

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

September 20, 2017 – 3:00 P.M.

Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswald, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Jim Wagoner, Bob Allen, John Ruzic, Nick Holmes III, Carolyn Hasser, and Kim Harden.
Members Absent: Robert Brown, Steve Stone, Harris Oswald, Craig Roberts, David Barr and Catarina Echols.
Staff Members Present: Cartledge W. Blackwell, Erich Bergdolt, Bridget Daniel, and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Holmes moved to approve the minutes for both the August 19th and September 6th meeting. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.
3. Mr. Holmes moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was approved with one in opposition, Mr. Robert Allen.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Dorothy White**
 - a. Property Address: 257 Marine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/25/2017
 - c. Project: Install new asphalt shingle roof, black.
2. **Applicant: Charlotte Brown**
 - a. Property Address: 163 S. Jefferson Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/25/2017
 - c. Project: Replace existing privacy fence across rear of property, eight feet in height; install six foot privacy fence with gate on north side of property; widen driveway extra ten feet with matching curb.
3. **Applicant: Tim Maness**
 - a. Property Address: 203 Michigan Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/29/2017
 - c. Project: Repair rotten wood on front porch columns to match existing in profile, dimension, and material or approved preservation method such as epoxy. Repaint to match existing.
4. **Applicant: Taylor Atchison**
 - a. Property Address: 917 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/30/2017
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated to match existing in dimension, profile, and material. Reroof in either 5V crimp galvalume or charcoal architectural shingle to fit aesthetic of dwelling.

5. Applicant: Taylor Atchison

- a. Property Address: 1005 Savannah Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/30/2017
- c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood to match existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint to match existing. Reroof with architectural shingles in charcoal.

6. Applicant: Michael and Michele Rumpf

- a. Property Address: 963 Palmetto Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/31/2017
- c. Project: Install gas light appropriate to scale of porch. Construct porch railing based on photographic evidence and MHDC stock drawings. Construct 3' wooden picket fence around side and front yards.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2017-44-CA: 1215 Palmetto Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Maynard and Roxanne Odom
- b. Project: Fenestration and Rear Addition Related: Alter existing fenestration; Enclose a portion of a rear porch; and Construct a rear addition (an enclosed porch and a screened porch by extending roof.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2017-45-CA: 306 Marine Street

- a. Applicant: Ben Stewart of Whatley Stewart Builders on behalf of Michael and Mary Imwalle
- b. Project: New Construction: Construct a single family residence.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Blight Initiative – Reminder for Discussion at the October 4, 2017 Meeting

Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that Mr. David Daughenbagh from City of Mobile Municipal Code Enforcement would be present at the October 4th meeting to discuss the city's Blight Initiative.

- 2. 1017 Old Shell Road – Reminder for Discussion at the October 4, 2017 Meeting

Mr. Blackwell notified the Board Mrs. Florence Kessler from the City of Mobile Legal Department would be present at the October 4th meeting to address the property at 1017 Old Shell Road.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-44-CA: 1215 Palmetto Street

Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Maynard and Roxanne Odom

Received: 8/31/2017

Meeting: 9/20/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden

Classification: Non-Contributing

Zoning: R-1

Project: Fenestration and Rear Addition Related: Alter existing fenestration;
Enclose a portion of a rear porch; and Construct a rear addition (an enclosed porch and a screened porch by extending roof).

BUILDING HISTORY

The residence situated on this large parcel was constructed in 2000.

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 since the review of plans authorizing its construction. The application up for review calls for the alterations to fenestration and an existing porch, as well as the construction of a rear addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Design additions and alterations to non-historic structures to be compatible with the placement, massing, and scale of surrounding historic structures.”
 - 2. “Design an alteration addition to a non-historic building to be compatible in mass and materials with surrounding properties and the district.”
 - 3. Retain an overall proportion of building mass to open space that is not significantly different than that of the surrounding historic neighborhood.”
 - 4. Design an addition to respect the original orientation of the building and maintain the typical orientation of adjacent historic buildings.”
 - 5. “Design an addition to a non-historic building to preserve setback distances and spacing between buildings to maintain setbacks and spacing typical of surrounding historic buildings.
 - 6. “Use materials with a character compatible to those used historically and with

- proven durability.”
7. “Design replacement roofs and roofs of additions to be compatible with the district.”
 8. “Design a new porch or an alteration to an existing porch to respect the character of the district.”
 9. “Design window alterations and windows on new additions to non-historic structures to be compatible with the neighborhood.”

D. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Alter existing fenestration.
 - a. South (Façade) Elevation
 - i. Extend the length of dormers.
 - ii. Three window openings will be enlarged.
 - iii. Six-over-six aluminum clad window will comprise the fenestration (and will match the existing configuration in terms of light pattern and construction).
 - iv. Siding and roofing treatments will match the existing
 - b. West (side) Elevation
 - i. Remove a louvered vent.
 - ii. Feather in siding to match existing.
 - iii. Install 2’0” x 3’0” four-over-four aluminum clad window.
2. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The addition will take the form of an enclosed living space and open porch space.
 - b. The addition will rest atop a brick foundation that will match the existing.
 - c. Hardiplank siding will clad the addition’s walls. .
 - d. Aluminum clad wood windows will be employed.
 - e. The aforementioned windows will be six-over-six in composition.
 - f. Cornice details will match the existing.
 - g. A shed roof will surmount the addition.
 - h. The aforementioned roof will be clad with shingles that will match existing.
 - i. West (side) Elevation
 - i. Enclose porch on northernmost portion.
 - ii. Install a six paneled door with approved material (wood or clad aluminum wood).
 - j. South (rear) Elevation
 - i. A louver vent located in the gable will be removed and a six-over-six window will be installed.
 - ii. An existing porch will be enclosed on the western portion of the elevation.
 - iii. On the aforementioned portion, a six-over-six window will be installed.
 - iv. The middle portion of the new addition will be screened-in porch.
 - v. The porch will be three bays in expanse.

- vi. The aforementioned porch will feature square section and boxed framed columnar posts that will match existing columnar posts on said elevation.
- vii. The westernmost bay will employ a screen door leading to wooden steps.
- viii. The easternmost portion of the elevation will feature three six-over-six windows.
- k. East (side) Elevation
 - i. An existing corner board will differentiate the new addition from the existing house.
 - ii. Install two equidistantly windows.
- 3. Paint the addition and where necessary touch up the body of the house per the existing color scheme.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application up for review calls for the alteration of fenestration, alteration of a rear porch, and the construction of a rear addition.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that window alterations on non-contributing buildings should be compatible with the neighborhood or district (See B 1, 2, & 9.). The fenestration proposed for alteration is located on the front and the side elevations of a non-contributing structure. The three dormer windows on North (façade) Elevation are proposed for alteration. The proposed design change (one of scale) is prompted by code related concerns of an egress nature. While the size of the dormers would change, the overall design (gabled surmounted with cornice returns), light configuration (six-over-six) would be retained. The proportions of the proposed dormers would be more in keeping with the massing and scale of the body of the house. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, the overall composition and light configuration of the dormers are of a historical formula found within the district, as well as surrounding districts. The louvered vent located on the East (side) elevation is proposed to be changed to a small window. The aforementioned fenestration change is also historically attuned to the overall character of the neighborhood. The material quality of both of the dormers and the side elevation fenestration are of construction nature appropriate for new work in Mobile's historic districts (See B-6.)

