

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**September 7, 2016 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, I, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:  
**Members Present:** Catarina Echols, Robert Allen, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone, and Robert Brown.  
**Members Absent:** Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes, III, Bradford Ladd and James Wagoner.  
**Staff Members Present:** Cartledge W. Blackwell, III, and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Stone moved to approve the minutes for the August 17, 2016 meeting. The motion received a second by Robert Brown and was unanimously approval.
3. Mr. Stone moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second by Robert Allen and was unanimously approval.

**B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED**

1. **Applicant:** Thomas Maddox
  - a. Property Address: 27 Macy Place
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/15/2016
  - c. Project: Construct 6' wooden dogeared fence in rear of lot along south lot line then turning along west lot line and terminating before carport.
2. **Applicant:** Jeffrey Jurasek
  - a. Property Address: 61 N. Monterey Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/15/2016
  - c. Project: Replace sets of French doors on first and second story on front façade to match existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repair masonry on front porch steps. Repair and replace decking, and rails per approved MHDC guidelines (typical 4-square pattern) on second story. Install rain gutter if necessary. Repaint to match existing color scheme.
3. **Applicant:** Barbara Johnson
  - a. Property Address: 1310 Chamberlain
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/16/2016
  - c. Project: Repaint exterior of dwelling. Benjamin Moore. Trim: White; Body: Covington Gray; Door: Woodlawn Blue; Porch Deck and Foundation: Kendall charcoal; Shutters: Black.
4. **Applicant:** Mr. Don and Mrs. Carol Quigley
  - a. Property Address: 255 Michigan Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/18/2016
  - c. Project: Repaint exterior in following approved color scheme by Benjamin Moore manufacturer: Body-Platinum Gray; Decorative Features- Jalapeno Jelly (Green); Decking and Accents such as Shutters and Lattice-Charcoal Slate; Windows and Door Trim-White.
5. **Applicant:** Benjamin P. Cummings on behalf of CEA Properties
  - a. Property Address: 1151 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/18/2016
  - c. Project: Construct concrete ribbon curb around existing gravel lot, and pour four new parking spaces and a sidewalk from said parking spaces to an existing sidewalk at building.

On exterior of building repair and replace rotten wood siding as needed in profile, dimension, and material and repaint to match existing color scheme.

- 6. Applicant:** Mr. and Mrs. Douglas Dunning
  - a. Property Address: 160 S. Georgia Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/22/2016
  - c. Project: Demolish existing porch located off rear of residence and construct screened-in porch per submitted design in its location. (Submitted design follows MHDC Design Review Guidelines.)
- 7. Applicant:** Michael Windom
  - a. Property Address: 208 Levert Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/22/2016 (amending 2/26/2016)
  - c. Project: Screen a rear porch and add outdoor fireplace. Remove existing roof structure and rebuild; re-roof to match existing shingles.
- 8. Applicant:** Andrea Moore
  - a. Property Address: 102 LeVert Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/22/2016
  - c. Project: Repair and repaint windows in urbane bronze. Exchanged louvered vents to be of wood construction and repaint in white or bronze. Repaint garage door.
- 9. Applicant:** George Pierce
  - a. Property Address: 16 N. Monterey Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/22/2016
  - c. Project: Demolish exterior rear deck.
- 10. Applicant:** Liz Garza
  - a. Property Address: 119 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/22/2016
  - c. Project: Apply vinyl decals to inside windows per CRC approved design and MHDC Guidelines.
- 11. Applicant:** John Moore
  - a. Property Address: 310 Charles Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/23/2016
  - c. Project: Repaint per the existing color scheme.
- 12. Applicant:** Jeffrey Juzang
  - a. Property Address: 61 N. Monterey Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/23/2016
  - c. Project: Replace front porch columns with fiberglass replicas to match in exact dimension and size.
- 13. Applicant:** Daniel Henderson
  - a. Property Address: 1017 Old Shell Road
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/24/2016 (Revised from 8/22/2016)
  - c. Project: Repair and rehabilitate existing 3 historic windows on site. Enclosed side porch is approved after the fact. Clad side porch to match existing wood lap siding in size, dimension, material and profile. Replace existing non-historic doors on side porch and enclosed porch to wooden four paneled, historically appropriate doors.
- 14. Applicant:** Adline Clarke
  - a. Property Address: 856 Canal Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/25/2016
  - c. Project: Paint the house per the provided color scheme: body, "Slate Gray". The trim color will be complementary hue.
- 15. Applicant:** National Society of Colonial Dames c/o Mr. T. T. Zieman
  - a. Property Address: 104 Theatre Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/25/2016

