

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**September 21, 2011 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:  
**Members Present:** Gertrude Baker, Kim Harden, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, Jim Wagoner, and Barja Wilson.  
**Members Absent:** Carlos Gant and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.  
**Staff Members Present:** Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes of the September 7, 2011 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously. Mr. Karwinski asked for clarification regarding midmonth #1.

**B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED**

1. **Applicant:** Raoul Porto for American Roofing and Construction, LLC
  - a. Property Address: 1108 Oak Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/30/11
  - c. Project: Reroof the building to match the existing. Replace a door to match the existing.
2. **Applicant:** Stacey Wellborn
  - a. Property Address: 1054 Palmetto Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/30/11
  - c. Project: Remove rotten wood, replace per existing and repaint. Remove and replace tongue and groove decking as existing. Repair damaged corner board and siding.
3. **Applicant:** Big Zion AME Zion Church
  - a. Property Address: 110-112 South Bayou Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/30/11
  - c. Project: Install a six foot double aluminum gate to the north of the parsonage. The gate will extend from a line not beyond the front plane of the body of the house. Install a six foot aluminum fence. The fence will extend along the western portion of the northern lot line, then extend along a setback of approximately 1 to 2 feet along South Jefferson Street and tie in at the southeast corner of the fellowship hall.
4. **Applicant:** Anchor Signs
  - a. Property Address: 900 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/31/11
  - c. Project: Replace the existing canvas awning with a new canvas awning. The awning will fit the existing canopy armature.
5. **Applicant:** Hancock Roofing Inc.
  - a. Property Address: 56 ó 58 South Conception Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/30/11
  - c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.
6. **Applicant:** Don Bowden
  - a. Property Address: 1657 Spring Hill Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/6/11
  - c. Project: Repair and/or replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile and dimension. Paint per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme. The body

will be Gauntlet Gray. The porch floors and shutters will be Anew Gray. The lattice underpinning will be Thunder Gray. The trim will be Oyster White. The porch ceiling will be Tidewater.

- 7. Applicant: WJC, LLC**
  - a. Property Address: 1757 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/6/11
  - c. Project: Perform exploratory demolition on rear kitchen addition to determine the extent of damage to the roof. Repair the roof to match the 1940s photo utilizing materials to match the hipped original that is under the current roof. Repair leaks on main roof maintaining the original tile roof, replacing with matching as necessary.
- 8. Applicant: All Phase Roofing**
  - a. Property Address: 58 Bradford Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/7/11
  - c. Project: Reroof the house with architectural shingles.
- 9. Applicant: Joseph Smith**
  - a. Property Address: 450 Dexter Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/9/11
  - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted color scheme. The body will be a grayish green and the trim will be white.
- 10. Applicant: Southeast Management Services**
  - a. Property Address: 659 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/12/11
  - c. Project: Repair stuccowork on the building. Repaint the stuccowork to match the existing color scheme. Remove a temporary section of wooden railing located within the western fence. Install a replacement iron railing in the aforementioned location. Paint the railings and posts.
- 11. Applicant: Walter Cumbie**
  - a. Property Address: 172 Hannon Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/9/11
  - c. Project: Install exterior storm windows to fit existing window openings.
- 12. Applicant: Daniel Morris**
  - a. Property Address: 207 Roper Street, Apt. 5
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/9/11
  - c. Project: Install 30 year weathered wood asphalt shingles. Repair rafters and decking at rear damaged by tree.
- 13. Applicant: John Hale Landscapes**
  - a. Property Address: 161 Macy Place
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/12/11
  - c. Project: Install a metal storage shed in the fenced backyard. Said shed will be painted in a color scheme matching that of the house.
- 14. Applicant: Eastern Shore Construction**
  - a. Property Address: 1650 Government Street, A
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/12/11
  - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork and detailing to match the existing in profile dimension and material. Repaint the house per the submitted color scheme.
- 15. Applicant: Davis Roofing**
  - a. Property Address: 65 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/13/11
  - c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.

**16. Applicant: Thomas Roofing**

- a. Property Address: 51 South Hallet Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/13/11
- c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2011-62-CA: 1757 Government Street**

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Mr. William Cutts
- b. Project: Restoration, Repair & Replacement, and Partial Demolition ó Remove later alterations; repair and replace deteriorated features; and demolish a later rear addition.

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

**2. 2011-63-CA: 10 South Ann Street**

- a. Applicant: Caldwell Whistler
- b. Project: Partial Demolition ó Demolish the later rear portion of a contributing residence.

**APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**3. 2011-64-CA: 155 South Monterey Street**

- a. Applicant: Eric and Kim Boone
- b. Project: Rehabilitation and New Construction - Remove a façade dormer, construct a façade dormer, install siding, construct a rear addition, and paint the house.

**DENIED FOR LACK OF INFORMATION. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

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

**2011-62-CA: 1757 Government Street**  
**Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley**  
**Received: 9/6/11**  
**Meeting: 9/21/11**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Leinkauf  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: B-1  
Project: Restoration, Repair and Replacement, and Partial Demolition ó Remove later alterations; repair and replace deteriorated features; and demolish a later rear addition.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

With its Southern Colonial Revival portico, stone-faced walls, and terracotta roofing tiles, this early 20<sup>th</sup>-Century residence is among the most eclectic residences located on the western portion of Government Street.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states öthe Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the changeí 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 districtí ö

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The owner/applicant proposes the removal of later alterations, repair & replacement of deteriorated features, and the demolition of a later rear addition.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: öProposed 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.ö 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 house is one the most imposing historic residential buildings located along western Government Street. Constructed some time before the First World War, the eclectic design adopted forms and finishes associated with several academic and picturesque revival styles. The later concrete block addition is of no architectural significance.

- 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 building is one of the most notable properties included in the 2009 Leinkauf Historic District expansion. The later rear addition does not contribute to the streetscape. Said largely engulfs the two-story building's original single story kitchen.
  - iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
- 1. The mass produced fire damaged 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. Later unsympathetic additions of this type were commonly constructed to the rear of historic residences during the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. A number of western Government Street's surviving large scale homes received unsympathetic rear additions when they were adapted to business and/or commercial functions.
  - 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 applicants would demolish the house's later rear addition and reconfigure the original kitchen's rear elevation. Plans were not submitted for the rear elevation on account of lack on information regarding the condition and appearance of the former kitchen's rear elevation. Upon dismantling the rear elevation, the applicant's representative will be better able to determine what design and intervention to propose to the Board.
  - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
- 1. The owner/applicant purchased the house on September 1, 2011 for \$75,000.
  - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
  - viii. The property owner/applicant is demolishing the rear addition and restoring the house as a single family residence
  - ix. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
- 1. The property has been purchased for restoration.
  - x. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
- 1. NA.
  - xi. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
- 1. See submitted materials.
  - xii. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and
- 1. Application submitted.
  - xiii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the Board.
    - 1. See submitted materials.
- 3. *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.ö

- C. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
1. "Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacements should reflect the age and style of the building."
  2. "The type, size, and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of the building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing."
  3. "The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period."
  4. "Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive features, the new shall match the old in design, color, texture and other visual qualities and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing feature shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence."
- D. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Remove the glazed and framed infill enclosing the façade's monumental portico.
  2. Reinstall glazed and framed sidelights within the façade's front door opening.
  3. Install a glazed door within the front door bay.
  4. Reinstall French doors in the bays to either side of the façade's front door.
  5. Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and composition.
  6. Repair and when necessary replace window sashes and glazing to match the existing.
  7. Remove a handicap access ramp and a flight of steps located off the east elevation.
  8. Remove the canvas covered porte-cochere.
  9. Demolish the later rear addition.
  10. Remove the wooden pergolas located to the east of the house.
  11. Remove portions of the asphalt paving located to the east of the house.
  12. Remove a fire escape from the West Elevation.

#### Clarifications

1. What is the design of the door?
2. Will there be any landscaping installed?

#### STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the removal of later alterations, the repair & replacement of deteriorated features, and the demolition of later rear addition.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation call for physical, documentary, and pictorial evidence when removing later alterations. As documented by historical photographs, this building's monumental portico originally did not feature glazed infill. The same photograph depicts the façade's fenestration treatment. The front door's jamb moldings survive intact thereby fixing the dimension of the door and transoms. Two of the French doors that flanked the central entrance have been located. These doors will guide the replication of additional doors. Based on the physical evidence surviving on the site and archival photograph provided by the architect, Staff does not believe the removal of the porch infill and the replication of the reinstallation of façade installation will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building.