With regard to the proposed new addition, which takes the form of the enclosure and extension of a porch, said work is located to the rear of a non-contributing building. For reasons of the proposed addition's situation on the lot, relationship to the body of the house, and proximity to abutting buildings, the overall character of the property and landscape would be retained and therefore would be in keeping with Mobile's Historic Districts Design Review Guidelines (See B-3.) The proposed addition would be located off the rear elevation, with the largest portion on the Southeast corner, an inner lot location as opposed to the opposition more prominent corner location. Said addition would square out the house and thus not introduce a new setback to the property (See B-5.). The overall orientation of the building would remain the same, while still affording increased use of the back lot (See B-4.). In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, the porch spaces respect the character of the neighborhood (See B-8.). The overall shed roof form is one traditionally employed for additions in Mobile's historic districts (See B-7.). The shed is also respectful of and subordinate to the body of the house. Materials employed are acceptable materials by Mobile's Historic Design Review Guidelines (See B1-3). The other building components of enclosed and open portions of the addition compliment the main house and match the existing.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. Door on West elevation has been changed from fiberglass to an accepted material.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-9), Staff does not believe that this application would impair either the architectural or the historical character of the district. Staff recommends approval of this application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley, the owner's representative, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner welcomed Mr. Kearley and asked him as the applicant's representative if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Kearley stated that Mr. Blackwell addressed the application in full.

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

Upon being asked by Ms. Harden, Mr. Kearley clarified that the easternmost window on the South elevation was the same size as the adjacent two windows.

No other questions ensued from the Board.

Mr. Wagoner opened the application to public comment. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Wagoner closed the period of public discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Holmes moved that, based upon the facts as 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: September 21, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-45-CA: 306 Marine Street

Applicant: Ben Stewart of Stewart and Whatley Builders on behalf of Michael and Mary Imwalle

Received: 8/31/2017

Meeting: 9/20/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction- Construct a single family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This property is currently a vacant lot. An altered two bay shotgun with later appendages was previously located on the site.

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 April 10, 2006. At that time, the Board approved an application for demolition as the structure had been severely damaged by fire. The application up for review calls for the construction of a single family residence on a vacant lot. The house will feature an engaged carport connected to the body of the house by way of a hyphen-like connector.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Maintain alignment of front setbacks.”
 - 2. “Maintain the rhythm of buildings and side yards.”
 - 3. “Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
 - 4. “Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
 - 5. “Design piers, a foundation, and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
 - 6. “Size foundations and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings.”

7. "Use building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties."
8. "Design building elements on exterior buildings walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements often include but are not limited to: balconies, chimneys, and dormers."
9. "Use exterior building materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district."
10. "Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic windows."
11. "Use traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings."
12. "Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings."
13. "Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings."
14. "When using artificial materials, use a blind or shutter unit that has a thickness, weight and design similar to wood."
15. "Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings."

D. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Construct a single family residence.
 - a. The house will be setback 16'0" from the sidewalk.
 - b. The raised slab foundation will measure at least 2'0" in height.
 - c. The aforementioned foundation will feature simulated brick piers spaced at equidistant intervals with framed lattice between on the front porch & façade and continuous brick water table for the side and rear elevations.
 - d. The walls will be clad with hardiplank siding.
 - e. The ceiling heights will be 10'0".
 - f. The windows will be aluminum clad in construction, multi-light (either four-over-four or single pane) configuration.
 - g. The dominant roof will be a hip in construction. As small secondary hip will also be employed.
 - h. A hipped roof will also surmount the carport engaged to the house by way of a hyphen-like connector. Said connector, along with the front porch, will be surmounted by a gable roof.
 - i. Architectural GAF shingles will sheath the roof.
 - j. East (Façade) Elevation
 - i. A single bay porch will advance from the southern portion of the dominant portion of the façade.
 - ii. The porch will be 7'6" in depth.
 - iii. A flight of brick steps will access the central bay of the porch.
 - iv. Two square section columnar posts will define the porch..
 - v. A glazed and paneled wood door (either painted or stained) with surmounting transom will define the central bay of the porch.
 - vi. Two windows will flank the main entrance. Said windows will be four-over-four in configuration.
 - vii. A four-over-four window will be centered in the gable roof.

