

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
September 6, 2017 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, Robert Allen, John Ruzic, David Barr, Steve Stone, Catarina Echols, Nicholas Holmes III, and Carolyn Hasser.
Members Absent: Robert Brown and Kim Harden.
Staff Members Present: Cartledge W. Blackwell, Florence Kessler, Bridget Daniel, and Paige Largue.
2. Approval of the minutes for the August 19, 2017 meeting was held-over until the following meeting on September 20th. It was noted that while the minutes were posted, they were listed under a different name, thus causing for confusion.
3. Mr. Stone moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was approved with one in opposition, Mr. Robert Allen. Mr. Allen said that in eight months over two hundred Certificates of Appropriateness's have been issued without public notice or input.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Earl Flowers**
 - a. Property Address: 200 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/24/2017
 - c. Project: Use 2' x 3'6" metal sandwich board sign.
2. **Applicant: Bryan Lew**
 - a. Property Address: 200 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/27/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof to match in charcoal gray.
3. **Applicant: Carson and Brandy Strickland**
 - a. Property Address: 1007 Savannah Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/28/2017
 - c. Project: Replace existing portions of 6' wooden dogeared fence along eastern and southern perimeter of lot. Construct new fence to match existing continuing along southern perimeter of lot and on southernmost portion of western perimeter of lot not exceed front plane of house.

- 4. Applicant: Carson and Brandy Strickland**
 - a. Property Address: 355 Chatham Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/28/2017
 - c. Project: Construct 6' wooden dogeared fence beginning at Northeast turning at the Southeast corner and running West along the south perimeter and taper off into a 3' wooden picket fence, aligning with the front plane of a neighboring residence. The picket will turn at the southwest corner and terminate at an existing fence along at the northwest corner. A section of a 6' wooden dogeared fence will be constructed between two portions of existing 6' fence along the Northern lot line. In the center of the lot construct a 3' picket fence parallel to Chatham Street.
- 5. Applicant: Virginia Brown**
 - a. Property Address: 907 Charleston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/31/2017
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood to match existing in profile, material and dimension. Repaint steps, porch decking in gray. Repaint trim in white. Repaint door in red or gray.
- 6. Applicant: Lance Carbary of Roof Doctor of Alabama for Moore Law Firm**
 - a. Property Address: 8 N. Dearborn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/01/2017
 - c. Project: Replace existing metal roof with standing seam metal roof.
- 7. Applicant: Mark Saunders**
 - a. Property Address: 106 Charles Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/02/2017
 - c. Project: Remove rotten deck located in rear. Repair and replace deteriorated wood to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Repaint to match the existing.
- 8. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley of DBK Inc. on behalf of Troy Zieman**
 - a. Property Address: 311 McDonald Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/02/2017
 - c. Project: Re-Roof the secondary roof to the side of the body of the house.
- 9. Applicant: Jay Ross**
 - a. Property Address: 955 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/03/2017
 - c. Project: Repair/ replace rotten wood to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
- 10. Applicant: Fred South of Renovations by Fred South LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 654 Monroe Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/03/2017
 - c. Project: Repair wooden newels. Replace wooden stair treads. Repair wooden balustrades to MHDC Design Guideline standards. Repair existing shutter. Repaint to match.

- 11. Applicant: Cornell Properties**
a. Property Address: 1751 Old Shell Road
b. Date of Approval: 8/04/2017
c. Project: Reroof with mechanically attached TPO.
- 12. Applicant: Johnny Armstrong on behalf of Modern Signs.**
a. Property Address: 600 Government Street
b. Date of Approval: 8/04/2017
c. Project: Install (1) sign 4'6" in height by 7' 3-5/8" in width composed of painted wood or metal on frieze of south elevation.
- 13. Applicant: Mikhaal Raheen**
a. Property Address: 1158 Texas Street
b. Date of Approval: 8/07/2017
c. Project: Repair metal roof as existing, replace rotten boards with new boards to match, repaint.
- 14. Applicant: Andrea Pennington**
a. Property Address: 25 S. Julia Street
b. Date of Approval: 8/08/2017
c. Project: Repair rear deck, replace rotten siding to match original.
- 15. Applicant: Mary Boliarakis**
a. Property Address: 310 S. Breamwood Avenue
b. Date of Approval: 8/08/2017
c. Project: Remove asbestos siding, side with Hardiplank, replace windows with vinyl clad wood, re-work existing shutters.
- 16. Applicant: Janis Pearman**
a. Property Address: 1013 Savannah Street
b. Date of Approval: 8/10/2017
c. Project: Install wood drop siding, paint, reroof with asphalt shingles, all to match existing.
- 17. Applicant: City of Mobile**
a. Property Address: 6 S. Joachim Street
b. Date of Approval: 8/11/2017
c. Project: Install cooling tower replacement not visible from street.
- 18. Applicant: Wendell Quimby**
a. Property Address: 605 Dauphin Street
b. Date of Approval: 8/11/2017
c. Project: Repaint to match existing.
- 19. Applicant: Wendell Quimby**
a. Property Address: 607 Dauphin Street
b. Date of Approval: 8/11/2017
c. Project: Repaint to match existing.
- 20. Applicant: Wendell Quimby**
a. Property Address: 609 Dauphin Street
b. Date of Approval: 8/11/2017
c. Project: Repaint to match existing.