The removal of the later handicap access ramp, side steps, the porte-cochere, pergolas, fire escape, and portions of paving would recapture additional historical integrity and improve the streetscape. Staff does not believe the removal of these later features will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

The house's original single story kitchen is engulfed by a later rear addition. The addition was heavily damaged in a recent fire. Applications calling for partial demolition of a contributing building entail consideration of the following factors: the architectural significance of the building, the architectural significance of the area to be demolished; the physical condition of the area to be demolished; the affect the demolition would have on the rest of the building; the affect of the demolition on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment. The later two-story addition is not of the same architectural caliber as the historic building. The fire-damaged area extends around two sides and over the building's original kitchen. Said addition detracts from the historical integrity of the side and rear elevations.

On account of the location and configuration of the later rear addition, the presence of any surviving components and treatments of the rear elevation remains unknown. If granted partial demolition approval, the removal of rear addition would proceed so the applicant's representative can determine what survives of the rear elevation. Upon ascertaining more information regarding the fabric, configuration, and treatment of the subject area, the project would reappear before the Board. Staff does not believe the proposed demolition will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-3) and C (1-4), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application, but reminds the owners that the original portion of the kitchen wing should be preserved until renovation plans are submitted.

#### **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 Mr. Kearley if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Kearley answered no. He told the Board that pictures of the house dating from the 1960s had been located, but he had not examined them. Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any comments to make or questions to ask.

Ms. Harden asked Mr. Kearley to clarify exactly what portion of the rear of the building would be demolished. Mr. Kearley addressed Ms. Harden's concerns.

Ms. Baker and Mr. Ladd complimented spoke in favor of the project. They noted that the undergrowth obscuring the building and trash located around the property had already been removed.

Mr. Karwinski said that he had several questions to ask the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Kearley about the area labeled solarium in the plans. Mr. Kearley told the Board that solarium was a later alteration that might be removed at a later date. Mr. Karwinski noted that neither does the proposed façade drawing depict nor does the Staff Report mention the existing handrails. Mr. Kearley told the Board that the later handrails would not be reused.

Mr. Karwinski referenced chain link fencing and other site features located to the rear and side of the house. Mr. Kearley addressed Mr. Karwinski concerns. He explained that the scope of work appearing before the Board was the first phase of the larger revitalization effort. This first phased addresses the house. Fencing and paving would be addressed at a later date.

Mr. Karwinski asked for clarification regarding the proposed treatment of original kitchen's second story. He said that windows were depicted in the second floor plan. Mr. Kearley explained the evolution of the kitchen's upper story. He told the Board that a sleeping porch was constructed atop the flat-roofed kitchen wing at an early date. Mr. Kearley stated that much fabric was lost during a recent fire and exploratory demolition would determine what still remained. He said that plans for the rear elevation would come to the Board after the later rear addition was removed and surviving fabric exposed.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, he closed the period of public comment. Mr. Ladd asked if any other Board members had any comments to make or questions to ask Mr. Kearley. No comments or questions ensued.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to include the removal of the later railing from the front steps.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/21/12**



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

**2011-63-CA:**           **10 South Ann Street**  
**Applicant:**           **Caldwell Whistler**  
**Received:**           **8/26/11**  
**Meeting:**             **9/21/11**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District:       Old Dauphin Way  
Classification:        Contributing  
Zoning:                 R-1  
Project:                Partial Demolition Request ó Demolish the later rear portion of contributing residence.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

Staff files date this single-story residence to 1896. The building does not appear in the 1904 Sanborn Map. It is possible that the gabled surmounted northern wing is a vehicular shed shown in the 1904 image, but the possibility is doubtful at best. The footprint of the older portion of the present building is present on the 1955 Sanborn Map. A rear addition was constructed in the 1970s.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states óthe Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the changeí 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 districtí ö

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The owner/applicants propose the demolition of a non-conforming rear addition to the contributing residence.
- B. The regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: öProposed 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.ö 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. Staff files date this single story cottage to 1896. The 1904 Sanborn Map does not depict a structure matching the footprint of the older portion of the existing building. It is possible that a vehicular shed identified on the 1904 Sanborn comprises the house's northern wing. The house's massing and siding lead Staff to suggest a 1930s or 1950s construction

- date. The later 1970s rear addition to the house is not of same design caliber and structural quality as the main house.
- ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
    1. Setback from the street and located behind two late 19<sup>th</sup>-Century houses, the house in question is part of larger familial compound, one of the few remaining in the historic districts. The demolition of the house's rear wing would not adversely affect the historic integrity of the building, complex, and the surrounding 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. Later unsympathetic additions of this type were commonly constructed to the rear of historic residences during the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century.
  - 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 applicants would demolish the house's 1970s rear addition and rebuild the western wall.
  - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
    1. The property was inherited by the owner/applicants.
  - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
    1. The property owner/applicants are demolishing only a portion of the building. The main residence will remain intact.
  - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
    1. The property has not been listed for sale.
  - 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. NA.
  - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
    1. NA.
  - 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; and
    1. Application submitted.
  - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the Board.
    1. See submitted materials.
3. *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.ö