- c. Project: Reinstate a lamppost in the parking.
- 16. **Applicant:** A.C. McElroy on behalf of the Pentecostal Church of God
  - a. Property Address: 308 N. Joachim Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/26/2016
  - c. Project: Replace wood as needed to match existing in dimension, size, profile, and material. Repair foundation/ brickwork including mortar to National Park Service Standards. Paint exterior body of house in “Stargazer” grey. Trim and Foundation in White, Decking in dark grey.
- 17. **Applicant:** Tommy Bernhardt of Bernhardt Roofing
  - a. Property Address: 57 Semmes Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/29/2016
  - c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in charcoal black.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

- 1. **2016-21-CA: 1122 Palmetto Street**
  - a. Applicant: Mr. Andrew Dooley on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Jason Valentine
  - b. Project: Demolish a later rear addition to a residence and construct a two- story rear addition and porch.
- 2. **2016-20-CA: 1017 Old Shell Road**
  - a. Applicant: Mr. Daniel Henderson
  - b. Project: Afterthe-Fact-Approval (Tabled Application from the 17 August 2016 Meeting) - Replace six-over-six wooden windows with four-over-four wooden windows on an antebellum side hall dwelling which was remodeled and enlarged in the 1920s.

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

- 1. Discussion

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

**2016-21-CA:** 1122 Palmetto Street  
**Applicant:** Andrew Dooley on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Jason Valentine  
**Received:** 8/24/2016  
**Meeting:** 9/7/2016

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Demolish a later rear addition to a residence and construct a two- story rear addition and porch.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This Italianate dwelling was built circa 1895 for use as a rental property by Lawrence C. Crump. The exterior was modified in 1920, including the addition of a “Craftsman” style porch. The porch was reverted back to a more traditional Italianate aesthetic in 2007. The Italianate style was popular in the United States from the late 1840s to the 1890s. This home features Italianate characteristics such as a hipped roof, overhanging eaves with supporting brackets, and tall first floor windows. This style can be seen throughout Oakleigh and neighboring districts such as DeTonti Square.

**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 February 5, 2007. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a rear 12’0” x 12’0” porch, modification of the front porch, and replacement of Craftsman style porch columns with new wooden columns and rail. With this application, the new owners propose the demolition of a later rear addition a construction of a rear two-story addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site (site topography, character-defining site features, trees, and significant district vistas and public views) are retained.”
  - 2. “Wherever possible, construct an addition in such a manner that, if the addition were to be removed, the essential form and integrity of the historic structure would be unimpaired.”
  - 3. “Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material and character of the property, neighborhood and environment.”

4. "Design the building components (roof, foundation, doors and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture. Maintain the relationship of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building."
5. "Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color and/or wall plane. Alternative materials, such as cement fiberboard, are allowed when the addition is properly differentiated from the original structure."
6. "Design a new porch to be compatible with the existing historic building."