- viii. Brackets will be employed at the apex and along the rakes of the aforementioned gable.
 - ix. The southernmost portion of the facade will be recessed and feature a small four-over-four window.
 - x. The northernmost most portion will feature a four-over-four window.
- k. North (side) Elevation
- i. The end of the porch bay will define the easternmost portion of the North elevation as it relates to the body of the house.
 - ii. The fenestration (in easterly to westerly direction) will be as follows: a transom followed by three four-over-four windows.
 - iii. The remainder of the elevation will feature an extended hyphen-like connector which will engage the main house to a storage room and carport.
 - iv. The aforementioned hyphen-like connector and carport will be inset from the body of the main residence in northerly direction.
 - v. Both constructions will be on grade.
 - vi. Both the hyphen and the carport will feature square section columnar piers.
 - vii. The storage room adjacent to the carport and situated within the hyphen-like connector will feature hardi-plank siding and a six panel metal or other acceptable material door.
 - viii. The two bay carport will be surmounted by a hipped roof and supported by boxed columnar posts.
- l. West Elevation
- i. A 20'0" portion of carport will be located in advance of the main dwelling. Said carport will be two-bay in composition.
 - ii. A storage room located within the hyphen-like will be located between the carport and the West Elevation of the body of the house
 - iii. A paneled and glazed door composed of either metal, aluminum clad or other approved material will be employed on the West Elevation.
- m. South (side) Elevation
- i. A one bay porch with columnar posts will inform the easternmost portion of the South Elevation.
 - ii. The fenestration (in an easterly to westerly direction) will be as follows: two four-over-four light windows and a smaller four-over-four light.
 - iii. The 7'4" long and hipped roof bay will advance from the westernmost portion of the South Elevation.
 - iv. The rest of the elevation will consist of the hyphen-like connector with its storage room and the engaged carport.
- n. Instate hardscaping.
- i. Install concrete walkway from street to steps leading to front entrance.
 - ii. Install concrete driveway (ribbons) and carport pad.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 306 Marine Street, is located within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application up for review involves construction of single family residential infill between extant historic dwellings located to either side of the subject lot. When reviewing the applications for new residential construction, the following criteria are taken into account: placement; orientation; massing; scale; building elements; and materials.

With regard to placement, two components are taken into account – setback from the street and distance between buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts state that new buildings should be responsive to and maintain alignment of traditional façade lines (See B 1), as well as the rhythm of side & rear setbacks (See B-2.). The property under review, an inner block situation, is located adjacent to/in the vicinity of contributing buildings situated to either side of it. In accord with Design Guidelines, the setbacks reflect the historical character of the contributing aspects of the built landscape. The proposed placement negotiates the placement of two buildings located to either side of it (some buildings on the lot line and other at varying setbacks). The side setbacks are traditional in dimension. The façade engages the street, while the backward placement of parking follows tradition and allows for screening.

The Design Review Guidelines state that mass - the relationship of the parts of the larger whole comprising a building - for new construction should be in keeping with arrangement and proportion of surrounding historic residences (B-3). The proposed house is three part in composition - a house; a hyphen-like connector; and a garage. By breaking up the composition, the three dominant parts of the proposed building are better situated into the architectural and historical traditions of the neighborhood. The body of the house adopts the elemental massing of a traditional Mobile dwelling – a porch fronted residence. While the particular nature of the irregular composition is not as common as some other more pervasive typologies, it is not unheard of in Oakleigh and Mobile's other historic districts. The advanced nature and the asymmetrical placement of the porch serve to compartmentalize the compositional massing in traditional fashion in general and specific (See B-13.). The two foot height of the foundation is reflective of traditional foundation elevations (See B-5.) and dwellings on properties abutting the subject address. The façade's more compartmentalized treatment is even more responsive to historical traditions (See B-5.). The massing of the structure, one informed by 10' ceilings, is compatible with the architectural context of the contributing landscape which it is situated amidst (See B-7.) The dominant hipped roof is relieved by secondary roofs informing the front porch, small side wing, hyphen, and engaged carport (See B-15.).