- 21. Applicant: Wendell Quimby**
a. Property Address: 613 Dauphin Street
b. Date of Approval: 8/11/2017
c. Project: Repaint to match existing.
- 22. Applicant: Melanie Stommel**
a. Property Address: 1055 New St. Francis Street
b. Date of Approval: 8/15/2017
c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingle in approved color.
- 23. Applicant: Jessica Callahan**
a. Property Address: 951 Government Street
b. Date of Approval: 8/15/2017
c. Project: Install decals on (9) windows to cover 20% or less than window with approved colors and nomenclature. Doors will have approved perforated decals and decals with business name and store hours.
- 24. Applicant: Yves Gorat and Melanie Stommel**
a. Property Address: 1055 New St. Francis Street
b. Date of Approval: 8/15/2017
c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in approved color.
- 25. Applicant: Pat Ghouison**
a. Property Address: 1122 Montauk Avenue
b. Date of Approval: 8/16/2017
c. Project: Reroof with desert brown asphalt singles; repair rafter tails; repair/ replace rotten wood to match original; and repaint house.
- 26. Applicant: Karen Wilson with Lemongrass Custom Home and Design Inc. on behalf of Paul Seghers**
a. Property Address: 101 S. Lafayette Street
b. Date of Approval: 8/17/2017
c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in black or gray.
- 27. Applicant: Chris Cole with Signarama**
a. Property Address: 1616 Government Street Suite 105 and 107
b. Date of Approval: 8/18/2017
c. Project: Install individual metal composite letters spelling "Metro PCS" to be roughly 3' by 19' overall. Letters will be either backlit or have gooseneck lighting.
- 28. Applicant: Kirsten Loper**
a. Property Address: 1306 Government Street
b. Date of Approval: 8/18/2017
c. Project: Install one upper building sign to be painted metal with logo and two lines of text that say "Mobile Academy of Music".
- 29. Applicant: Kenbow Contractors**
a. Property Address: 1458 Brown Street
b. Date of Approval: 8/21/2017
c. Project: Reroof to match existing.

30. Applicant: Myrah Clemens

- a. Property Address: 57 N. Ann Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/23/2017
- c. Project: Repair and replace when necessary deteriorated wood to match existing in dimension, profile and material. Repair wooden windows and replace broken glass panes to match. Repair damaged deck in rear of house. Paint to match existing.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2017-38-CA: 206 State Street

- a. Applicant: Robert Maurin of Maurin Architecture on behalf of State Street Land, LLC
- b. Project: Overall Rehabilitation & Alterations to Secondary Elevation – Conduct in-kind repairs; alter of fenestration.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2017-39-CA: 1416 Brown Street

- a. Applicant: James N. Christiansen
- b. Project: Demolition and New Ancillary Construction Related in the Ancillary Realm - Demolish an existing ancillary building; Construct a new two-story garage with connector to main dwelling.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2017-40-CA: 1013 Caroline Avenue

- a. Applicant: Gary Jackson with City of Mobile, Municipal Enforcement
- b. Project: Demolition-Demolish an extremely deteriorated residence.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2017-41-CA: 1017 Caroline Avenue

- a. Applicant: Gary Jackson with City of Mobile, Municipal Enforcement
- b. Project: Demolition - Demolish a deteriorated non-contributing building.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

5. 2017-42-CA: 1019 Caroline Avenue

- a. Applicant: Gary Jackson with City of Mobile, Municipal Enforcement
- b. Project: Demolition - Demolish a non-contributing building.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

6. 2017-43-CA: 1012 New St. Francis Street

- a. Applicant: City of Mobile Municipal Enforcement, Gary Jackson
- b. Project: Demolition - Demolish a contributing building.

WITHDRAWN.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. The next meeting of the ARB will be held on September 20th, 2017 in the Multi-Purpose Room of Government Plaza.
2. Mr. Allen recounted that on August 1st, 2017 the ARB received an email on a property at 1017 Old Shell Road which had been reviewed by the Board for unacceptable windows installed without issuance of a COA. The ARB had rendered the decision for the original windows, which were on site, to be reinstalled. He further explained that the owner had not completed the appeal process and a Municipal Offense ticket was issued and a several court appearances followed.

Mr. Allen then stated he received an email from Jarrod White, a board member of Restore Mobile, in which Mr. White explained at the trial on August 2nd the City attorney stopped the court proceedings without citation. Mr. White followed up with the City attorney who then stated the case would not be pursued in criminal or civil court.

Mr. Allen questioned how to proceed with enforcing ARB regulations. Mr. Blackwell replied that legal counsel would be present to explain the action in an upcoming meeting.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-38-CA: 206 State Street

Applicant: Robert Maurin of Maurin Architecture on behalf of State Street Land, LLC

Received: 8/18/2017

Meeting: 9/6/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: T4

Project: Overall Rehabilitation & Alterations to Secondary Elevation – Conduct in-kind repairs; alter of fenestration.

