

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
September 18, 2013 – 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: Robert Allen, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes III, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, and Jim Wagoner.
Members Absent: Kim Harden, Oswald, Harris Oswald, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Staff Members Present: Cart Blackwell, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the August 21, 2013 and September 4, 2013 meetings. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: Archdiocese of Mobile**
 - a. Property Address: 2 (or 4 according some listings) South Claiborne Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/28/13
 - c. Project: Reroof the building to match the existing
2. **Applicant: Clyde Roland**
 - a. Property Address: 201 South Catherine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/29/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated decking and woodwork to match the existing in type, material, and dimension. Touch up the work per the existing.
3. **Applicant: George Baird for John Klotz**
 - a. Property Address: 959 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/29/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
4. **Applicant: Russ Pritchard**
 - a. Property Address: 1011 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/3/13
 - c. Project: This COA clarifies COA of 2 August. Owners have approval to remove rot wooden on shed and replace studs and tin roof.
5. **Applicant: Arby's**
 - a. Property Address: 659 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/3/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork and wall facings to match the existing. Repaint the building per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme. The body will be dark tan, trim will be red, other portions of the trim will be off white and light tan.
6. **Applicant: Joseph E. Ringhoffer**
 - a. Property Address: 1211 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/4/13
 - c. Project: Install an aluminum vehicular gate accessing the property's rear lot.

7. **Applicant: Marcio Simao**
 - a. Property Address: 251 Roper Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/5/13
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with architectural shingles. Replace decking if necessary.
8. **Applicant: Nathaniel Walker, Jr.**
 - a. Property Address: 162 South Warren Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/5/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.
9. **Applicant: Belinda Bodie with Neel-Schaffer**
 - a. Property Address: 301 Conti Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/9/13
 - c. Project: Install three additional antenna and on mechanical box atop the existing mechanical platform.
10. **Applicant: Keith Jarvis**
 - a. Property Address: 1060 Caroline Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/9/13
 - c. Project: Repaint the trim, etc... white. Repaint the rear woodwork and windows to match the brick.
11. **Applicant: ArtCraft for the A & M Peanut Shop**
 - a. Property Address: 209 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/9/13
 - c. Project: Replace a canvas awning. The existing awning armature will be reused.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2013-CA-70: 101 Dauphin Street and 16 South Royal Street**
 - a. Applicant: Tracy Bassett with Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood for the Retirement Systems of Alabama
 - b. Project: Restoration and New Construction -Reconstruct the historic cornice atop 101 Dauphin Street. Construct infill at the site of 16 South Royal Street

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
2. **2013-CA-71: 1058 Texas Street**
 - a. Applicant: City of Mobile, Architectural Engineering for Mooring Tax Asset Group
 - b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a condemned residential building.

APPROVED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Laura Clarke with Urban Development apprised the Board to the status of the Andres Duany Plan for Downtown.
2. The Board moved to revise a ruling regarding 1400 Dauphin Street.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-70-CA: 101 Dauphin Street and 16 South Royal Street
Applicant: Tracy Bassett with Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood for the Retirement Systems of Alabama
Received: 9/3/13
Meeting: 9/18/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing and Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Restoration and New Construction - Reconstruct the historic cornice atop 101 Dauphin Street. Construct infill at the site of 16 South Royal Street.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Van Antwerp Building (101 Dauphin Street) is Mobile's first skyscraper. The building was built between 1904 and 1906 according to the designs of George B. Rogers. The three part division of the building demarcated by the commercial ground floor mezzanine, the office stack above, and the cornice-capped (removed) utility floor is indicative of Rogers' awareness of contemporary theories on the design of tall office buildings.

The northern portion of 16 South Royal Street was occupied by the remains of the Festorazzi Building. The building was remodeled several times over the course of the 20th Century. The inner lot buildings and their appendages dated from 1901 or later. All the buildings comprised the rear portions of the Van Antwerp complex. The site is vacant.

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. 101 Dauphin Street last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on May 1, 2013. At that time, the Board approved the replacement of windows. 16 South Royal Street last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on February 20, 2013. At that time, the Board approved the demolition of the deteriorated buildings occupying the site. The application up for review calls for the reconstruction of the cornice atop 101 Dauphin Street and construction of infill on the site of 16 South Royal Street.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 1. "Replacement of existing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence."

2. “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 building or the district.”
3. “New construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby buildings.
4. “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 impossible for new construction to use new materials and ornamentation and still fit into the historic district.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Reconstruct the cornice atop 101 Dauphin Street based on surviving pieces and photographs.
2. Construct metal screen wall at 16 South Royal Street.
 - a. The two-story screen wall will feature a centrally located vehicular entrance accessed by way of curbcut.
 - b. The perforated screen wall will feature two bands of imagery. One band will depict the Mobile skyline in 1909 and the second will picture the skyline as of the present year.
 - c. A cornice will surmount the façade.
 - d. The screen will front upper-story meeting room.
 - e. The meeting room will feature a glazed east-facing wall with two doors accessing the balcony.
 - f. The aforementioned balcony will be located by the screen wall.
 - g. An exterior staircase (located behind the screen wall), parking spaces, and other service related fixtures will be located within the rear portion of the lot.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the ongoing restoration and renovation of the Van Antwerp Building complex. Comprised of 101 Dauphin Street (the Van Antwerp Tower) and 16 South Royal Street (the site of the feed store and warehouse), the two part application concerns the reconstruction of a historic cornice atop the former and the construction of infill at the later.