Scale refers to a building's size in relationship to other buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction state that new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings (See B-4.). As mentioned in the preceding paragraph addressing massing, the elevation of the foundations, height of the ceilings, and pitch of the roof combine to form a whole that would be compatible with surrounding architectural landscape.

With regard to building components, the Design Review Guidelines call for responsiveness to traditional design traditions. Innovation is not ruled out, but compatibility is the goal. The asymmetrically composed and porch-fronted residence takes inspiration in both general and specific from several architectural typologies that animated Mobile's architecture during the latter half of the 19th Century and the first half of the 20th Century. While not exacting to particular example in the immediate vicinity, the overall composition is not without precedent. The front gabled porch distinguishing the façade is compatible with immediate and larger residential architectural vocabulary of the district (See B-8.). Going further into building components, the building employs sash window types (sash) and wall treatment (siding) that inform the immediate and vast majority of the surrounding architectural and historical context (See B-

11.). While the type of window is responsive, the solid-to-void relationship could be improved. The Design Review Guidelines state that new construction should adopt traditional solid-to-void patterns (See B-10.). Distancing the windows which flank the front entrance would improve the overall appearance of the front elevation and would serve to cause them to read individually as opposed to oversized sidelight (See B-12.) Faux windows on the side elevations would engender further architectural compatibility (in terms of massing and scale in addition to design elements) without causing for changes to the arrangement of the interior volumes. The applicant is amenable to addressing both aspects of the aforementioned solid-to-void related concerns.

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

RECOMMENATIONS/CLARIFICATIONS

1. The applicant is amenable to spacing the windows flanking the entrance door apart. Clarify distance.
2. The applicant is amenable to employing additional faux or blind fenestration on the side elevations. Confirm locations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-15), Staff does not believe this application would impair either the architectural or the historical character of the historic district. Pending the preceding clarifications, Staff recommends the approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-9), Staff does not believe that this application would impair either the architectural or the historical character of the district. Staff recommends approval of this application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Ben Stewart and Mr. Tyler Whatley, the owner's representatives, were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner welcomed Mr. Stewart and Mr. Whatley and asked them as the applicant's representatives if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Stewart answered no, but said that he was present to answer any questions which the Board might have.

Mr. Stewart asked if the Board would be amenable to allow the faux fenestration located on the North elevation to be approved administratively at a later date. The Board was in agreement.

Mr. Wagoner asked if the newly submitted drawings should be substituted for what was in the ARB packets. Mr. Blackwell replied yes and further explained that the applicant submitted the revised drawings with requested clarifications just prior to the start of the meeting.

Mr. Wagoner then asked if any of his fellow Board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Stewart or Mr. Whatley.

Mr. Stewart clarified for Mr. Ruzic that the 16'0" setback for the proposed dwelling was measured from the sidewalk. Ms. Lague explained that the neighboring residence to the North had a setback of 16'0" from the curb. Mr. Holmes suggested that the residence setback be moved forward to align more closely between the residences lying to the North and South of the property. The applicants were amenable.

Mr. Allen noted that the 4/4 windows were not common in the neighborhood. He further explained he had located them in the landscape on early 20th century sun porches, turrets, and on Russell School (ground floor). Mr. Whatley inquired as to the Board's suggestions for window configurations. Mr. Allen suggested a more common light pattern such as 2/2, 6/6, 1/1, or 3/1. Mr. Blackwell noted a mixture of light patterns in the neighborhood, mentioning that it was common in older homes to have 6/6 windows replaced with 1/1 windows. Ms. Harden suggested making a site visit with Mr. Blackwell in the neighborhood to decide on a more appropriate light pattern. Mr. Whatley and Mr. Stewart were willing.

No other questions ensued from the Board.

Mr. Wagoner opened the application to public comment. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Wagoner closed the period of public discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Holmes moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as amended to reflect that: the faux fenestration located on the North elevation would be approved administratively; the change of the distance of the setback to be reflective of the houses to the north or the south of the lot to be approved by administratively; and alteration of the light pattern of the 4/4 windows to light configuration to be approved administratively.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: September 21, 2018

