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback – the distance between a building and the street – and spacing – the distance between buildings – should approximate that of nearby historic structures (See B-5.). The **placement** of the interpretative center responds to both historical context of the property and the surrounding district. Predating the platting of Mobile's street grid, the Conde-Charlotte House rests askew to the street. The other historic buildings that occupied the block prior to the construction of the Wallace Tunnel and the alteration of street grid possessed a setback comparable to the proposed front setback of the building. Said front setback is informed by the berm located to the east of the property's main building. The building would be located to one side (East) of an extended courtyard and would serve as anchor to the western portion of street. It would in effect frame the building, functioning as bookend to the berm. The side setbacks allow for access to a service alley from the west and highlight of the Conde-Charlotte House to the east.

In addition to placement, **Mass** - the arrangement and proportion of a building's parts – and **Scale** – a building's relationship to other nearby historic buildings - constitute factors informing successful infill construction. The New Construction Guidelines state that infill should reference the massing of forms exhibited by nearby historic buildings (See B-6.). New Construction Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that infill should be in scale with nearby historic buildings so to preserve continuity (See B-10.). Massing is informed by foundations, walls, porches, and roofs. Foundations, the platform upon which a building rests, should have heights similar to those on nearby historic buildings (See B-7.). The proposed building would be constructed atop a raised foundation. Recognizing the on grade nature of nearby historic commercial construction, the foundation of the Conde-Charlotte House, and the situation of old carriage houses, the building's South (street-facing elevation) possesses an on grade effect on account of the faux fenestration. A continuous water table, South Elevation porch, and East Elevation gallery break down the (mural) massing, while simultaneously reflecting traditional residential construction. The full-length gallery to the East is oriented to the house. Full-length galleries were common features of principle dwellings and kitchen houses. The stoop-like porch to West anchors the other side of the Theatre Street Elevation. The parapet wall fronting Theatre Street operates in a similar fashion similar to the galleries in that it respects multiple historical realities: the stepped and raked gable of the main building; the parapet walls of historic and nearby commercial buildings; and roof structures of traditional carriage houses. The simple configuration is responsive to nearby historic massings (See B-8.). The ceiling heights work with open and enclosed spaces to create a massing that is in keeping the main building and the scale of surrounding historic buildings.

New construction should reflect the use of **façade elements** of nearby historic buildings (See B-11.). Facades elements, such as bay windows, doors, and other elements, make up the "face" or façade of a building. This building has two principle elevations. The South or Theatre Street Elevation employs the three arcuated openings that hark to carriage doors. The vehicular doors of nearby contributing commercial buildings represent a second design source for said openings. The street-facing (South) elevation provides a presence for and prelude to the East Elevation, the building front which allows access into the building and engages the property's principle buildings. The East Elevation features a traditional gallery and symmetrical fenestration. The solid-to-void relationship established by the fenestration is respectful of traditional patterns (of appearance and use) and situational realities. While the North Elevation, a building face that is not visible from the public view, does not feature fenestration it has a presence on account of its overall massing. The West Elevation .The West Elevation's porch and

fenestrated bays takes into account proportional and component factors in a manner similar to the South and East Elevations (See B-13.).

The New Construction Guidelines state that **material and ornamentation** are important characteristics of a building. A range of decorative motifs can be seen in the historic districts. Both materials and ornamentation are important in creating continuity within the districts. New construction should take these elements into consideration (See B-15.). The proposed interpretive center's wall surfaces will be treated in the same manner as those of the historic Conde-Charlotte House. The traditional materials and articulations of the fenestrated bays are responses to the contexts of both the property and the surrounding district. Porch posts and detailing are reflective piazza patterns in terms vertical support and eave treatments.

The fencing enclosing the front lawn of the Conde-Charlotte House would extend in front of the proposed interpretive center. The Design Review Guidelines state that 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 (See B-16.). Either iron or wood picket fences located at the inner edge of the sidewalk fronted most of Mobile's residential compounds.

“The Design Review Guidelines state that the appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design and that those spaces should be screened from view (See B-2.). Located off of a secondary elevation and partially shield by a landscaping, the parking lot is situated and treated in such a way as to respect property and district. Either brick pavers or concrete surfacing for both the curbcuts and the parking would complement the surroundings. The same paving materials would be utilized in the walkways within and accessing the courtyard created by the construction of the proposed building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-16), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the property or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mrs. Schley Rutherford and Karrie Maurin were present to discuss the application

Mr. Holmes recused himself from the discussion and departed the room.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. Mr. Ladd complimented Mr. Blackwell on the presentation. He asked Mrs. Rutherford and Mr. Maurin if they had any clarifications to address, or questions to ask.