BUILDING HISTORY

Originally constructed as a chapel in 1927, this two-story masonry structure recently served as part of the Mobile Waterfront Rescue Mission complex.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board in recent years. The application up for review calls for the rehabilitation of the building as whole and alterations to secondary elevations.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “If replacement of a historic element is required, replace the historic element in kind, or with a product that is similar in visual character and durability to the original.”
 - 2. “Replace exterior finishes to match original in profile, dimension and materials.”
 - 3. “Maintain the original position and proportions of a historically significant door.”
 - 4. “Replacements (door) should reflect the age and style of the building.”
 - 5. “Materials that are same to the original or that appear similar in texture and finish to the original is acceptable (if known). These often include: wood panel, wood panel with glass lights, leaded glass with lead comes, metal with a painted finish, other materials original to the building.”

6. “Where historic windows (wooden or metal) are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair then to match the existing as per location, light and configuration, detail and material.”
7. “In instances where there is a request to replace a building’s windows, the new windows shall match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration.”
8. “Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture, profile and finish to the original are acceptable. These often include: wood sash; steel, if original to structure; custom extruded aluminum; aluminum clad wood; windows approved by the National Park Service.
9. Regarding on secondary elevations, “Preservation is still preferred but additional flexibility exists for compatible replacement or alteration.”
10. Regarding alterations on secondary elevations, “More flexibility in treatment may be considered, especially for compatible replacement or alteration that is not visible from the street.”
11. “Position communications equipment to be hidden or minimally visible from public streets (including both streets on corner lots).”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Conduct in-kind repairs and repaint.
 - a. Repair deteriorated masonry/stucco to match the existing in terms of composition and finish.
 - b. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match as per profile, dimension and material.
 - c. Repair or when necessary replace wooden windows or components thereof to match the existing as per light configuration, muntin profile, and material composition.
 - d. Paint the building per submitted color scheme: body, BLP Chesapeake Manor; trim or decorative features, BLP Bellingrath Green; and accent areas, Sherwin Williams Diverse Beige.
2. South (Façade) Elevation
 - a. Remove the existing (later) doors from the first-story’s center bay/main entrance.
 - b. Install a set of wood doors in a aforementioned location.
 - c. The aforementioned door bay will feature a glazed and panel wood door.
3. East (Side) Elevation
 - a. Remove HVAC units and screening.
 - b. Demolish existing (later) wood stair, platform, and awning.
 - c. Convert a window bay into a door on the first-story’s northernmost portion.
 - d. The aforementioned door will be glazed and paneled.
 - e. At said door bay, construct a masonry stair, instate a steel rail, and instate a lift.
4. North (Rear) Elevation (See also C-3-b.)
 - a. Remove a door comprising the second-story’s centermost fenestrated bay.
 - b. Install two sets of glazed and paneled doors on the second-story.
 - c. Doors will be installed equidistantly between existing windows.
 - d. Construct two steel balconies under each grouping of window and newly installed doors.

5. Remove mechanical equipment.
6. Install HVAC units/ equipment on roof of building out of or minimally visible from public view.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application for rehabilitation involves the following: repair and replacement of deteriorated elements; alteration of fenestration; construction of balconies; and removal & replacement of mechanical equipment.

With regard to in-kind repair and replacement of the existing features, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic districts state that historic stylistic and architectural details should be preserved, but note that when repair is necessary all work match in dimension, profile, and material (later in most cases) (See B 1-2). All repair and replacement related work would match the existing with respect to the qualifying criteria for material and design. Wood would match in profile, dimension, and material. Masonry would match in composition and finish. Windows would match in material composition, light configuration, and overall detail (See B 6-8.).

On the façade (South Elevation), a pair of double doors is proposed for removal and replacement. The aforementioned doors are not original to the building. In accord with Design Review Guidelines, the proposed doors are appropriate to the style and period of the building (See B 4-5.).

Additional fenestration changes are proposed for the East (side) and North (rear) Elevations. Fenestration would be altered in type (side elevation) and additional fenestration would be added (rear elevation). The Design Review Guidelines convey that while preservation is the priority, greater flexibility is allowed when a proposed change is compatible with the historic fabric (See B 9-10.). Only one of the impacted bays is visible from public view. Said East (side) Elevation fenestrated bay is the farthest back from the street. In addition to being the most distant from the street, the subject fenestration - a window - would be converted to a door. The conversion would maintain the rhythm of the current fenestration thus preserving the solid to void ratio of the pertinent elevation. A flight of stairs with rails and lift would afford access to the newly installed door. On the North (rear) Elevation, a door is proposed for infill, two additional doors are proposed for installation and later stairs are proposed for removal. The door proposed for removal is located on the second-story. Said door is accessed by the present (later stairs). The proposed doors that would be installed to either side of the exiting second-story door bay would match the designs of the doors proposed for the façade and side of the building. The doors are appropriate to the style and period of the building (See B 4-5.). Said doors would access balconies. The balconies would be a simplistic in design thus differentiated, but compatible with the building.