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

1. Demolish the later addition located the rear of the contributing building.

2. Said addition is to the west of the north/south gable and to the south of the east/west gable.
3. Reconstruct those portions of the main house's South Elevation and West Elevations that were covered by the addition.
4. The walls will be faced in wooden siding.
5. The small portion of re-exposed South Elevation will feature a six-over-six wooden window.
6. The re-exposed West Elevation will feature a pair of six-over-six windows (matching the existing) and a sixteen light window.
7. The eaves will be boxed like those found on the façade.
8. The work will be painted to match the existing color scheme.

## **REQUESTS/CLARIFICATIONS**

1. Provide existing and reconfigured plan drawings.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the demolition of a later addition to a contributing dwelling. Partial demolition applications entail consideration of the following factors: the architectural significance of the building, the architectural significance of the area to be demolished; the physical condition of the area to be demolished; the affect the demolition would have on the rest of the building; the affect of the demolition on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

The exact date of construction of this contributing dwelling is unknown. Staff files record an 1896 construction date. Sanborn Maps do not corroborate such an early date. It is possible that the northern wing of the building dates around the turn of the century, but this seems unlikely given that the location of the northern wing does not exactly accord with placement on outbuilding depicted in earlier maps. The body of the main house is sheathed in siding installed sometime from the 1930s to 1950s. The siding and massing lead Staff to date the house's construction from the 1920s to the 1950s. The house's later addition cannot be seen from the public right of way. Said addition is neither of the same construction nor design quality as the existing house. The roof has collapsed and the walls have buckled. The location and placement of windows conforms to an earlier interior layout. The house currently features asbestos siding. The wooding siding proposed for the affected area will differentiate the old and the new work while simultaneously blending with the historic context.

Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building, complex, or district.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Caldwell Whistler was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Whistler if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Whistler explained to the Board that he and his wife had

inherited this house along with houses located to the north and south of the subject property. He stated that their time and efforts had previously been engaged with the care of elderly relations residing therein, not on the buildings themselves. Mr. Whistler told the Board that he and his wife were now turning their attentions to the buildings. Mr. Ladd applauded Mr. Whistler for moving forward. He asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask or comments to make.

Mr. Karwinski questioned the appropriateness of the submitted drawings. He said that corner boards were not depicted on the proposed elevations and the window placement was awkward.

Mr. Roberts asked for clarification as to the Staff Recommendation. Discussion ensued as to what was to be demolished. Mr. Blackwell clarified what portion of the rear elevation would be removed.

Mr. Whistler explained to the Board the evolution of the rear elevation. He said that an addition was made in the 1960s. A second addition was constructed in the 1970s. By removing these derelict accretions the house would be returned to its footprint. Addressing the proposed fenestration he said it reflected to the best of his knowledge the original configuration of openings.

Mr. Karwinski suggested that demolition of the collapsed rear alterations be allowed to proceed. He noted the condition and quality of the addition, as well as its location. Mr. Karwinski said that Staff could work with the applicant regarding the fenestration and detailing of the reclaimed rear wall.

#### **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Robert 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 allow the demolition conditional on Staff approval of the fenestration and detailing of the rear elevation.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

#### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/21/12**

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

**2011-64-CA:** 155 South Monterey Street  
**Applicant:** Eric and Kim Boone  
**Received:** 9/2/11  
**Meeting:** 9/21/11

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Rehabilitation and New Construction - Install a façade dormer, construct a rear addition, install siding, and paint the house.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This hipped roof bungalow once featured a full length gallery. In its original form, the house resembled numerous other high end bungalows located throughout the confines of the present day Old Dauphin Way Historic District.

**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 owner/applicants propose the removal of a façade dormer, the construction of new façade dormer, the installation of siding, and the construction of a small rear addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained.
  - 2. “The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period.”
  - 3. “Where windows cannot be replaced, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Remove the façade’s dormer
  - 2. Construct a new dormer
    - a. The centrally placed dormer will measure 10’ in length and 5’ in height. (The existing dormer is 6’ in length and 4’ in height.).
    - b. The dormer will be 12’ deep.
    - c. The dormer’s hipped roof will be located below the apex of the house’s gabled roof.
    - d. The dormer will feature wooden siding matching that found on the main house.
    - e. The dormer will feature three one-over-one wooden windows.