Mrs. Rutherford explained to the Board the relationship between the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America and their Alabama Chapter thereof. She stated that the latter owns the Conde-Charlotte House and that the Chapter is committed to property's upkeep & interpretation. Mrs. Rutherford went on to articulate the three interrelated mission of the Dames: preservation, education, and patriotism. She articulated that the construction of the small, but

important interpretive center/dependency would allow the Alabama Chapter to better realized their outreach efforts.

Mr. Ladd thanked Mrs. Rutherford. He then reminded his fellow Board members of the approval of a likeable expansion of the nearby Hall-Ford compound. Remarking that the Conde-Charlotte and the aforementioned property are comparable in style and date, he stated the proposed addition to the Conde-Charlotte House compound would be complement its surroundings just had the Hall Ford's addition.

Mr. Roberts addressed Mrs. Rutherford, Ms. Maurin, and the Board. He complimented the design and then proceeded to ask for clarification as to paving and landscaping. Ms. Maurin and Mr. Blackwell addressed Mr. Roberts' concerns.

No further Board discussion ensued.

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

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/16/16

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-36-CA: 255 Church Street
Applicant: Ryan Fendt on behalf of 255 Church Street
Received: 8/31/15
Meeting: 8/16/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: T5-2
Project: Fenestration – Remove and replace the main entrance.

BUILDING HISTORY

This late 1960s motel complex occupies an entire city block. The building and site feature examples of traditional ironwork.

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 2, 2012. At that time, the Board approved the installation of a new signage package. The application up for consideration calls for the removal and replacement of the original main entrance.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Often one of the most important features of a building, doorways reflect the age and period of a building. Original doors should be retained along with any moldings, transoms, or sidelights. Replacements should reflect the age and style of the structure.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Remove the original main entrance with its integral sidelight and transoms.
 - 2. Install a new aluminum storefront entrance in the location of the original entrance.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the removal of the original doors informing the building’s main entrance. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that doorways reflect the age and period of a building. Original doors should be retained along with any moldings, transoms, or sidelights. Replacements should reflect the age and style of the structure (See B-1.)”. The original doorway is part of a comprehensive fenestration pattern informing the public portions of the building. Said doorway, sidelights, and transom are in a good state of structural repair. The proposed replacement does not the design, material, or construction of the existing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and the historical character of the surrounding district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell addressed the Board. He explained that the applicant's representatives were amenable to the Staff Recommendation.

No Board discussion ensued.

The audience had since departed.

FINDING OF FACT

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

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 approved by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DENIED.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-36-CA: 10 South Ann Street
Applicant: Sandra Whistler for Caldwell Whistler and Jane Whistler
Received: 8/24/15
Meeting: 0/16/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition – Demolish a single-family residence located within a larger family complex.

BUILDING HISTORY

Materials in this property’s MHDC file date the dwelling to 1896. The building does not appear on the 1901 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. It is possible that the house’s gable surmounted northern wing incorporates a vehicular shed depicted in the aforementioned map, but the probability is unlikely for reasons of elevation and construction. The footprint of the building is found within the 1955 Sanborn Maps.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on December 3, 2014. At that time the Board denied an earlier application for demolition of the deteriorated residence. The building suffers from long-term deferred maintenance. On September 21, 2011, the applicant’s received approval to demolish a later rear wing. The demolition caused structural damage to building, as well as opening up portions of the dwelling to the elements. At the December 3, 2014 meeting, the applicant was advised that the property could be reconsidered for demolition following six months of being listed on MLS. The Board also recommended that the applicant instigate mothballing measures.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:

- i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
 1. Material found within this house's MHDC property file dates the dwelling to 1895. The house does not appear in the Sanborn Fire Insurance Map of 1901. While the dwelling could incorporate a portion of a dependency, possibly a carriage house/servants quarter, depicted in the 1901 Sanborn Map, it is doubtful. The present configuration of the house appears on the 1955 Sanborn Map. The materials, massing, detailing, and scale of the dwelling are characteristic of the building's period, style, and typology.
- ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 1. This house is part of a larger family compound comprised of three principle residences and attendant ancillary structures. Setback within the boot of L-shaped compound, the building faces, but does not directly engage the street (on account of the presence of distance from the street and presence of the two other principle residences).
- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced.
- iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 1. Other frame dwellings of the same construction and articulation dating from the middle third of the 20th Century survive within and beyond Mobile's westernmost historic districts (local and not).
- v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 1. If granted demolition approval, the owner would demolish the house, remove debris, and level the site.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The owner acquired the property by inheritance.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. After demolishing the 1970s rear additions, the applicant began to consider demolishing the whole dwelling.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. As the house is situated on property that is constricted by the two other properties forming the family compound, the applicant has not considered listing the property individually.
- ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 1. N.A.
- x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 1. N.A.
- xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for

completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.