Existing mechanical equipment and screening would be removed. Replacement mechanical equipment would then be installed on the roof of a later addition located to the rear of the original building. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, said mechanical equipment would be so situated as to be minimally visible from the public view (See B-11).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-11), Staff does not believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application would impair the property and would impair the architectural and the historical character of the property and historic districts. While realizing the physical condition of the building, Staff encourages other means of addressing the buildings impact on the surrounding landscape other than demolition at this time. At this juncture, Staff recommends denial of the application for reasons of the architectural and historical considerations highlighted herein and articulated in the Design Review Guidelines.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Robert Maurin, the owner's representative, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

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

Upon being asked, Mr. Maurin clarified that the lift platform located off the East elevation was a wall mount type behind the stair and that no fence was located on the eastern lot line.

Mr. Ruzic asked what the spaces would be utilized as following the restoration. Mr. Maurin stated the downstairs would be a brewpub and the upstairs two apartments.

No other questions ensued from the Board.

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

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: September 7, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-39-CA: 1416 Brown Street

Applicant: James N. Christiansen

Received: 8/11/2017

Meeting: 9/6/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way

Classification: Contributing *Classification references principle residence, but not the ancillary structure informing the application.

Zoning: R-1

Project: Demolition and New Construction Related in the Ancillary Realm - Demolish existing ancillary building; Construct new two-story garage with connector to main dwelling.

BUILDING HISTORY

The one-story bungalow defining this was erected in 1915. The non-contributing ancillary located behind it building was built at a later date.

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 8, 1992. At that time, the Board approved an application for a porch addition. The application up for review calls for the demolition of a non-contributing ancillary building and the construction of a new ancillary building & connector.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. When reviewing applications calling for the demolition of ancillary structures, the following criteria are taken into account “architectural significance of the building, physical condition of the structure, impact on the street & the district, and nature of any proposed development.”
 - 2. “Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from the new.”

3. "A new accessory or ancillary structure should be compatible with those in the district."
4. "Design an accessory or ancillary structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure."
5. "Locate a new accessory or ancillary structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district. These are traditionally located at the rear of the lot."
6. "Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture and finish to the original are acceptable. These often include: wood panel; wood panel with glass lights; leaded glass with lead comes; and metal with a painted finish."
7. "Design a garage door to be simple and compatible with the primary building."

B. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Demolish an existing ancillary building.
 - a. Clear debris from site.
 - b. Install white gravel on the location as well as additional gravel for the drive.
2. Construct a new ancillary building (a garage)
 - a. The ancillary building will be setback 2'4" from the eastern lot line and 4'5" from the northern lot line.
 - b. The ancillary building (garage) will be comprised of a garage with a smaller hyphen-like connector that will engage the ancillary to the main residence.
 - c. The hyphen will be inset from the body of the main residence.
 - d. The garage will be 33'9" x 23'0" in size and will be two-stories in height.
 - e. The garage and hyphen will be at grade level.
 - f. The walls will be clad with wooden lap-siding so as to match the siding found on the body of the main residence.
 - g. Exterior will be painted to match the main dwelling.
 - h. Wooden fascia and rafter tails will match found on the on body of the principle residence.
 - i. Gable roofs will surmount both the garage and the hyphen.
 - j. The roof will be sheathed in asphalt shingles matching those found on the body of the house.
3. East (side) Elevation
 - a. The inset hyphen-like connector will not feature fenestration.
 - b. A single paneled and finished metal door will be employed on the garage.
4. North (rear) Elevation
 - a. The rear elevation will not feature fenestration.
5. West (side) Elevation
 - a. The hyphen-like connector will not feature fenestration.
 - b. Two (2) multi-panel painted metal garage door will flank one (1) six paneled and finished metal door.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a later non-contributing ancillary structure and the construction of a new ancillary (garage) and hyphen-like connector.

With regard to the removal of the existing ancillary building, the same criteria by which Board reviews the demolition of principle buildings are taken into account. According to the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the considerations taken into account are as follows: architectural significance of the building, condition of the structure, impact on the street & the district, and

nature of any proposed development (See B-1.). With regard to significance, the ancillary building is not of the same architectural importance and construction quality. Based on Sanborn Maps, the building was not constructed contemporaneously with the main building. In addition to the age, the detailing and materials caused it to not contribute to the architectural significance of the property and district. As to condition, the building is in bad state of repair. With regard to the impact on the streetscape and district, the building is located behind the main dwelling at the very rear of the lot. While building is visible, its impact on the streetscape is minimal. If authorized demolition approval, a new ancillary building and connector would be constructed. See the ensuing paragraph for the nature of the proposed redevelopment of the subject portion of the property.

The Design Review Guidelines state that new ancillary construction should be compatible with those in the district (See B-3.). New ancillary construction involves review of considerations: placement, scale, massing, façade elements, and materials so as to obtain compatibility between the new and the existing.

As to placement, the proposed new construction, a garage with hyphen-like connector, would occupy a rear portion of the lot and would be located directly behind the main house. Garages were constructed behind the front plane of residential buildings in general and for the subject property (See B-5.). The side (East) setback of the garage will be in line with the current dwelling, while the hyphen will be inset in nature. The rear setback of 4'5" feet is permissible by reason of the Historic District Overlay, a planning regulation authorizing (in certain cases) the employment of traditional setbacks within Midtown's four locally designated National Register Districts (Old Dauphin Way being one). The aforementioned taken into account, the proposed building's placement is compatible with traditional ancillary construction. Scale is crucial component of compatibility.