- f. The roofing shingles will match those found elsewhere on the building.
2. Face the walls of the infilled portion of the front porch with wooden siding to match that found elsewhere on the house.
3. Construct a rear addition.
  - a. The addition will both infill and extend from a rear porch.
  - b. Said addition will square out the northeast corner of the house.
  - c. The addition will rest atop brick foundation piers of the same height as those supporting the body of the house.
  - d. The addition's northern wall will measure 9' in length.
  - e. The addition's rear or east wall will measure 14' in length.
  - f. The addition's wall will be faced with wooden siding matching that found on the body of the house.
  - g. The addition's east (rear) elevation will feature a bank of three one-over-one windows matching the rear elevation's other window fenestration as well as a single glazed and paneled wooden door. A flight of wooden steps will access the door.
  - h. The addition's roof will continue the same downward and be in plan with the southeast section of the rear elevation's roof.
  - i. The addition will feature the same rafter and eave treatment as that employed elsewhere on the rear elevation.
  - j. The addition's roofing shingles will match the existing.
4. Paint the house per the submitted Glidden color scheme.
  - a. The body will be Pinwheel.
  - b. The trim and decorative details will be High-Hiding.
  - c. The porch decking will be Garden Path.
  - d. Other details will be Garden Path.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the removal of a façade dormer, the construction of a new dormer, the installation of siding, the construction of a rear addition, and the painting of the house.

This single story bungalow has undergone numerous alterations. That said the roof form and features remain intact. The hipped roof is one of the characters defining features of the house. The façade's dormer survives intact. While the proposed new dormer would be based upon design of and utilization of the same materials as the existing dormer, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that original roof forms should be maintained. The proposed dormer would be larger than the existing thus altering the proportion and massing of the building. On account of the intact condition and prominent location of the dormer, Staff believes the removal of the original dormer and its replacement with a larger dormer would impair the architectural and historical integrity of the building.

The front porch was infilled during the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. The walls of the infill are faced with plywood-like siding. Batten-like strips cover the vertical junctures. The applicant's propose facing the walls of the porch infill with wooden siding. The plywood would be removed. The siding would match that employed on the body of the house with regard to both profile and dimension. It would be installed in such a manner as to be in plane with and not project beyond the main house's siding. As long as the easternmost corner boards remain in situ thereby allowing the infill to read as a later alteration, Staff does not believe the installation of wooden siding will impair the architectural or historical integrity of the building, but on account of the quality of the drawings Staff cannot recommend approval of the work for reason of lack of information.

The rear elevation of this inner block property is not visible from the street. The southeast corner of the rear elevation takes the form of slightly projecting ell. This ell was a later addition. The applicants propose squaring out rear elevation through the construction of a northeast addition. The addition would feature foundation, siding, window, and roofing treatments that would match the existing. The roof would continue the downward pitch established by the southeast corner ell. Staff does not believe rear addition would impair the architectural or the historical interiority of the building, but on account of the quality of the submitted drawings cannot recommend approval of the work for reason of lack of information.

The proposed color scheme, while not objectionable, is not appropriate for an Arts and Crafts-influenced house. Staff does not recommend approval of the color scheme.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1), Staff believes both the removal of the dormer and painting per the submitted would impair the architectural and historical character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of the aforementioned portion of the scope of work.

Based on B (2-3), Staff does not believe the installation of wood siding on the porch infill and the construction of a rear addition will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district, but does not recommend approval of the aforementioned work for reason of lack of information.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Kim Boone was present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Ms. Boone if she had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Ms. Boone replied by saying that she had a lot to add. She told the Board that she and her family had lived in the house for seven years. Ms. Boone stated that she was appearing before the Board to determine what she can and cannot do.

Referencing the Staff Report, Mr. Ladd raised the subject of the proposed dormer. Ms. Boone told the Board that the installation of a dormer was her number one priority. She said if could not install the dormer she and her family would likely sell the house because of the need of additional living space. Mr. Karwinski suggested to Ms. Boone that she consider a rear dormer. Ms. Boone stated that the stairs are located at the rear of the house. She said that she had meet with a draftsman regarding plans.

Ms. Baker asked for clarification regarding the proposed work.