1. Application submitted.
- xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
 1. See submitted materials.
 2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted materials):

1. Demolish a contributing residence.
2. Remove debris from the property.
3. Clear the site formerly occupied by the demolished dwelling.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the demolition of a contributing residential building. When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into the account the following considerations: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

This building is said to date from 1895. Sanborn Maps from 1901 through the 1920s do not depict the dwelling. While portions of an ancillary structure depicted on both documents could have aligned with the location of the house’s northern wing, it is highly on likely. The residence does appear on the 1955 Sanborn Map. The contributing house features traditional design components and materials.

Deferred maintenance is taking its toll on the building. Additionally, when the 1970s rear addition was removed, the structure was impaired and the building not properly mothballed. Windows and doors were faced with plyboard, but the roof structure was left exposed to the elements. Siding is rotting at certain locations. Formosan moths have infested and jeopardized the building’s structure and facings. Resurrection fern carpets portions of the roof. Since the last meeting, no efforts have been made to maintain the building. Structural conditions have worsened.

While the house is set back within the lot and minimally impacts the streetscape, the dwelling remains a character defining component of a rare surviving family compound.

When the property last appeared before the Board, the applicant was informed of the Board’s policy regarding first demolition applications. If the property is not substantially damaged, applicants are required to list the property on MLS for period of six months. The property was not listed for sale. The aforementioned allowed, said property is located within compound that features a number of buildings and which have long been within the hands of the same family.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application would impair the architectural and the historical character of the building, compound, and district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Caldwell Whistler and Crosby Latham were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant and his representative. He asked Mr. Whistler and Mr. Latham if had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Whistler referred the Board to the technical information submitted for their review and found within their packets. He elaborated by stating the building is basically beyond repair. He informed that when the application last appeared before them he was instructed to repair mothball and repair the building. Mr. Whistler explained that upon examining the building it was realized that repair the building it would require rebuilding it from the ground up.

Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Whistler what efforts had been done since the last meeting.

Mr. Whistler stated that little had been done on account of termite damage.

Mr. Ladd spoke of how removal of the later rear wing further jeopardized the building.

Mr. Whistler mentioned the existence of structural failure preceding the aforementioned demolition of the later rear wing.

Discussion ensued as to the age of the building.

Mr. Whistler stated that the building existed as of 1956 when his father purchased that portion of the property.

Mr. Roberts voiced considerable doubt as to whether the building dated from the 1890s.

It was noted that the building was still a contributing structure.

Ms. Harden asked if a licensed contractor had inspected the building. Mr. Latham explained that he had inspected the building. Mr. Whistler stated that he had a fellow colleague from the City look at the building.

Mr. Whistler spoke of his plan to combine 8 and 10 Lafayette Street into one re-subdivided lot.

Mr. Roberts articulated that the aforementioned notion did possess some merit.

Mr. Latham stated that while the building appeared to be in a decent state of repair, appearances are deceiving. He said that the structural core of the building, that which is hidden by asbestos tiles on the exterior and plaster on the interior, masks an impaired superstructure.

Mr. Harden asked for further clarification. Mr. Latham continued to describe how the building's envelopment hides the real damage.

Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Whistler if he had listed the property on MLS as was requested by the Board.

Mr. Whistler answered no. He explained that though his sister is the other owner, she was not cooperating with regard to upkeep and other property related concerns. He stated that he was meeting with his attorney in efforts to buy out her interest.

Mr. Ladd said that while he and the Board could understand and respect familial issues, procedures are in place that would facilitate Mr. Whistler's intentions. He encouraged the applicant to list the building on MLS so to advertise it to possible purchasers.

Mr. Whistler again articulated the vision of combining the subject lot with that fronting it.

Mr. Ladd said that the plan sounded nice, but the property is in a historic building and that it is listed as a historic building. Mr. Ladd reiterated precedent established by the Board with other applications.

Mr. Roberts noted that the application up for review was unique in that the other demolition requests which the Board had reviewed in recent years did not involve the demolition of primary dwelling with a compound featuring multiple dwellings.

Ms. Harden informed the applicant and the Board that following the property's last appearance before the Board, she had mentioned the possible listing of the house to a colleague. She stated that said colleague had inspected the house from outside of the fence and was interested in seeing and possibly purchasing the property.

Mr. Ladd reminded the Board of their operating policy regarding demolitions.

Mr. Allen stated that the Board's mission is to save buildings. He cited the example of 359 Charles Street as prime example of how a building in an advanced state of deterioration could be restored.

