

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
September 21, 2016 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes III, Harris Oswalt, Robert Allen, and Jim Wagoner
Members Absent: Catarina Echols, Kim Harden, Bradford Ladd, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, and Robert Brown.
Staff Members Present: Cartledge W. Blackwell and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Holmes moved to approve the minutes for the September 7th meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.
3. Mr. Wagoner moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant:** William S. Hanes
 - A. Property Address: 1056 Elmira Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 8/31/2016
 - C. Project: Repair foundation piers with the appropriate mortar composition. Repair and when necessary replace wooden siding to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Remove a later replacement door. Install either glazed and paneled wooden door or a paneled wooden door. Reinstate square section wood porch posts. Remove later aluminum jalousie windows. Install six-over-six wooden, aluminum clad wood, or extruded aluminum windows.
2. **Applicant:** David McConnell
 - A. Property Address: 150-164 Government Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 9/1/2016
 - c. Project: Repair a window/door unit opening onto the second-story gallery.
3. **Applicant:** Joanna Wilson
 - A. Property Address: 11 North Monterey Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 9/1/2016
 - C. Project: Reroof house in asphalt shingles.
4. **Applicant:** Benjamin Ross
 - A. Property Address: 450 Charles Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 9/1/2016
 - C. Project: Repair/replace siding to match, replace window glass within existing frames, repair columns per existing, whitewash and replace electric service.
5. **Applicant:** Jeff Davis
 - A. Property Address: 314 S. Monterey Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 9/6/2016
 - C. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood to match existing, repaint exterior, replace concrete steps with wood.
6. **Applicant:** Contractors of Today
 - A. Property Address: 206 Roper Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 9/8/2016
 - C. Project: Patch the roof to match existing.

7. **Applicant:** Suzanne Montgomery
 - A. Property Address: 1411 Government Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 9/8/2016
 - c. Project: Construct a 10 by 12 foot cedar garden shed, with gable roof.
8. **Applicant:** Gaillard Teague of Teague Construction Systems
 - A. Property Address: 1506 Dauphin Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 9/9/2016
 - C. Project: Reroof with asphalt shingles to match existing.
9. **Applicant:** Diversified Roofing Services
 - A. Property Address: 205 George Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 9/9/2016
 - C. Project: Low slope membrane roof in black for rear addition 1:12 slope.
10. **Applicant:** Sp+
 - A. Property Address: 203 Church Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 9/9/2016
 - C. Project: Repainting exterior of building in gray with black trim. Install awnings. .
11. **Applicant:** Stewart and Whatley Builders
 - A. Property Address: 37 Blacklawn
 - B. Date of Approval: 9/9/2016
 - C. Project: Install 6' dogeared wooden fence beginning behind front plane of porch line at North perimeter of lot turning at West perimeter at lot and turning again at south perimeter at lot until it ends behind façade line of garage structure..
12. **Applicant:** Lacey Sovik
 - A. Property Address: 113 S. Dearborn
 - B. Date of Approval: 9/9/2016
 - c. Project: Install cast iron drive gate towards rear of house.
13. **Applicant:** Reginald Washington
 - A. Property Address: 360 Dauphin Street
 - B. Date of Approval: 9/9/2016
 - C. Project: Mount/hang (1) 4' x 6' temporary sign and (1) 4' x 8' temporary sign on iron fence above ground level. Signs will be taken down after six months or new permit will be reissued.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2016-22-CA: 360 Dauphin Street**
 - A. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley on behalf of Reginald Washington for Southern National
 - B. Project: Downtown Commercial Rehabilitation: Contributing and Non- Contributing Downtown Commercial Renovation: Fencing Changes, Façade Wall Reconstruction & Reroofing, and Rear Exterior Service Court Related.
2. **2016-23-CA: 611 Dauphin Street**
 - A. Applicant: Robert Maurin on behalf of Charles Morgan III
 - B. Project: Downtown Commercial Rehabilitation - Replace an existing non-contributing metal storefront with reclaimed wood windows and doors to match work approved on an adjacent storefront.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion
2. Amish Woodworks, Trey Lee

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2016-22-CA: 360 Dauphin Street

Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley on behalf of Reginald Washington for Southern National

Received: 9/6/2016

Meeting: 9/21/2016

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: T5.1

Project: Downtown Commercial Rehabilitation: Fencing Changes, Façade Wall Reconstruction & Reroofing, and Rear Exterior Service Court Related.