Mr. Karwinski asked Ms. Boone if she had considered removing the later porch infill. Ms. Boone answered no.

Ms. Boone explained to the Board that the phases of her proposal as follows: the repair & replacement of woodwork and the installation of siding; the construction of a new dormer; and the squaring off of the rear elevation.

Ms. Harden asked Ms. Boone if she had considered constructing a dormer on one of the side elevations. She told Ms. Boone and her fellow Board members that in years of experience solutions of this type

allowed for continuity usability without the sacrifice of historic integrity. Ms. Boone said that she was not inclined to construct a side dormer on account of personal reasons.

Mr. Roberts asked Staff to explain why the proposed color scheme was appearing before the Board. Mr. Bemis explained that Staff cannot refuse a submitted color scheme. He told the Board that they can encourage applicants to consider alternatives. Mr. Bemis stated that the colors were not appropriate for the style and the period of the house. Mr. Oswalt consulted the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. He stated that the Guidelines suggest the use of colors appropriate to the style and period of the house. Ms. Boone told the Board that the colors she had selected were not objectionable. She distributed to the Board photographs of buildings with wall colors of similar hue as she proposed for her home.

Mr. Karwinski redirected the conversation. He said that the main problem was the quality of the drawings. Regardless of how it was rendered, Mr. Bemis said that the removal of the original dormer would alter the integrity of the house. Ms. Boone told the Board that she would not proceed with any of the proposed work without approval of a new dormer. She said the proposed dormer was not out of scope for the period. Ms. Boone told the Board that she had modeled it on nearby examples. Mr. Bemis reiterated that alteration of the facade's dormer would impair the architectural and historical integrity of the house. Addressing the Board and Ms. Boone, Mr. Bemis explained that the Board has prioritized the preservation of building facades. He suggested that Ms. Boone reconsider the placement of a new dormer. Ms. Bemis suggested to Ms. Boone that she take advantage of other proposed work to relocate the previously mentioned stair so to relocate a possible new dormer to the rear elevation.

Returning the discussion to the proposed color scheme, Mr. Roberts stated that while the selected palette was nice it was not appropriate to the period. Speaking for the application as a whole, Ms. Boone stated that it is not always possible in today's world to maintain the whole of building's integrity. Mr. Roberts concurred, but reminded Ms. Boone of the impact of the proposed work on the building and the surrounding district.

If a good design was developed, Mr. Karwinski said that personally he did think the alteration of the dormer would impair the building. He said that the infilled porch was a larger source of impairment. Mr. Wagoner pointed out that the existing infill was not a part of the current application. Mr. Karwinski and Mr. Roberts entered into a discussion concerning the possibility of altering the dormer. Mr. Roberts stated that if approved it would set a bad precedent. Mr. Bemis addressed the Board. He said that the subject application should stand on its own. He reminded the Board that it was their obligation to determine whether or not an application impairs or does not impair a historic building and/or a district. Mr. Bemis told the Board that personal opinion should not enter into assessment. He stated that as Board members their task was to maintain the historical and architectural character of Mobile's historic districts.

Ms. Harden stated that aside from the issue of removing an original building feature, the proposed replacement did not look to the subject building's proportion and detail. She noted that a new dormer in another alternative location should take into account the building's character and treatment. Ms. Harden recommended to Ms. Boone that she reconsider the addition of side or rear dormer instead of altering the facade by removal and replacement of the facade's dormer. Mr. Ladd recommended to Ms. Boone that her draftsman meet with some of the Board members to find a working solution.

Ms. Boone told the Board that she neither wanted to jeopardize the integrity of her home nor move from it. She said that she and her family simply required more living space.

The Board's discussion returned to the proposed color scheme. Mr. Bemis reiterated that Staff cannot deny colors. Ms. Boone told both the Board and Staff that the proposed color palette was her personal



choice. The Guidelines were consulted. Mr. Roberts noted that the Guidelines suggested, but did not mandate the use of period appropriate colors. He said the colors were not of the period, but were still pleasing. Mr. Bemis said the impact of any proposed changes to a building also impact the neighborhood. He told the Board that they should take into account the surrounding district.

Mr. Roberts suggested to Ms. Boone that she have her draftsman revise the plans so to preserve the façade's dormer.

A discussion of whether to table, deny, or approve portions of the application ensued. Mr. Baker urged for clarity. She stated that Ms. Boone had been straightforward with the Board and that the Board should act and rule in a similar manner.

### **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 on account of lack of information.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/21/12**