Mr. Allen then voiced considerable concern over the legality of not have the cooperation and agreement of both owners of the property.

Mr. Blackwell directed the Board's legal concerns to Ms. Mutert.

Ms. Mutert explained that tickets had been issued on the property and that the applicant's sister, the other owner, had been subpoenaed, but not appeared in court.

Ms. Harden redirected the discussion to the building. She explained that she personally and professionally had been involved in numerous projects where buildings impacted by structural issues had been saved. She stated that there are multiple ways which to repair, replace, etc... individual elements, parts of members, etc...

Mr. Stone stated that it according to the owner appearing before the Board that the building would have to be rebuilt from the ground up. He added that he had concerns regarding the lack of redevelopment plan.

Mr. Holmes voiced his concerns as per the legalities of ruling on the application.

Mr. Allen said that in approving the demolition of the building, the Board would be putting the City in a possible bind.

Discussion as to how to proceed ensued.

It was agreed to the holdover the application to the next meeting that scheduled for October 21st.

Mr. Whistler stated that he understood the Board's concerns and was amenable to the holdover.

Mr. Holmes made a motion to holdover the application to the October 21st meeting. Mr. Stone seconded the motion. Said motion was unanimously approved.

HELDOVER.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-31-CA: 911 Dauphin Street
Applicant: K.I.M. Kearley for the Historic Restoration Society, Inc.
Received: 7/13/15 (held for reason of Planning Commission Approval, which has been given)
Meeting: 9/2/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Property Revitalization and Redevelopment – Construct additions to a contributing building, construct a new building on the expanded property, and instigate site improvements.

BUILDING HISTORY

Commenced in 1845 and completed in 1846, the Protestant Orphan Asylum building stands as a testament to both the architectural and philanthropic pursuits of excellence that typified Mobile during Antebellum Era. Established in 1839 in the wake of yellow fever epidemic, the Protestant Orphanage Society was created to care for orphaned children. The Society fulfilled that mission until 1971. The three-story Orphanage building, which is composed of double pile main block and a massive rear wing, was designed and constructed by Henry Moffat of Philadelphia. It is one of less than a dozen of Antebellum orphanages to survive in the Lower South. The Greek Revival structure received a cast iron gallery sometime during the mid to late 19th Century. Improvements were made in 1920s. Following the closure of orphanage in 1971, the building survived educational, housing, and other ends. After a disastrous period of vacancy, the building and expanded complex are being thoroughly restored and redeveloped in a community conscious manner.

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 had not appeared before the Architectural Review Board in some years until the September 2, 2015 meeting. The building had stood vacant for a number of years. Demolition by neglect and damage by arson adversely impacted the principle building and an ancillary structure, to mention the surrounding neighborhood and thoroughfares. The larger complex had long been underutilized. The main building, a historically significant orphanage, is being restored. A large non-contributing structure the west of the main building has been renovated and other betterments are intended. With regard to the latter, the proposal up for review includes the following: construction of additions to the old orphanage building; construction of new buildings upon the expanded compound; and the instigation of other site/landscape improvements. The project received concept approval at the September 2, 2015 meeting. A Design Review Committee was scheduled for and held on September 9, 2015. Following the examination of site plans, elevation

drawings, detailed renderings, and material samples, the Board members assembled departed the Design Review Committee meeting with a recommendation of approval

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the New Construction Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:

1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic material that characterizes a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
2. 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 is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.”
3. The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples. The choice of materials and ornamentation for new construction is a good way for a new building to exert its own identity. By using historic examples as a point of departure, it is possible for new construction to use new materials and ornamentation and still fit into the historic district.”
4. “Historic buildings feature the use of a variety of materials for roofs, foundations, wall cladding and architectural details. In new buildings, exterior materials – both traditional and modern - should closely resemble surrounding historic examples. Buildings in Mobile’s historic districts vary in age and architectural styles, dictating the materials to be used for new construction. Traditional building materials which are not present on nearby historic buildings or buildings in the area that contains only Victorian-era frame houses, a brick ranch-style house would be conspicuous and disrupt the area’s visual continuity. Modern materials which have the same textural qualities and character as materials of nearby historic buildings may be acceptable.”
5. “PLACEMENT: Placement has two components: setback, the distance between the street and a building; and spacing, the distance between its property lines and adjacent structures. New construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings. New buildings should not be placed too far forward or behind the traditional “facade line”, a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the facade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape. Current setback requirements of the City of Mobile Zoning Ordinance may not allow the building to be placed as close to the street as the majority of existing buildings. If the traditional facade line or “average” setback is considerably less than allowed under the Zoning Ordinance, the Review Boards will support an application for a Variance from the Board of Adjustment to allow for new construction closer to the street and more in character with the surrounding historic buildings.”
6. “MASS: Building mass is established by the arrangement and proportion of its basic geometric components - the main building, wings and porches, the roof and the foundation. Similarity of massing helps create a rhythm along a street, which is one of the appealing aspects of historic districts. Therefore, new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.”
7. “FOUNDATIONS: The foundation, the platform upon which a building rests, is a massing component of a building. Since diminished foundation proportions have a negative effect on massing and visual character, new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings. In most historic residential areas, buildings are usually elevated above a crawl space on a pier foundation. Pier foundations

