A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
   **Members Present:** Harris Oswalt, John Ruzic, Catarina Echols, Steve Stone, Bob Allen and Nick Holmes.
   **Members Absent:** Jim Wagoner, Robert Brown, David Barr, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, and Craig Roberts.
   **Staff Members Present:** Bridget Daniel, John Sledge, Marion McElroy, Bert Hoffman and Paige Largue.

2. Mr. Stone moved to approve the minutes of the December 5th, 2018 meeting. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

3. Agenda Item 9 from the December 5th Mid-Month approval was discussed by the board. Mr. Allen inquired as to who approved the size of the sign to be larger than the allotted amount by the guidelines of 64 square feet. Ms. Largue replied the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Bert Hoffman, of Planning and Zoning explained the project was located in both the Downtown Development District and Lower Dauphin Commercial Historic District. He noted the sign of the size required approval from both the Consolidated Review Committee and Architectural Review Board, respectively. He further explained the Board of Adjustment can only grant variances for items specified in the zoning ordinance. Ms. Largue stated the variance explicitly stated the size of the sign was granted a variance from the ordinance, but not the materials. Mr. Hoffman stated if the ARB does not approve the mid-month, the applicant would then have to return to the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Allen expressed concern that applications such as this are slipping through the cracks. Mr. Hoffman stated staff works to keep the Board informed. Mr. Stone moved to approve the Mid-Months as written. Mr. Holmes seconded the motion. The motion was approved with one in opposition, Mr. Allen

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant:** (PREVIOUSLY MID-MONTH ITEM 9, HELD OVER FROM DECEMBER 5TH) Chris Murphy of Goodwyn, Mills and Cawood
   a. **Property Address:** 107 St. Francis Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 11/09/2018
   Project: Allow one upper building sign per West, East and North elevation for a total of three signs. Signs were allowed a variance from the guidelines for size. Signs will be constructed of aluminum and backlit.

2. **Applicant:** Michael Dow
   a. **Property Address:** 1056 Palmetto Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 11/19/2018
   c. **Project:** Repair and replace rotten wood, 2 windows and paint exterior. Color to be determined.

3. **Applicant:** Thomas Beale
   a. **Property Address:** 65 S. Julia Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 11/26/2018
   c. **Project:** Reroof with asphalt shingles, black.
4. **Applicant:** Suzie Lindblom  
   a. Property Address: 62 S. Lafayette Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 11/26/2018  
   c. Project: Reroof with architectural slate.

5. **Applicant:** Aaron Rogers of Southern Poolscapes, LLC  
   a. Property Address: 1157 Government Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 11/26/2018  
   c. Project: Construct gunite pool in back yard out of public view.

6. **Applicant:** Peter Zalopany  
   a. Property Address: 954 Charleston Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 11/26/2018  
   c. Project: Repaint house per existing.

7. **Applicant:** Porchlight, LLC  
   a. Property Address: 357 Chatham Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 11/26/2018  
   c. Project: Construct 4' white picket fence at north and south sides of house. Northern side will feature a vehicular gate. Construct 6' wooden shadowbox fence along southern and eastern perimeter of lot.

8. **Applicant:** Douglas Hunter  
   a. Property Address: 954 Government Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 11/27/2018  
   c. Project: Reroof with flat asphalt roof to match.

9. **Applicant:** Jean Archibale  
   a. Property Address: 264 Church Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 11/27/2018  
   c. Project: Replace dormer windows to match existing.

10. **Applicant:** St. Francis Joachim, LLC  
    a. Property Address: 251 St. Francis Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 11/29/2018  
    c. Project: Install one diagonal corner sign as submitted. Sign will be externally illuminated and constructed of painted metal.

11. **Applicant:** Richard Bailey  
    a. Property Address: 1800 Dauphin Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 11/29/2018  
    c. Project: Build patio cover with low hip matching adjacent garage, open sides.

12. **Applicant:** Harris Oswalt  
    a. Property Address: 301 West Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 12/3/2018  
    c. Project: Replace deteriorated rear steel window, with aluminum clad to same dimensions and comparable light pattern.

13. **Applicant:** John Ruzic  
    a. Property Address: 120-122 Houston Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 12/3/2018  
    c. Project: Reroof with black fiberglass shingles.

14. **Applicant:** Eldridge Dickerson  
    a. Property Address: 1114 Old Shell Road  
    b. Date of Approval: 12/4/2018  
    c. Project: Replace existing fence with six foot replacement, replace gates, add concrete pad at gates.
15. Applicant: Catherine Arms Ltd, Bowen
   a. Property Address: 111 S. Catherine Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/4/2018
   c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles to match existing.

   a. Property Address: 1210 Government Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/5/2018
   c. Project: Repaint white/gray blend, repair/replace a few rotten boards to match.