With regard to scale and massing, the Design Review Guidelines state that new ancillary construction should be subordinate to the main building (See B 3- 4.). The proposed building's placement behind the main residence and the employment of the intervening hyphen-like connector serve to make the building not only subordinate to, but also respectful of the historic body of the house (See B-2.). Additionally, the hyphen is lower in height and inset in placement. The aforementioned considerations allow the proposed work to "read" as a later, albeit sensitive, intervention within a historic context. On grade construction is authorized for garages. While the garage is two-story, the elevation (on grade construction), secondary use of the building, and location on the lot cause for the overall design to be compatible with the context. The height of the proposed garage, despite being two-stories, is no higher than the single-tory main residence. Many ancillary building of the period and style of the main residences construction featured two-story garage buildings.

Façade elements are crucial to compatibility of compatible ancillary construction. Box-like/rectilinear massing, gable roof forms, and matching eave treatments serve engender compatibility between the main house and the garage and hyphen. The aforementioned elements reference the existing fabric. The garage doors are compatible with the style and period of the main residence in terms of their simplicity and design (See B-7.).

With regard to materials to be employed on ancillary construction, the Design Review Guidelines allow for composite materials if said materials appear similar in texture and finish of the original (See B-6.). Wooden siding will be employed on the walls. Said siding will match that found on main residence. Roofing shingles will similarly match those surmounting the body of the house. The doors on the garage, both vehicular and pedestrian, would be metal. In accord the Design Review Guidelines for ancillary construction, said doors would be painted and finished. Additionally, said doors would be paneled so made even more traditional in appearance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-7), Staff does not believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the property or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. James Christiansen, owner, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Christiansen.

Mr. Stone asked if the door located centrally on the West elevation could be relocated, or if the garage doors be spaced further apart. Mr. Christiansen stated that originally the door had been placed at the southernmost portion, but was relocated to under the stairway since the elevation was not visible from the street.

Upon being asked Mr. Christiansen clarified for Mr. Ruzic that the hyphen between the principal dwelling and the new ancillary building would be used for storage.

No further discussion ensued.

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

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: September 7, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-40-CA: 1013 Caroline Avenue

Applicant: Gary Jackson with the City of Mobile, Municipal Enforcement

Received: 8/16/2017

Meeting: 9/6/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way

Classification: Non-Contributing

Zoning: R-1

Project: Demolition- Demolish an extremely deteriorated non-contributing building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This cinderblock building dates from the 1960s.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 10 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 City of Mobile proposes the demolition of the derelict non-contributing building.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
 - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
 - 1. This property was built in the 1960s. This building is listed as a non-contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. It holds neither architectural merit nor historical significance.
 - ii. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;

1. While the dwelling adds to the built density of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District and Caroline Avenue, it contribute to either the architectural or historical character of neighborhood or streetscape.
 - 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 or acquired.
 - iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 1. This building is not an example of a particular style and does contribute to the historic aesthetic of the neighborhood or street. It was of countless cinderblock constructions found across the western and eastern worlds.
 - 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 house would be demolished, debris would be removed, the lot would be leveled, seed would be planted, and a lien would be placed on the property.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The date the current owner acquired the property is unknown.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. The property has stood vacant for a number of years.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. To the City representative's knowledge, the property has not been put up 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. N.A.
 - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 1. N.A.
 - xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
 1. N.A.
 - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
 1. See submitted materials.
2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

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

1. Demolish a non-contributing residence.
2. Remove the debris from the site.
3. Stabilize the site.
4. Plant seed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the demolition of a deteriorated residential building which is listed as a non-contributing building in the Old Dauphin Way National Register Historic District. The property has been listed on the City of Mobile's Nuisance Abatement list. The Nuisance Abatement allows for either the City to repair/secure vacant buildings which are salvageable or remove of vacant buildings that are in such an extreme state of disrepair as to pose a life safety issue.

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

1013 Caroline Avenue is a non-contributing building located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The dwelling is not an example of any architectural typology or style.

This CMU building is in an extremely advanced state of disrepair. Conditions extend far beyond cosmetic concerns. The house is also a liability for (continued) crime.

While house contributes to the built density and rhythmic sequencing of the landscape, it does not lend to historic character or physical experience of Caroline Avenue. As an inner block dwelling, the building is only viewed from head on or an oblique angle.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be removed, site would be leveled, ground would be stabilized, and seed would be planted. Work would be done by a firm contracted by the City. A buyer would be obligated to redevelop the site in manner fully in keeping with Mobile's Historic District Guidelines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application for the demolition of the non-contributing building would impair the property or historic district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Gary Jackson, City of Mobile Municipal Enforcement, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Stone asked for legal clarification.

Mr. Blackwell telephoned Ms. Kessler (who was delayed by another meeting).