are encouraged for new residential construction. When raised slab foundations are constructed, it is important that the height of the foundation relate to that of nearby historic buildings. For this reason, slab-on-grade foundations are not allowed for single family residences. For multi-family, where slab-on-grade is most practical, other design elements such as water tables and exaggerated bases can be effective in creating the visual appearance of a raised foundation.”

8. “MAIN BODY AND WINGS: Although roofs and foundations reinforce massing, the main body and wings are the most significant components. A building’s form or shape can be simple (a box) or complex (a combination of many boxes or projections and indentations). The main body of a building may be one or two stories. Secondary elements, usually porches or wings extend from the main building. These elements create the massing of a building. Interior floor and ceiling heights are reflected on the exterior of a building and should be compatible with nearby historic buildings.”
9. “ROOFS: A building’s roof contributes significantly to its massing and to the character of the surrounding area. New construction may consider, where appropriate, roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings. Additionally roof designs of new residential buildings may incorporate eave overhang and trim details such as exposed rafters, soffits, cornice, fascia, frieze board, molding, etc. as those of nearby buildings.”
10. “SCALE: The size of a building is determined by its dimensions - height, width, and depth - which also dictate the building’s square footage. SCALE refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings - large, medium, and small. Buildings which are similar in massing may be very different in scale. To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.”
11. “FAÇADE ELEMENTS: Facade elements such as porches, entrances, and windows make up the “face” or facade of a building. New construction should reflect the use of facade elements of nearby historic buildings.”
12. “Some architectural styles, such as those dating from the Victorian period, featured decorative elements in gables like barge boards and louvered vents. Later styles such as bungalows used decorative cornice brackets or show rafters as design elements. Depending on the character and style of new construction and its relation to surrounding historic structures, similar gable elements should be used.”
13. “The number and proportion of openings - windows and entrances - within the facade of a building creates a solid-to-void ratio (wall-to-opening). New buildings should use windows and entrances that approximate the placement and solid-to-void ratio of nearby historic buildings. In addition, designs for new construction should incorporate the traditional use of window casements and door surrounds. Where a side elevation is clearly visible from the street, proportion and placement of their elements will have an impact upon the visual character of the neighborhood and must be addressed in the design.”
14. “The degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings. Although new buildings should use decorative trim, window casings, and other building materials similar to nearby historic buildings, the degree of ornamentation should not exceed that characteristic of the area. Profile and dimensions of new material should be consistent with examples in the district.”
15. “Institutional buildings represent a unique aspect of community life and frequently have special requirements that relate to their use. For these reasons, these buildings are usually freestanding and their massing, scale, and architectural arrangements may be a different nature than their residential and historic neighbors.”

16. “Materials and ornamentation are important characteristics of a building. A range of decorative motifs can be seen in the historic districts. Both materials and ornamentation are important in creating continuity within the districts. New construction should take these elements into consideration”
17. “The Review Board recognizes that modern materials are appropriate for new construction and will review applications on a case by case basis.”
18. 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 is usually restricted to six feet...”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

9. Construct additions onto the campus’s main building.
 - a. The two additions will be constructed off of the East Elevation of the recessed service wing adjoining the main building’s principle block.
 - b. The northernmost addition will be two-stories in height.
 - c. The southernmost addition will be one-story in height.
 - d. Both additions will maintain the foundation level of the building’s ground floor.
 - e. The addition’s walls will faced with wooden siding.
 - f. Hipped roofs with sheathed with asphalt shingles matching those found on main building will surmount the additions.
 - g. Hyphen-like connectors will afford transition to and from the existing building and new construction.
 - h. Northernmost Addition.
 - i. The northernmost addition will be T-shaped in configuration.
 - ii. A 6’ 1 ½” wide inset (front and rear) connector will marry the 21’ 6” wide by 20’ 9” deep addition to principle building.
 - iii. The connector will feature an East-West oriented gabled roof.
 - iv. The connector’s North Elevation will be defined by a tripartite sequence of fenestrated bays. The ground floor grouping will feature an entrance with flanking sidelights, while the upper-story unit will be formed a simple store-front unit.
 - v. The main portion of the northernmost addition’s North Elevation will feature three three-light transom windows on the ground floor and three shuttered windows at upper-story level.
 - vi. A stepped and capped wall will extend eastward from the North Elevation to receive the gallery roof return.
 - vii. A stuccoed wall will extend in front of and beyond the northern most addition.
 - viii. The wall will be distinguished by advanced pilaster-like buttresses and will be surmounted by both a cornice-like cape and iron cresting.
 - ix. The masonry portions of the wall will measure 5’5” in height.
 - x. An iron gate, one featuring pickets and finials, will front the connector portion of the addition.
 - xi. A single-story hipped roof gallery will be located between the wall and northern wall.
 - xii. The gallery will be paved with concrete and bordered in brick.
 - xiii. Decorative iron supports located at the pilasters will support the roof of the gallery.
 - xiv. The East Elevation of the northernmost addition will feature two three-light transom windows at ground level and a grouping of three transoms on the upper-story. The central transom of the upper-story will feature vertical blanked board infill with a crescent motif.