In accord with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, the reconstruction of the historic cornice is substantiated by physical, documentary, and physical evidence (See B-1). Following the removal of the cornice by City order in the 1950s, the remains were removed to a family property and used to infill a gulley. The RSA’s architects accessed the gulley and borrowed pieces possessed by Van Antwerp descendants, in order to rec sample sections of the cornice. Accurate reconstruction of the cornice was aided by precise photographs made shortly after the completion of the building.

As per the construction at the site of 16 South Royal Street, the demolition approval of the earlier buildings required either the reconstruction of the street front façade or the construction of a board approved alternative. This application, a proposal calling for the construction of a screen wall, adopts the latter form of redevelopment. Taking the form of a planar façade overlaid with imagery, the screen wall would be perforated stainless steel in construction and surmounted by a cornice. Serving to shield the service areas required by the renovated skyscraper from public view, the ground level behind the screen wall will be accessed by way of a centrally located vehicular entrance. An upper level balcony, located behind an operable portion of the screen wall, will front a meeting room. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, the placement, height, and cornice of the screen wall complement nearby historic buildings, while the materials and treatment serve to differentiate the old from the new (See B-2-4).

The imagery on the screen wall is permanent in nature and integral to the design of the proposed new construction. It neither obscures architectural features, nor requires repainting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff does not believe the reconstruction of the historic cornice will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of the aforementioned portion of the application.

Based on B (2-4), Staff does not believe construction of the screen wall and service area will impair the architectural or the historical character of the district. Staff recommends approval of the infill construction.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tracy Bassett and Steve Timms were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Karwinski asked if the applications could be considered and ruled upon in two separate motions. Mr. Ladd said it could.

Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representatives. He asked Mr. Bassett and Mr. Timms if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Bassett said Mr. Blackwell had more than adequately addressed the application. He explained how digital technology had aided the cornice restoration. Mr. Bassett told the Board that the shell of the cornice would be virtually the same as the original cornice. Only the structure would be different for reasons of code.

Addressing the proposed infill, Mr. Bassett described the horizontal levels of the screen wall. Moving from the lowest level to the highest, he stated the sequences would be as follows: a map of Mobile and its environs, a 1909 skyline, and a present day skyline. Mr. Bassett added that text and sites would be employed on the lower level as a means to engage and inform the passerby. Mr. Bassett and Mr. Timms provided the Board with a sample panel of the screening.

Mr. Roberts asked if the screening would be monogram in color. Mr. Timms answered yes. He added that lighting was being discussed, but was not fully determined. He informed the Board that the same type metal screening up for review had been employed on other RSA projects in Montgomery and to great success. He said that the aim was to highlight Mobile sites, events, and personages (thereby speaking to both the city and the site). Mr. Timms stated that the proportions of the lower level would have to be rescaled for a more substantial bulkhead zone.

Mr. Holmes asked for clarification regarding the aforementioned bulkhead. Mr. Timms stated that on account of wear and weather, a bulkhead made of a material other stainless steel would be better suited to the busy site.

Ms. Hasser asked for clarification regarding the use of the 16 South Royal Street portion of the complex. Mr. Timms and Mr. Bassett addressed Ms. Hasser's query.

Mr. Karwinski asked for clarification regarding the material composition of the reconstructed cornice. Mr. Timms replied that the cornice would be made of a composite material. Mr. Karwinski said that since a guard rail and/or other devices would likely be employed the cornice portion of the proposal should only be approved as a schematic design and that the applicants should provide additional drawings and materials at another meeting.

Mr. Karwinski asked if the RSA logo was necessary. Mr. Timms answered no, but stated that it was desired.

Mr. Karwinski stated that as far as the infill was concerned, the Board had approved the demolition of a contributing building and should demand a lot more than what was up for review. He said that more concern needed to be shown to adjacent building as per lines and rhythms. Mr. Karwinski stated that while modern infill is legitimate, it should still respect existing fabric.

Mr. Timms explained that while he was not contradicting the perspective of Mr. Karwinski, the design had in fact been given considerable thought. The intention had been to acknowledge more than the site alone. The whole city, it's past and present, was to be engaged. He said that everyone can have opinions, but that he believed the proposal submitted for review lives up to site and community.

Mr. Ladd complimented the project.

Mr. Roberts thanked the RSA and the applicants for reconstructing the cornice. He asked if any additional rooftop barriers and devices would be shielded from view. Mr. Timms answered yes. Mr. Roberts said that he was ok with the design as proposed.

Mr. Roberts then addressed the signage. Referencing a previously submitted signage related image, he stated that signage placed before the Board was much improved. Mr. Roberts admired the three-dimensionality of the signage.

Mr. Roberts stated that while he appreciated Mr. Karwinski's comments he sees the building as more as a piece of sculpture, a work of art, than a façade. He admired the proposal.