BUILDING HISTORY

360 Dauphin Street dates from 1919. This three-story brick building was one of the first buildings constructed on Dauphin Street after World War I. The building replaced two 19th-Century brick buildings. With regard to materials and articulation, the facade bears a strong resemblance to 457 Dauphin Street and 259 St. Francis Street, both designs of Mobile architect C.L. Hutchisson, Sr. A fire claimed the interior of the building in the late 1980's. The lower floor and basement were rehabilitated. In 2015, rehabilitation on the two upper floors began and said work was completed during August of the calendar year. The single-story storefront to west of the main building dates from the 1930s.

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 October 21, 2015. At that time, an application calling for the installation of fenestration and replacement of railings was approved. The aforementioned work allowed for the reconstruction of upper-story living space within the long vacated two upper stories of the prominently situated buildings. The application up for review calls for the rehabilitation of the ground floor commercial for purposes of new restaurant.

- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
1. “Preserve and repair an original detail or ornamentation on a historic commercial building.”
 2. “Incorporate traditional façade elements in a new commercial structure.”
 3. “Use building materials that are compatible with the surrounding context.”
 4. “Use building elements that are of a similar profile and durability to those seen on historic buildings in the district.”
 5. “Use wooden and metal awnings if there is evidence that this awning type was used historically.”
 6. “Install an awning to fit the opening.”
 7. With regard to door and window materials, “wood” is listed as acceptable material selection.
 8. “Cement or fiber board siding” is authorized for new construction.

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

- 1. 360 Dauphin Part A: Remove, modify, and reinstate existing iron fencing which encloses an outdoor entry and dining area accessing the three-story eastern portion of the complex.**
 - A. Remove three existing iron gates and fencing.
 - B. Modify existing iron gates and fencing to be 42” in height
 - C. Return modified iron gates and fence to same plane which they previously occupied.
 - D. Mount 6” in height cast aluminum stud mounted address letters on western portion of aforementioned elevation.
 - E. Instate wooden pilaster-like piers against the southern wall of the entry and dining courtyard.
- 2. 360 Dauphin Part B: Rehabilitate the storefront fronting the single-storied western portion of the complex and reconstruct the roof over the same.**
 - A. Remove iron fencing occupying the space formerly occupied by lost fenestration.
 - B. Install a traditional storefront sequence of fenestrated bays.
 1. A centrally located glazed and paneled wooden door will be employed.
 2. Flanking the aforementioned door will be traditional paneled wooden bulkheads.
 3. Over the bulkheads (and door) will be traditional display-like windows and surmounting transoms.
 4. A six foot deep pre-finished aluminum canopy will hang over said transom.
 5. Prefinished downspouts will flank the fenestrated bays.
 6. Install a flat membrane roof over the one story shell of a building (Courtyard). See B-4.
- 3. 360 Dauphin Part C: Reconfigure an existing rear service area of the main building.**
 - A. Remove later fenestration from an interior court.
 - B. The aforementioned fenestration dates from the 1980s.
 - C. Reinstall said fenestration on building’s West Elevation. See B-4.
 - D. Extend and rearrange existing walls of this altered service area.
 - E. Install a metal entry door allowing access to and from this interior service area.
- 4. 360 Dauphin Part D: Alter fenestration on what was historically an interior party wall between two separate buildings (continually mentioned three-story and one-story portions of this now larger complex), make improvements to the courtyard space occupying that portion of the larger site, and divide the current courtyard space into separate dining & service areas.**
 - A. Remove existing doors and infill as necessary.
 - B. The aforementioned constructions and installations date from the 1980s and after.