- xv. The South Elevation of the northernmost addition will be tripartite informed fenestrated bays in the connector and three three-light transom windows at the upper-story level.
 - i. Condenser units will be located between the two additions.
 - j. Southernmost Addition
 - i. The southernmost addition will be L-shaped in composition.
 - ii. The connector marrying the addition to the main building's East Elevation will be stucco in composition on its Southern face.
 - iii. Parapets will be employed on the connector to conceal the rooftop air handling unit.
 - iv. The North Elevation will feature two-three light transom window located beneath an integral awning continuing the pitch of the surmounting roof structure.
 - v. A hipped roof porch continuing the roof pitch of the main roof structure will continue to front the northern portion of the East Elevation. Painted pipe column porch posts will support the porch roof.
 - vi. A double-door (painted hollow metal service door) will open onto the receiving porch accessing the service yard.
 - vii. A wooden planked gate anchored to the South by a brick posts will terminate the East Elevation.
 - viii. An integral shed roofed porch like that off of the East Elevation will front the South Elevation. Two pairings of painted pipe column porch posts will support the porch's roof.
 - ix. A low brick wall will front service-related devices located off of the East Elevation.
 - x. A painted brick dado-like course will constitute the lower portion of the South Elevation's wall. That wall will transition into a fencing fronting a portion of the hyphen-like connector's entrance.
 - xi. The South Elevation will also feature a single three-light transom window.
 - xii. The connector's South Elevation will feature a glazed and paneled door and a single light window.
10. Construct a new building upon the expanded campus.
- a. The new building, a float barn, will be stepped in westerly direction.
 - b. The building will have a 120' setback from Broad Street.
 - c. The building will have a 66' setback from Conti Street.
 - d. The dimensions of the building are as follows: eastern half – 150' 1" by 60' 2"; western half – 60' 1" by 81' 5 5/8".
 - e. The two attached blocks will be constructed approximately 6" above grade.
 - f. The natural galvalume finished panels and structure will be relieved by masonry buttresses and parapets.
 - g. The stepped buttresses will be made of brick.
 - h. Said buttresses will feature caps and will feature ironwork placards of a Carnival nature.
 - i. Continuous shed roof awnings will skirt be located between and before the buttresses.
 - j. Bracketed posts (pairings flanking window of blind bays) will be located within the buttressed bays.
 - k. Vertically oriented Galvalume panels of a mill finish will sheath the walls
 - l. East Elevation
 - i. The East Elevation will number five bays in composition.
 - ii. Six stepped buttresses will define the East Elevation.
 - iii. Bracketed posts (two per bay) will define bays.
 - iv. The aforementioned posts will support a continuous shed roofed awning.
 - v. The aforementioned awning will roofed with 5-V crimp metal roof panels.