Mr. Ruzic asked if the owners of the property had been contacted. Mr. Jackson explained that the city had sent notice through certified mail, however the owner had not responded. Mr. Jackson further explained

that once City Council condemns a property another notice is sent, and then the property is demolished using city funds. He clarified that City Council had not yet condemned the property.

Mrs. Echols expressed her concern that two adjacent properties were on the ARB agenda for demolition review. She stated that if all three properties were approved for demolition a portion of the block would lose its built density. Mr. Blackwell noted the non-contributing nature of all three properties and the opportunity to reshape the revitalizing landscape via more sensitive design infill.

Mr. Jackson stated that all three properties were a concern for the Mobile Police Department due to criminal activity. Upon being queried, Mr. Blackwell noted while noted in the staff report, criminal activity is not a principle criterion when reviewing demolitions.

Mr. Stone questioned if the property was declared a nuisance, condemned by City Council, and then demolished by the City, who then would maintain the vacant lot. He went further by saying that if the current structures were listed for sale, the properties could possibly be renovated and then positively improve the landscape.

Ms. Kessler arrived.

Mr. Stone then asked Ms. Kessler if there were any other legal mechanisms in place by the city to take possession and sell the property. Ms. Kessler stated there is a mechanism expedited title action for tax delinquent properties. She further noted that a new state law had been enacted which allows the city to acquire properties which have been declared a public nuisance. Ms. Kessler explained that the municipal ordinance for the aforementioned was still be reviewed and would need to be approved by City Council.

Mr. Blackwell stated that the criterion which is most important to consider is historic significance. Mr. Allen commented the Board should consider which would be better for the landscape: dilapidated building or vacant lot which to maintain.

Mr. Ruzic stated the vacant lot would give the opportunity for a new buyer to build a dwelling that would better fit the landscape.

Mr. Stone noted previous applicants have come before the board with intentions to build in recent years; however those plans have not come into fruition.

Mr. Allen stated that the lots would not be able to be built upon until the title is quiet. Mr. Ruzic expanded upon Mr. Allen's comments by noting that the building would not be able to be purchased and rehabilitated until the tile was quieted.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment.

Mr. Jamie Betbeze shared his concern over the City of Mobile's practices involving blight remediation in respect to its emphasis on demolition instead of creative solutions. He stated that new buildings can contribute to the streetscape as well. Mr. Betbeze further explained another address on the agenda could be secured, rather than demolished, and give a potential buyer the opportunity to rehabilitate it in the future. He also expressed that the City needed to prove its legal authority to demolish structures that have been a public nuisance when they are not owned by the City. Lastly, Mr. Betbeze stated the City needed to address their environmental court procedures. Mr. Betbeze thanked Mr. Oswalt and the Board for the opportunity to speak.

Upon being queried, Mr. Blackwell clarified for Mr. Roberts that the applications before the Board were part of a larger citywide blight initiative aimed at securing or removing derelict buildings that are adversely impacting surrounding properties. Mr. Blackwell also noted that the staff reviews municipal applications according to the same standards as those coming from private individuals.

Ms. Kessler stated under the ARB ordinance a Certificate of Appropriateness must be issued for the general public. She further explained this although this is a private property; the city is asserting authority in the interest of public safety and does not need approval by the ARB to condemn a property and grant demolition with city funds. Mr. Blackwell went on to allow that Board input was important. He stated the City has in recent years not only appeared before them with applications for demolition, but held off from demolition upon not receiving approval by the Board. Mr. Blackwell said that when declarations of nuisance appear before cancel the Board's stance is relevant. He encouraged Board review for public record and noted how it has and could save properties.

Mr. Stone asked how the application differed from an application received from a private application on 8 Ann Street and was not able to proceed with the approval for demolition until the applicant, an owner, proved the other owner new and approved of the application. Mr. Blackwell reiterated Ms. Kessler's remarks and explained that this application involves the City whereas that application involved two private owners.

Mr. Stone asked if the ARB was a necessary step for the City's Municipal Enforcement Department since City Council could grant the condemnation and subsequent demolition without ARB approval. Mr. Allen commented there was an inconsistency. Ms. Kessler stated that the ARB needed to review these applications. Mr. Blackwell further explained the review of applications by the City is a courtesy that allows opportunity for significant buildings to be saved. Mr. Holmes noted that staff could speak on behalf of the Board at the hearing. Mr. Allen expressed his concern that staff may be put in a position to speak against another departments recommendation. Mr. Blackwell stated the four criteria would still be spoken for, but reiterated the benefits of Board review in advance of Council appearances.

Addressing the Board's concern, Mr. Blackwell stated that the ARB meeting was the Board's opportunity to speak in opposition or approval of a City demolition application. He further explained that the support or opposition can be relayed to City Council.

Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

No further discussion ensued.

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. Mr. Stone abstained from voting.

The motion received a second and was approved. Mr. Allen and Mrs. Echols voted in opposition.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was approved. Mr. Allen, Ms. Echols, and Mr. Stone voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: September 7, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-41-CA: 1017 Caroline Avenue
Applicant: Gary Jackson with the City of Mobile, Municipal Enforcement
Received: 8/16/2017
Meeting: 9/6/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition - Demolish a non-contributing building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story brick-veneered building is a non-contributing structure.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 10 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. The application up for review calls for the demolition of the non-contributing building.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 2. *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:
 - v. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
 - 1. This property was built circa 1970. This two-story brick veneer building is listed as a non-contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. Said building possesses neither architectural nor historical significance.
 - vi. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. Though the building adds to the built density of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District and Caroline Avenue, it does not contribute to the historical and architectural character of either the surrounding district or the immediate streetscape.