- C. Install new 3'0" x 6'8" insulated galvanized metal door and frame at the northernmost portion of the former party wall.
- D. Install two glazed and paneled wood doors with a single sidelight to one side (See B-3.).
- E. Patch with salvaged brick to match the existing.
- F. Relocate a gas meter south of the new metal door.
- G. Existing water lines will remain South of the gas meter's new location.
- H. A new electrical box shall be located adjacent to the water lines.
- I. Situate 8" x 8" wood columns equidistantly about the perimeter of the courtyard walls.
- J. Construct a wooden enclosure for a walk in cooler that will divide the current courtyard into dining and service areas. The wall will be constructed of hardiboard. See the below.
- K. Instate a single door connecting the new service court with the existing service court. See B-3.
- L. Install new mechanical and other functionally informed devices.
- M. Remove and replace existing wooden gates and accessing the new service are from the rear parking area.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the final fitting of a sequence of vacated ground floor commercial spaces. When viewed from the street, the building is defined by a three-story main structure to the East and a single-story structure to the west. The four part application up for review entails the following:

- A.) Removal, Modification, and Reinstatement of Iron Fencing within Front Entrance and Dining Areas that front the Three-Story Eastern Portion of the Complex.
- B.) Rehabilitation of the Façade and Reroofing of the Single-Story Western Portion of the Complex.
- C.) Reconfiguration of the Existing Service Area located behind the Three-Story Eastern Portion of the Building.
- D.) Reconfigure the Courtyard Space of the Single-Story Western Portion of the Complex into Service and Rear Courtyards and Alter Fenestration and Locations Informing the Same.

While the intention is to fully reroof the single-story western portion of the complex, this application is written with the intent of embracing a possible phased approach if the roof should not be constructed in the immediate future.

The first part of the application involves the removal of an existing iron fence, modification of its height to 42", and returning the aforementioned fencing components (and a gate) to same plane which they previously occupied, minus several entrances so as to separate dining and entry spaces. While the Design Review Guidelines do not specifically address a unique instance such as this, the height and material of the fencing does meet height requirements.

The second part of the application calls for the rehabilitation of the façade of the western single-story portion of the complex and the reconstruction of a roof over the same. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the design employs traditional storefront façade features such as bulkhead, large glass windows, and glass transoms in the updated storefront design (See B-2.). The original brickwork will be preserved (See B-1.). The overall materials, profiles, and design are responsive to the appearance and quality of nearby historic example (See B 3-4.). The façade bears evidence of an

earlier awning. The metal awning is based on historic awnings such as those located at 612 and 656-662 Dauphin Street (as well as the Buick Building on St. Louis Street). Such an awning would have fronted this building. The historically informed design will be so constructed as to work with proportions of the building (See B 5-6.). The flattened roof will not be visible from the public view as the parapet wall will obscure.

The third part of this application involves alterations to a 1980s fenestration and reconfiguration of an existing service area located off the Rear Elevation of three-story portion of complex. Minus the extension and alteration of a small portion of a wall, this portion of the project will be minimally visible from the public view. The work shall be treated to match the existing finishes. The door type selected is one commonly approved for rear service entrances.

The fourth and final part of this application concerns the alteration of fenestration on a party wall that formerly separated the three-story and single-story portions of the building and the creation of separate dining and service courts. It should be noted that this application is written so as to allow the continuation of this project if the area should not be roofed in the immediate future. If the area is roofed, the dining court will return to being interior space and consequently outside of historical jurisdiction. Both courtyards will not be visible from the public view (The will dining court will only be seen through windows and service blocked by existing gates that will be replaced to match). Regardless of the weather the space is immediately reroofed, wooden windows and doors are listed as acceptable by the Design Review Guidelines, as is cement or fiber siding for new wall surfaces (See B 7-8.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on (B 1-8), staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural and historical character of the building or the district. Pending final review and approval by the Downtown Development District's (DDD) Certified Review Committee (CRC), Staff recommends approval of this application in full. Staff also requests final review and clarification of the fencing design for reason of facilitating the approval of the project in a timely manner.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley and Mr. Reginald Washington were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswald asked the applicant's representative if he had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address. Mr. Kearley answered no.