- vi. Multiple configurations of operable four-light window units define each bay.
- vii. The aforementioned fenestrated groups will occur alternately above & below and above the shed roofed awnings.
- viii. Wooden framing will further define the clerestory like upper flight of windows.
- ix. The siding of the aforementioned area will be opaque corrugated panels.
- m. South Elevation
 - i. The South Elevation will be defined of two gabled and parapet-fronted portions.
 - ii. The more advanced Eastern portion will be comprised of a three bay composition.
 - 1. A pair of 15' by 16' decoratively treated Galvalume doors will occupy the central bay.
 - 2. A louvered window will be located above the door.
 - 3. Stepped buttresses will define the three bays.
 - 4. Metal siding will face the central and side bays.
 - 5. Exposed wooden framing and brackets will articulate the side bays.
 - 6. Decorative pulley works will allude to warehouse prototypes.
 - 7. Exposed truss work will enliven the surmounting openwork pediment.
 - iii. The recessed Western portion will be defined by a three bay composition.
 - 1. A pair of 15' by 16' decoratively treated Galvalume doors will occupy the central bay.
 - 2. A louvered window located within a monitor will be located above the aforementioned door and within exposed wood framing.
 - 3. Brick buttresses and veneer walls with frame the metal siding fronting the side bays.
 - 4. Wooden framing will further define the side bays.
 - 5. A stepped and raked wall with opening will extend from the western portion of this portion of the building.
- n. West Elevation
 - i. The eight and a half bay West Elevation will feature terminal buttresses.
 - ii. Three tripartite windows arranged in cascading fashion will articulate to three of the bays.
 - iii. Single doors will articulate two additional bays.
 - iv. Carnival informed placards will further articulate the elevation.
 - v. A platform for antique float wagons will be located in advance of the elevation.
- o. North Elevation
 - iv. The two part North Elevation will comprised of an unarticulated western portion and tripartite eastern portion.
 - v. The eastern portion will be comprised of three bay composition featuring a galvalume double door with surmounting transom.
 - vi. The door will be flanked by buttresses, fronted by an awning, surmounted by two four-light windows, and surmounted by an open truss work pediment.
- 11. Install paving.
 - a. Install a network of brick bordered concrete walkways within the existing courtyard.
 - b. Install gravel and curbing within the service courtyard between and east of the proposed additions.
- 12. Install fencing.
 - a. For a description of the wall located before northernmost addition's North Elevation see the Elevation Sheets and earlier portions of the Staff Report.
 - b. A 6" tall wooden privacy fence featuring two double gates will be located east of the southernmost addition of the main building. Said fencing will be anchored and defined by brick piers.

STAFF ANALYSIS

General

This project involves the first phase of larger project impacting a large institutional complex. The portions of the project up for review are as follows: the construction of additions to a highly significant institutional building; the construction of new building on the larger site; the construction of fencing; the installation of paving within a service court; and other aspects of a scope of work that will revitalize recently expanded historic ensemble.

Additions

Two additions are proposed for construction off of the main building's East (a side) Elevation. Most additions to historic buildings are encouraged to be located to the rear of said structures. A sizable wing, one which is original to the building, and a later one-story ancillary building, both it and the aforementioned wing are located to the rear of the structure, prevent the construction of a rear addition. When rear additions are not possible, side additions are considered. The main building is set back well into the block deep lot. Recessed behind the façade lines (front and rear), both additions respect the architectural and historical context of the building, lot, and expanded compound. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, the additions are differentiated from the old, yet still compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features so thereby protecting the historic integrity of the property and its environment (See B-1.). As such, the proposed additions "read" as later interventions, while at the same time remaining responsive to the historical and architectural context. The main building is constructed out of brick (Philadelphia for the façade and Mobile for the side and rear walls). Lower in height than the three-story main building, the wooden siding faced additions (respectfully one-story and single-story in height), are connected to the main block by way hyphen-like connectors. Said connectors provide a subtle, but distinctive transition between the old and new. The hipped and shed roof forms of the additions mimic those of the main building. Proportional systems, elevation components, and other design elements integrate and complement with upstaging the principle building.

New Construction

The New Construction Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that the goal for new construction should be to blend into the historic district without creating a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples (See B-3.). Successful new construction or infill redevelopment should take into account placement, mass, scale, material, and historical context.

The **placement** of the new building proposed construction on the eastern portion of the expanded property responds the historical context of the site (and its building type as a genre), ARB approvals for comparable infill redevelopment, site conditions of the site specific natures, and the immediate surroundings of the property. The New Construction Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback – the distance between a building and the street – and spacing – the distance between buildings – should approximate that of nearby historic structures (See B-5.). Other buildings largely surround the building to the West and East. The proposed building's recessed location within a larger complex highlights the historic building located within and those on property, but outside of the historic district. Located at an angle to the front plane or "façade line" of the main building's North Elevation, the building would little alter the appearance and experience of the property's main north frontage. The substantial setback, angles of streets, and built landscape condition views and thus the experience of the proposed building from the northerly and northwesterly

cardinals. Two older commercial buildings, a contributing Colonial Revival structure to the Northeast and an interesting Mid Century Modern experiment to the East, anchor those vistas/lot lines and would front the proposed building. The historic context of the West, North, and East expanses would be maintained. In addition to taking into the account the existing context of the built environment, recessed setbacks typified institutional construction. Notable institutional setbacks of epochs past include such landmarks as the following: Government Street Presbyterian Church; Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception; Christ Church Cathedral; the Main Branch of the Mobile Public Library, and the nearby Old Dauphin Way Baptist Church (ASMS) are setback into the their large lots. The New Construction Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that institutional buildings represent a unique aspect of community life and frequently have special requirements that relate to their use. For these reasons, said buildings are usually freestanding and their massing, scale, and architectural arrangements may be a different nature than their residential and historic neighbors (See B-15.). The Review Board approved the construction of other buildings of an increased setback and height within lots located within historic districts, a prominent and successful example being 1112 Government Street. The Broad Street and Conti Street setbacks are mindful approved infill construction located at South of the site. While recessed, the setback allows for proper scaling, without ruling out eventual construction closer the street. Side setbacks or spacing takes into account the built context of the buildings occupying the lot.