Mr. Stone stated that he had no objections to the reconstruction of the cornice and the installation of signage. With regard to the infill, he stated that while he had no objections to a minimalist design, he found the design too planar. Mr. Stone recommended pushing the façade back to provide a reveal. He stated that though he did not object to the graphics, he was not a fan of them.

Mr. Bassett stated the cornice line of the proposed infill could and would be altered to better reflect the adjacent building.

Mr. Holmes addressed the submission. He stated that he understood the thought process but noted that it was not a course of action he would have taken. Mr. Holmes said that when the demolition was approved, he thought a design that called for more of building would be forthcoming. Mr. Holmes said that he was adjusting his mind to the application as submitted.

Mr. Allen said that the façade of the proposed infill lacks dimension. He stated that he does not object to the imagery, but reiterated the planar aspects of the façade made it more a billboard than an elevation.

Mr. Wagoner said that he liked the concept behind the design but realized the sense of disconnect that other board members had voiced. With regard to the signage, Mr. Wagoner stated the branding of that nature was not uncommon in historic districts.

Ms. Hasser inquired as to the origins of the design. Mr. Timms and Mr. Bassett explained that the nucleus of the idea came from Dr. Bronner. Ms. Hasser complimented the design and mentioned similar developments in Montgomery. She applauded the project.

Mr. Roberts pointed out that according to imagery brought to the meeting, the reconstructed cornice would feature lighting.

Mr. Holmes asked for clarification of the base of the infill.

Mr. Roberts redirected the discussion to the lighting of the cornice. He voiced concern over their maintenance. Mr. Timms assured Mr. Roberts that the lights would be maintained.

Mr. Ladd encouraged his fellow Board members to move forward on motions deciding the application.

No one spoke for or against the application.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski introduced a failed motion regarding the cornice.

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

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

With regard to the signage, Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony; the Board finds the facts as presented and reviewed.

The motion received a second and was approved.

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note the addition of a bulkhead.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the cornice does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. No further drawings were required. Guardrails, etc... located behind the cornice were allowed. The motion received a second and was approved. Mr. Allan and Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

APPROVED.

Certificate of Appropriateness for Expiration Date: 9/18/14

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

APPROVED

Certificate of Appropriateness for Expiration Date: 9/18/14

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the infill design 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. Mr. Karwinski, Mr. Wagoner, Mr. Stone, and Mr. Allan voted in opposition. Mr. Holmes abstained. The motion failed.

DENIED.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-71-CA: 1058 Texas Street
Applicant: City of Mobile (Architectural Engineering) for Mooring Asset Group
Received: 9/3/13
Meeting: 9/18/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition – Demolish a condemned residential building.

BUILDING HISTORY

958 and its twin 956 Texas Street were constructed in 1912. Both houses feature rafter tails, all encompassing hipped roofs, and other Arts & Crafts inspired elements.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The house was set afire by arson in 2008. Since that time the house has been boarded up and mothballed. Condemned by the City, the house is proposed for demolition.
- 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. This Arts & Crafts inspired house is a contributing building in the Oakleigh Garden District. The dwelling and the adjoining property to the east (its twin) were constructed for rental purposes in 1912.
 - ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;

1. The fire-damaged dwelling contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and traditional façade line, of the streetscape and overall integrity of the district.
- 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. This house type, a rectangular block with a corner porch and all encompassing hipped roof, can be found in and around several of Mobile’s historic districts.
- 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 fire damaged house would be demolished, debris would be removed, and the site would be leveled.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. Not provided. The house is being proposed for demolition by the City of Mobile. The property has been condemned by the City and marketed for sale by the Neighborhood Renewal Project.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. The property has not been maintained by the owners. It has been condemned by the City of Mobile. Despite efforts to sell the property, no alternative options have proved feasible.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. The Neighborhood Renewal Project marketed the property. No offers ensued.
- 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 plan):

1. Demolish a contributing residential building.
2. Level the lot.
3. Plant grass.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a fire damaged residential building. Demolition applications entail the review of the following concerns: the architectural significance of the building; the effect of the demolition on the streetscape and surrounding district; the condition of the building; and the nature of the proposed development.

The building is a contributing residential structure located within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. Constructed as a rental dwelling, the house has a twin on the adjacent property to the east. Other examples of the building typology, a rectangular dwelling with a corner porch and Arts & Crafts details, are located in and around the historic districts.

Situated in plan with the traditional façade line (to the east), this building contributes to the architectural character, built density, and rhythmic spacing that typify the historic integrity of the historic district.

A 2011 fire gutted the interior and rear elevation of this house.

The property has been listed for sale. No offers ensued. If granted demolition approval, the City of Mobile would demolish the deteriorating building, remove the debris, and level the lot.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and historical character of the building and the district, but taking into account the condition of the building, the effect the continued deterioration of the building is having on the district, and the efforts to sell the property, Staff recommends approval of the demolition request.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell addressed the Board's queries. He spoke of the condition of the building and the recent improvements in the area.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski introduced a failed motion.

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

moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building but that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued on account of the condition of the building.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/18/14