Mr. Wagoner asked if the courtyard would transform into an interior space. Mr. Kearley replied yes.

Mr. Allen asked what elements would be visible behind the lowered iron fence. Mr. Kearley explained there would be patio dining located behind the iron fence. Mr. Wagoner compared the fence to that of local dining establishment Spot of Tea. Mr. Kearley confirmed the aforementioned reference. He further explained the exact design is to be determined.

Mr. Oswald turned the discussion to the audience. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Oswald closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/21/2017

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2016--CA: 611 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Mr. Robert Maurin on behalf of Mr. Charles Morgan III
Received: 9/7/2016
Meeting: 9/21/2016

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.1
Project: Downtown Commercial Rehabilitation - Replace an existing non-contributing metal storefront with reclaimed wood windows and doors to match work approved on an adjacent storefront to the east.

BUILDING HISTORY

This circa 1858 building is a contributing commercial structure located within the Lower Dauphin Commercial Historic District. The building features an altered ground floor storefront and intact upper-story fenestration.

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. According to materials this property’s MHDC vertical file, this building has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review calls for the removal a later metal storefront and the extension of a sequence of reclaimed or salvaged wood windows and doors matching those installed on the adjacent building to the east in the impacted fenestrated bays.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Historic materials that are significant shall not be removed.”
 - 2. “Preserve the key defining features of a historic commercial façade.”
 - 3. “Retain the bulkhead below the display window.”
 - 4. “Design elements to be compatible with the existing historic building and the district.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Retain a door and transom occupying the storefront’s westernmost bay.
 - 2. Retain existing bulkheads.
 - 3. Remove an existing non-original storefront occupying the storefront’s easternmost bays.
 - 4. Install a five part storefront sequence featuring a door bay flanked by window bays.

5. Install two (2) sets of reclaimed windows and shutter system will be installed to either side of entrance. Said windows and shutters will match those employed on the storefront located to the east of subject storefront.
6. Aforementioned shutters will be natural pine.
7. Install one (1) salvaged door in natural pine that will also be natural pine color between the windows. Said door will match that employed on the adjoining storefront to located to the east of the subject building.
8. Locate two (2) planters in advance of the window bays. Said planters will match those placed in advance of those of storefront to the east of the subject location.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the removal of non-original windows and doors from the ground floor storefront of on a contributing building in the Lower Dauphin Historic District and their replacement with salvaged architectural components. The same fenestration and fittings were approved and installed on the adjacent building to the East. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Guidelines, the proposed work will not damage historic fabric and key defining features of the building (See B 1-3.). The proposed installation of a salvaged door, windows, and shutters would recapture the layered nature of fenestration that once typified the bulk of Dauphin Street's building stock, most notably the 1850s architecture of the building and numerous lost examples formerly found on Dauphin, lower Government, Royal, and Water Streets (See B 1-4).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-4), Staff recommends does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district and recommends the replacement of the non-historic storefront. Pending final CRC review and approval, Staff recommends approval the application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Due to a scheduling conflict, no one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswald thanked Ms. Largue for the introduction to application.

Mr. Oswald asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions or clarifications which they would like addressed.

Mr. Allen and Mr. Wagoner asked for clarification on images for 609 and 611 Dauphin Street. Ms. Largue explained 611 Dauphin Street storefront would be receiving the same treatment of that of 609 Dauphin Street with reclaimed wood door, windows, shutters and new planter boxes.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Oswald closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mrs. Hasser 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

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/21/2016