- vii. 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 or acquired.
 - viii. 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. . The brick-veneered structure is example of a vein of ubiquitous mid Post World War construction. It is neither an example of a particular style nor does it contribute to the historic aesthetic of the neighborhood or street
 - vi. 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 house would be demolished, debris would be removed, the lot would be leveled, seed would be planted, and a lien would be placed on the property.
 - vii. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. The date the current owner acquired the property was not provided.
 - viii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. The property has stood vacant for a number of years.
 - ix. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The property has not been listed for sale to the City’s knowledge.
 - 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. N.A.
 - xi. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. N.A.
 - xiii. 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.
 - 2. N.A.
 - xiv. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
 - 1. See submitted materials.
2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

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

- 5. Demolish a non-contributing residence.
- 6. Remove the debris from the site.
- 7. Stabilize the site.
- 8. Plant seed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the demolition of a deteriorated residential building which is listed as a non-contributing building in the Old Dauphin Way National Register Historic District. The property has been listed on the City of Mobile's Nuisance Abatement list. The Nuisance Abatement allows for either the City to repair/secure vacant buildings which are salvageable or remove of vacant buildings that are in such an extreme state of disrepair as to pose a life safety issue.

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

1017 Caroline Avenue is a non-contributing building located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The dwelling is not an example of any historically significant architectural typology or style.

This brick veneered building is not in a good state of disrepair. The building is not secure and therefore a liability for (continued) crime.

While the building adds to the built density and rhythmic sequencing of the landscape, it does not contribute to the historic al or architectural character of Caroline Avenue. As an inner block dwelling, the building is only viewed from head on or an oblique angle.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be removed, site would be leveled, ground would be stabilized, and seed would be planted. Work would be done by a firm contracted by the City. A buyer would be obligated to redevelop the site in manner fully in keeping with Mobile's Historic District Guidelines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application for the demolition of the non-contributing building would impair the property or historic district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Gary Jackson, City of Mobile Municipal Enforcement, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any if his fellow board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Jackson.

Upon being asked for input, Ms. Kessler clarified for Mr. Holmes a nuisance query.

Mr. Jackson noted that the current code allowed for the mothballing and securing of public nuisance declared properties. Mr. Blackwell stated most buildings are mothballed. Ms. Kessler further explained that after a lien is placed on the secured property, the new process of acquiring the property can begin.

Mr. Blackwell clarified that crime, while mentioned in staff report, was not a principle factor in staff's recommendation for the approval of demolition applications. He further explained architectural significance was the most important factor. Mr. Allen stated that the historic significance was not the main factor according to the ordinance, but that other criteria be taken to account.

No further discussion ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment.

Mr. Betbeze stated that his previous comments applied to both this application and 1019 Caroline Avenue.

Mr. Roberts and Mr. Holmes agreed that the removal of these structures was not detrimental to the streetscape.

Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

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. Mr. Stone abstained from voting.

The motion received a second and was approved. Mr. Allen and Mrs. Echols voted in opposition.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Ruzic 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 approved. Mr. Allen, Mrs. Echols, and Mr. Stone in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: September 7, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2017-42-CA: 1019 Caroline Avenue

Applicant: Gary Jackson with the City of Mobile, Municipal Enforcement

Received: 8/16/2017

Meeting: 9/6/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way

Classification: Non-Contributing

Zoning: R-1

Project: Demolition - Demolish a non-contributing building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This building, one resembling a garage-apartment, is listed as a non-contributing component in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 10 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. The application up for review calls for the demolition of the non-contributing building.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 3. *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:
 - ix. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
 - 1. This building is listed as a non-contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. It possesses neither architectural merit nor style.
 - x. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. The dwelling adds to the built density of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District and Caroline Avenue, but does not contribute to the historical character.

- xi. 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 or acquired.
 - xii. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 - 1. This building is not an example of a particular style and does contribute to the historic aesthetic of the neighborhood or street.
 - vii. 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 house would be demolished, debris would be removed, the lot would be leveled, seed would be planted, and a lien would be placed on the property.
 - viii. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. The date the current owner acquired the property was not provided.
 - ix. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. The property has stood vacant for a number of years.
 - x. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The property has not been listed for sale to the City's knowledge.
 - xi. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 - 1. N.A.
 - xii. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. N.A.
 - xv. 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.
 - 3. N.A.
 - xvi. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
 - 1. See submitted materials.
2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

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

- 9. Demolish a non-contributing residence.
- 10. Remove the debris from the site.
- 11. Stabilize the site.
- 12. Plant seed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the demolition of a deteriorated residential building which is listed as a non-contributing building in the Old Dauphin Way National Register Historic District. The property has been listed on the City of Mobile's Nuisance Abatement list. The Nuisance Abatement allows for either the City to repair/secure vacant buildings which are salvageable or remove of vacant buildings that are in such an extreme state of disrepair as to pose a life safety issue.