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

1. Demolish a later rear addition.
2. Construct a new two-story addition beginning at the Rear of North Elevation of the original residence.
3. The addition will feature enclosed living and open porch spaces.
4. The aforementioned porch portions of the will feature 8" square section porch piers with crown, base, and bracket(s). Said columnar constructions and related constructions will match those found on the body of the house.
5. The foundation brick veneered foundation will be interspersed with boxed and recessed lattice panels/skirting.
6. Walls will be clad with hardieplank siding.
7. Two-over-two aluminum clad wooden windows will be employed.
8. The light configuration of the aforementioned windows will match those found on the body of the main the house.
9. Some windows located on the later rear addition and rear will be salvaged from the impacted areas and employed on the addition.
10. Ornamental brackets will be employed on the eaves.
11. The aforementioned ornamental brackets will match those found on the body of the house.
12. Hipped roof forms will surmount the new construction.
13. The roof will be sheathed with architectural shingles which will match the existing.
14. South Elevation
  - a. The South Elevation will be defined by a shuttered bay surmounted by concave hipped roof will be located to the East side of the rear portion of the house.
15. East Elevation (a Side)
  - a. The first-story of the L-shaped East Elevation will feature open and shuttered porch(-like) bays.
  - b. Both the two smaller shuttered bays and one larger shuttered bay will feature field and transom zone shutters units set between bracketed square section porch piers based on those found on the front gallery.
  - c. The middle porch bay will feature a glazed and paneled door flanked by shutter expanses.
  - d. A canvas awning will extend over the door and above a brick stoop.
  - e. Flights of bricks steps accessing the canvas awning covered brick stop.
16. North Elevation (Rear Elevation)
  - a. The North Elevation will be picturesque or irregular in composition.
  - b. A three bay gallery with an advanced western portion will extend the length of the first -story.
  - c. The eastern portion of the L-shaped first-story will feature a singled paneled door and a pairing of one-over-one windows.
  - d. The western portion of the ground floor will feature pairs of double (six light each) French doors.
  - e. The second-story will feature two salvaged two-over-two windows.
  - f. The aforementioned windows will be flanked by shutters.

#### 17. West Elevation (a Side)

- a. The L-shaped West Elevation will feature a corner board on the first-story and a hipped roof oriel at the second-story at its southernmost portion.
- b. A double French door featuring six light windows will be located beneath the aforementioned oriel.
- c. A telescoping flight of brick steps will access the French doors.
- d. The paneled oriel above the French doors will feature three (3) six-light windows.
- e. Single salvaged two-over-two wooden windows will be located in the middle portions of both the first-story and second-story.
- f. Porch screening and framing will be constructed/installed with the North-facing porch's terminal bay.

### **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application calls for the demolition of a later single-story rear addition to a contributing main residence and the construction of a new two-story building atop and beyond the footprint of the aforementioned building.

When reviewing demolition applications for additions to main buildings, the criteria for demolitions in general are taken into account: 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.

With regard to the architectural significance of the building the original footprint was built in 1895, while the rear portion was built in the 1920s. While the 1920s addition achieves a form of significance terms of its age, it does not have the same architectural significance as the body of the house. The Board has approved numerous demolitions of later service oriented additions over the course of its existence.

The building is concealed from the public view. The location of the main residence, proximity to the eastern lot line, and presence of landscape features cause the building to not be visible from Palmetto Street.

When addressing the nature of redevelopment, the design of the addition comes into play. Location, massing, scale, compatibility, and building components come into effect. Here follows an assessment of the proposed addition:

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that when possible, "construct an addition in such a manner that, if the addition were to be removed, the essential form and integrity of the historic structure would be unimpaired." (See B-2.). The original configuration of the main side hall residence would remain intact and enhanced by a more complementary addition. The placement, footprint, elevation, and height of the addition all serve to make it subordinate to the principle dwelling that defines the property.

The Design Review Guidelines also state that building components (roof, foundation, doors and windows) of an addition should be compatible with the historic architecture" (See B-4). The lap siding, architectural shingles, aluminum clad windows, and ornamental brackets will match those on the existing historic building. All other components and design aspects draw inspiration from the original portion of the house which compliments the design of the residence and enhances the integrity of the neighborhood.

Continuing on, the Design Review Guidelines require that additions should be differentiated “from a historic structure using changes in material, color and/or wall plane” (See B-6). The addition is differentiated by advances & recesses in plan & elevations, corner boards, and other design components.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

With regard to the demolition of the later rear addition, Staff recommends approval of that portion of the application on account of the addition’s lack of architectural significance, its location on the lot, and the proposed redevelopment of the pertinent portion of the site. The aforementioned work would not impair the architectural or historical character of the original portion of the building (which establishes the historical and architectural character of the property).

The final portion of the application concerns the construction of a new rear addition. Based on B (1-6), Staff does not believe the construction of the proposed addition will impair the architectural or the historical character of the property or the surrounding district. Said addition is successfully differentiated from yet compatible with the architectural and historic environments.

Staff recommends approval of the application in full.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Andrew Dooley was present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Oswalt thanked Ms. Largue for the introduction to the application. He asked if the applicant’s representative if he had clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make concerning the staff report.

Mr. Dooley answered no saying that he was present to address any concerns the Board might hold.