17. Applicant: Joseph Steadman Jr.
   a. Property Address: 251 Rapier Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 12/6/2018
   c. Project: Replace existing metal and glazed storm door to match on rear of house. Metal will be painted.

18. Applicant: Motion Graphic and Image, LLC
   a. Property Address: 1106 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/7/2018
   c. Project: Reroof metal per existing.

19. Applicant: Congress Street Warehouse
   a. Property Address: 108 S. Claiborne Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/7/2018
   c. Project: Remove exterior window and courses of brick to conduct interior repairs. Reconstruct brick and window to match existing with appropriate mortar.

20. Applicant: Elnora Stokes
   a. Property Address: 960 Conti Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/7/2018
   c. Project: Mothball and secure residence.

21. Applicant: James E. and Susan Crowson
   a. Property Address: 1110 Savannah Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/7/2018
   c. Project: Repair dormer by replacing rotten wood to match and replace vent on east side of dormer to match right side. Open enclosed porch addition on eastern portion of elevation. Install wooden balustrade. Remove awning window on rear elevation and larger window on later addition (1960’s) located to the rear of house. Install smaller wooden window on western portion of rear elevation. Remove rotten pergola. Construct one story carport conformed to stock guidelines. Elements on carport will match existing house in dimension, material and profile. Construct 6' wooden fence at rear of lot to tie into existing fence.

22. Applicant: Margaret McNellage
   a. Property Address: 967 Old Shell Road
   b. Date of Approval: 12/10/2018
   c. Project: Reroof architectural shingle, pewter gray.
C. APPLICATIONS
1. **2018-46-CA: 1114 Caroline Avenue**
   a. **Applicant:** Mr. Michael T. Stephens
   b. **Project:** Rehabilitation Related: Reconstruct a front porch. Conduct in-kind repairs.

   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

2. **2018-47-CA: 15 Semmes Avenue**
   a. **Applicant:** Mr. Jacob Hartley of Prime Design Homes, LLC on behalf of SSK Asset Management, LLC
   b. **Project:** Demolition Related: Demolish contributing residence. Construct new single family residence.

   **HELD OVER. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

   a. **Applicant:** Twin Hotels, LLC
   b. **Project:** Remove existing port cochere. Construct new canopy.

   **HELD OVER. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

D. **OTHER BUSINESS**
1. Ms. Largue noted that a few Board members were resigning from their position and that the Council has been notified of all expiring terms.

2. Mr. Allen noted the number of demolitions brought before the Board by the City and constituents. He stated his concern about the number of requests from the City and noted five in the recent year. Ms. Largue stated she attends blight coordination meetings every week in an effort to work alongside other departments so that properties can be secured rather than demolished. She went onto explain the limitations of what the City and staff can do. Ms. Largue further explained these departments are working together to find alternative solutions.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-46-CA: 1114 Caroline Avenue
Applicant: Mr. Michael T. Stephens
Received: 11/19/2018
Meeting: 12/19/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Rehabilitation Related: Reconstruct a front porch. Conduct in-kind repairs.

BUILDING HISTORY

This residence, referred to as the “Spotswood House,” is a one story, three bay Gulf Coast cottage. The interior previously featured both Victorian Eastlake and Greek Revival fireplace mantels.

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 in 1995 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time a new building was proposed on the lot adjacent. The proposed scope of work includes an repair and replacement of siding, and reconstruction of a front porch.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Porches and galleries are important elements of traditional Mobile residential architecture. They frame and protect primary entrances. They also display a concentration of decorative details. In many neighborhoods, they continue to serve as outdoor living rooms.”
   2. “Maintain the height and pitch of a porch roof.”
   3. “Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character.”
   4. “If replacement is required, design it to reflect the time period of the historic structure.”
   5. “Use replacement materials and elements that are appropriate to the style, texture, finish, composition and proportion of the historic structure”
   6. “Where an original porch is missing entirely, base a replacement porch on physical or photographic evidence. If no evidence exists, draw from similar structures in the neighborhood.”
   7. “When reconstructing a porch, pay particular attention to matching the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
   8. “Do not use a railing that is too elaborate for the building (of a different style).”
   9. “Repair and, when necessary, replace piers, foundations and foundation infill to reflect historic character.”
   10. “Recess foundation screening from the front of the foundation piers.”
11. “Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.”
12. “Remove only those materials which are deteriorated, and beyond reasonable repair.”
13. “Do not remove original materials that are in good condition.”