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

1019 Caroline Avenue is a non-contributing building located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The dwelling is constructed of a variety of materials is not an example of any architectural typology or style.

This building is not in a good state of disrepair. The building is not secure and therefore a liability for (continued) crime.

While house contributes to the built density and rhythmic sequencing of the landscape, it does not lend to historic character or physical experience of Caroline Avenue. As an inner block dwelling, the building is only viewed from head on or an oblique angle.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be removed, site would be leveled, ground would be stabilized, and seed would be planted. Work would be done by a firm contracted by the City. A buyer would be obligated to redevelop the site in manner fully in keeping with Mobile's Historic District Guidelines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application for the demolition of the non-contributing building would impair the property or historic district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Gary Jackson, City of Mobile Municipal Enforcement, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Mr. Oswald then asked if any if his fellow board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Ruzic inquired as to the alleyway located behind the property. Mr. Blackwell explained that the alleyway had previously provided access to Hearin-Blacksher property on Government Street, but has since been closed.

No further discussion ensued.

Mr. Oswald opened the application to public comment.

Mr. Betbeze stated, as has previously spoken, that his same observations of opposition informed this application as they did the two preceding.

Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

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. Mr. Stone abstained from voting.

The motion received a second and was approved. Mr. Allen and Mrs. Echols in opposition.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was approved with Mr. Allen, Ms. Echols, Mr. Ruzic and Mr. Stone in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: September 7, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-43-CA: 1012 New St. Francis Street
Applicant: Gary Jackson with the City of Mobile, Municipal Enforcement,
Received: 8/16/2017
Meeting: 9/6/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition - Demolish an extremely deteriorated residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This bulk of this building dates circa 1900. Portions of it could be older. The contributing building represents a blending of typologies and aesthetics.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 10 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 according to the MHDC vertical file. A Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) was issued for repairs in July of 2015. The building’s fenestration was mothballed at that date.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
 - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
 - 1. The bulk of this house dates circa 1900. The building is listed as a contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. An eclectic building in terms of typology and styling, the building features a two-tiered gallery supported by turned post, as well as eave level scroll sawn bargeboarding. The building is one of the most architecturally significant houses on New St. Francis Street.

- ii. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. The dwelling contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and historical character of the surrounding Old Dauphin Way 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. Of the exterior facings and elements, many of those which are still in place would have to be replaced. The building's structure is an even more periled condition than the exterior cladding and detailing. The roof has is in danger of collapsing.
 - 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. Foursquare dwellings are located within all of Mobile's seven locally designated National Register Historic Districts. Old Dauphin Way contains a large number of this uniquely American residential typology. Examples are found across the United States. This one of the earliest examples in the district.
 - 2. 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.
 - 3. If granted demolition approval, the house would be demolished, debris would be removed, the lot would be leveled, seed would be planted, and a lien placed on the property.
 - ix. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. The date current owners acquired the property via inheritance.
 - x. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. The property has been vacant for several years.
 - xi. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The property has been not listed for sale.
 - xii. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 - 1. N.A.
 - xiii. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. Not provided.
 - xvii. 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.
 - 4. N.A.
 - xviii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
 - 1. See submitted materials.
2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

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

1. Demolish a non-contributing residence.
2. Remove the debris from the site.
3. Stabilize the site.
4. Plant seed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the demolition of an extremely deteriorated residential building which is listed as a contributing property in the Old Dauphin Way National Register Historic District. The property has been listed on the City of Mobile’s Nuisance Abatement list. The Nuisance Abatement allows for either the City to repair/secure vacant buildings which are salvageable or remove of vacant buildings that are in such an extreme state of disrepair as to pose a life safety issue.

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

1012 New St. Francis Street is a contributing building located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The dwelling is unique blending of architectural typologies. The massing of the front portion of the building strongly resembles an American Foursquare, while rear portions add a side component to plan and elevation. The initial construction date of the building is not yet determined. Portions of the building could rank among the oldest constructions on New Saint Francis Street.

This building is in an extremely advanced state of disrepair. Conditions extend far beyond cosmetic concerns. The roof structure is beginning to fail. Sizable portions of walls are missing on a later addition.

The house contributes to the built density, rhythmic sequencing, historic character, physical experience of New St. Francis Street. Located on the corner of New St. Francis Street and Pine Street, the building is highly visible. It is anchor to the intersection and streetscape.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be removed, site would be leveled, ground would be stabilized, and seed would be planted. Work would be done by a firm contracted by the City. A buyer would be obligated to redevelop the site in manner fully in keeping with Mobile’s Historic District Guidelines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application would impair the property and would impair the architectural and the historical character of the property and historic districts. While realizing the physical condition of the building, Staff encourages other means of addressing the buildings impact on the surrounding landscape other than demolition at this time. At this juncture, Staff recommends denial of the application for reasons of the architectural and historical considerations highlighted herein and articulated in the Design Review Guidelines.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Gary Jackson, City of Mobile Municipal Enforcement, formally withdrew the application.