In addition to placement, **Mass** - the arrangement and proportion of a building's parts – and **Scale** – a building's relationship to other nearby historic buildings - constitute factors informing successful infill construction. The New Construction Guidelines state that infill should reference the massing of forms exhibited by nearby historic buildings (See B-6.). New Construction Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that infill should be in scale with nearby historic buildings so to preserve continuity (See B-10.). Massing is informed by foundations, walls, and roofs. Foundations, the platform upon which a building rests, should have heights similar to those on nearby historic buildings (See B-7.). The proposed building will be constructed atop a 6" foundation. On grade construction informs the foundation level of the main historic building, as well as the expanded property's and nearby historic commercial construction. The body of the building is also a reaction to the site. The simple configuration is responsive to nearby historic massings (See B-8.). The L-shaped composition, the same as the main building, breaks up mass, affords a telescoping view, and strengthens Broad Street. The walls negotiate the heights of the context. Considerably lower in height than the main historic building, the proposed building's mural surfaces are broken up horizontally in such a ways as to maintain lines established by Spanish Colonial Revival building fronting the Northern portion of the expanded complex. Clerestory-like effects informing the East and West Elevations achieve that end on the East and West Elevations. Stepped, raked, and open pediments fulfill the same purpose on the North and South Elevations. The clerestory and transom components are similar to and compatible with other nearby historic buildings (See B-9.). In addition to adopting a similar setback to the commercial property to the South, the overall heights are comparable. A backdrop rhythm will thus be established.

Facades elements, such as bay windows, doors, and other elements, make up the "face" or façade of a building. New construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings (See B-11.). The previously mentioned clerestory-like effect of East and West Elevations (created by awnings) and pediments of the North and South Elevations afford regularity and symmetry. Brick buttresses afford rhythmic spacing and vertical coordination. Advancing walls and eaves serve to bring together the building and the landscape. The proportioning of bays and the windows within them provides a solid-to-void relationship that responsive to nearby historic buildings of varying styles and periods. Even the minimally visible West (a side) Elevation takes into account proportional and component factors (See B-13.).

The New Construction Guidelines state that **material and ornamentation** are important characteristics of a building. A range of decorative motifs can be seen in the historic districts. Both materials and

ornamentation are important in creating continuity within the districts. New construction should take these elements into consideration (See B-16.). Metal is listed as what is generally suggested as an inappropriate material, but the Guidelines go on state that the Review Board recognizes that modern materials are appropriate for new construction and will review applications on a case by case basis (See B-17.). The Review Board has approved metal treatments on several notable projects, including Space 301. In that project the panels were installed in a design that built upon the Modernist design of a 1960s building. Most of the wall bays are faced with naturally finished and vertically oriented Galvalume panels. As mentioned in the project narrative, the design for the building, a float barn, is to evoke Mobile's industrial heritage and warehouse architecture. Train sheds and cotton warehouses served as the points of departure for the design. The fronting the South Elevation with brick and the employment of brick buttresses around the building, along with the use of substantial awnings, prominent entrances, and other devices were serve to frame define the panels. In complex and landscape characterized by multifarious building walls surfaces the metal panels work with an already varied context. Galvalume panels are employed on the awnings of building located to south of the rear elevation.

Fencing

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that fencing should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement, and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District (See B-18.). The wall and fence located about the two additions are the only fencing up for review at this juncture. Both enclosures meet height, material, and design requirements.

Landscaping, paving, and additional fencing will be reviewed at a later date.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-18), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the contributing building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the additions, new construction, and site improvements.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

KIM Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He thanked Ms. Kearley for efforts and asked her if she had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Ms. Kearley responded that no she did not have anything further to add, but was present to address any concerns that the Board might entertain.

Mr. Roberts complimented Ms. Kearley on the project and thanked her for going beyond the necessary clarifications during the Design Review Committee scheduled and conducted a week prior to the meeting. Mr. Roberts recommended that the application be approved and today.

No further discussion ensued amongst the Board.

There was no one present for public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/16/16