Mr. Stone asked Mr. Dooley for clarification on several parts of the application. His first question concerned the concave roof profile on the East Elevation (to the North and South). Mr. Dooley clarified Mr. Stone’s inquiry.

Secondly, Mr. Stone questioned Mr. Dooley on the material of the simulated wood columns being employed. Mr. Dooley confirmed the material of the column would be wood.

Lastly, Mr. Stone inquired if there were any distinguishing features of the shuttered fields to either side of the West Elevation’s entrance. Mr. Dooley stated that the shutters would be painted black, therefore differentiating it from the color of siding on the rest of the house.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wanted to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, 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. Robert Allen 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: 9/7/2017**



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

**2016-20-CA: 1017 Old Shell Road**  
**Applicant: Mr. Daniel Henderson**  
**Received: 8/9/16; previously tabled at the 8/17/16 meeting.**  
**Meeting: 8/17/16**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval - Replace four (4) unauthorized four-over-four wooden windows with original six-over-six sashes on an antebellum side hall dwelling remodeled and enlarged in the 1920s. **OR** Retain the unauthorized windows.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to materials located in the property’s file, the core of this residence dates circa 1859. An overlay in the 1901 City of Mobile Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps depicts rear additions and alterations that expanded the dwellings footprint. The house was remodeled in the 1920s. Other changes ensued. In 2015 a later side/ rear addition was demolished and the exterior was restored.

**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 previously appeared before the Architectural Review Board on March 4, 2015. At that time, the Board approved a restoration package for Restore Mobile that centered on the construction of prominently located, but historically attuned and design sensitive roof cricket, as well as the demolition of small southeast corner addition that obscured a significant historic fabric. It is with this application the new owner would like to retain two four-over-four wooden windows on West Elevation. The work was executed without the issuance of a building permit or a Certificate of Appropriateness. The application was reviewed by the Board at their August 17, 2016 meeting. Portions of an amended application pertaining to the replacement of windows were tabled for purposes of an onsite examination of the windows. The object of the visit was to determine if the unauthorized windows could be altered so as to reflect the appearance/configuration of the windows which had been removed. Said site visit occurred on Wednesday, August 24<sup>th</sup>.

- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
1. “Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Remove four (4) unauthorized window sashes.
2. Reinstall original six-over-six window sashes.
3. Repair window casings/jambs.

OR

1. Retain four (4) four-over-four unauthorized windows.

### **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application, one providing to proposed scenarios for unauthorized work, stems from a 311 call received earlier this month, a tabling on an application that appeared before the Board at the August 17<sup>th</sup> meeting, and an onsite visit on August 24<sup>th</sup>. Two proposals were discussed at the meeting.

One proposal involves the removal of four (4) unauthorized four-over-four windows and their replacement with original six-over-six windows. Said windows are located on the southernmost end of the West elevation (facing Pine Street) and the Rear/South Elevation. This approach is in concert with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts which state where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material (See B-1.).

The retention of the unauthorized replacement windows, ones which do not match the light configuration of the original windows (See B-1.), would result in the loss of historic fabric on the property’s principle contributing building, one situated on a prominent corner lot.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1), Staff does recommend approval of the reinstating of the original windows. Said solution would recapture lost architectural and historical character.

Also based on B (1), Staff does not recommend approval of the retention of the unauthorized windows. Said solution would impair the architectural and historical character of the building.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

No person was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Largue recounted events which took place since the last meeting. She presented two scenarios to the board for approval. Mr. Oswalt thanked Ms. Largue for the introduction.

Mr. Oswalt asked if the applicant had been properly notified. Ms. Largue responded that the agenda/staff report had been emailed and a sign had been posted on the property. She then reiterated the convention of two site visits to the property during which staff and the applicant interacted.

Mr. Stone and the Board agreed the first scenario involving the insertion of historic sashes into the four new jambs would be the best choice. The Board also discussed the trim detail framing the four newly installed windows.

No further discussion ensued among the Board.

There was no one present in the audience.

## **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, amending fact to remove the second option of keeping newly installed four-over-four windows seeing that the retention of said windows would impair the historic integrity of the house and district. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Allen moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board. It was noted that original sashes would be reinstated within the window openings and the casings would be reconfigured to match the appearance of the unaltered original casings and that said interventions would not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/7/2017**