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

1. Reconstruct a front façade (South) elevation porch.
   a. The porch will maintain the existing roofline and floor height.
   b. Repair and rebuild existing brick piers using brick to match appropriate mortar.
   c. Framed wood lattice in between piers will be employed.
   d. Construct porch deck.
   e. Deck will be constructed of wooden tongue and groove.
   f. Construct a set of brick steps to access porch.
   g. Install simple iron railing on steps.
   h. Install six equidistant (three on either side of door) eight inch square wooden columns.
   i. Columns will be feature a recessed panel and boxed.

2. Conduct in-kind repairs.
   a. Repair and replace deteriorated wood siding to match existing in dimension, profile and material.
   b. Repaint body of house white with black shutters.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for reconstruction of a front façade porch and minor repairs. The Design Review Guidelines state that porches are an important element in Mobile’s architecture (See B-1). The proposed reconstruction of the porch on the house involves repairing or replacing to match the historic character of the house (See B-5). Replacement materials include brick and wooden tongue and groove decking (See B-7). The simplicity of the iron handrail proposed on the brick steps does not overpower porch elements (See B-8).

The guidelines go on to state that when replacement of a porch is necessary, it should be designed to “reflect the time period of the historic structure” (See B-4). The residence, a Gulf Coast cottage, was constructed in 1878. Gulf cottages are thought to be a variation from the Creole cottage. Gulf Coast cottages are raised with a center hall floor plan and typically Greek Revival or Federal in detail. The proposed column is boxed with a recessed paneling. While classical columns of the Greek Revival style were typically round, square and octagonal columns were also employed. The columns proposed would be appropriate to the period of the house (See B-7).

The house is in need of repair. When replacing materials, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state deteriorated wood materials should be repaired and only replaced when “beyond reasonable repair” (See B-11 and B-12). Wood siding would be replaced where necessary to match in dimension, profile and material. The house will be repainted white with black shutters.

Staff notes that Restore Mobile, a non-profit organization dedicated to revitalizing neighborhoods, holds a façade easement on the property. The organization has reviewed the proposed project and provided staff with a letter of support.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-4) Staff does not believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends the application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Michael Stephens, owner, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. The applicant stated Ms. Largue addressed the application in full.

Mr. Allen inquired as to if the existing piers would be repaired where they are currently located. Mr. Stephens noted the cinder block pier currently used for stabilization. MR. Allen clarified his question by referencing photographic evidence and a drawing. Mr. Stephens stated existing brick piers will be repaired and new brick faced piers installed under porch. Mr. Allen asked if the original windows were underneath the plywood securing the building. Mr. Stephens replied yes and that the windows will be repaired.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

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. Holmes moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board holds over the application for more clarification.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

CERTIFICATE EXPIRES: DECEMBER 21, 2019
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-48-CA: 15 Semmes Avenue
Applicant: Mr. Jacob Hartley of Prime Design Homes, LLC on behalf of SSK Asset Management, LLC
Received: 12/3/2018
Meeting: 12/19/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1

BUILDING HISTORY

This bungalow was constructed circa 1920.

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 September 14, 2000 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time a railing for the front porch was approved by the Board. The proposed scope of work includes the demolition of a contributing residence.

B. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The City of Mobile proposes the demolition of the derelict non-contributing building.

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.

2. The Design Review Guidelines state in pertinent part:
   a. This section provides general guidelines for consideration of demolition of a historic structure. The demolition of historic structures is generally not allowed unless there are extraordinary circumstances. When demolition is proposed, consider the following general guidelines.
b. As an initial step, determine the significance of the historic structure. An analysis should be undertaken to determine if the historic structure retains its integrity. In some cases, a property previously identified as a contributing historic structure may no longer retain its integrity due to changes to the structure since the time it was originally determined to be historic.

c. Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.

d. In some cases, the original designation of a structure as contributing or noncontributing to the historic district in which it is located may no longer be valid either because the structure has lost its historic integrity or because the passage of time or change in appreciation of the structure has resulted in the structure contributing to the character of the district.

d. The physical condition of the historic structure should be considered when determining whether or not a structure may be demolished.

e. Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.

f. Consider the impact of removing the historic structure relative to its context. Demolition may be more appropriate where the removal of the historic structure does not significantly impact the perception of the block as viewed from the street.

f. Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.

g. Also consider the potential impact of demolition of the structure on the overall context of the structure.

h. Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street or properties throughout the individual historic district.

i. Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.

j. When applicable, the project proposed to replace the structure proposed for demolition should be considered.

k. Consider the future utilization of the site.

j. If a development is proposed to replace a demolished historic structure, determine that the proposed replacement structure is consistent with the guidelines for new construction in historic districts in Chapters 6 and 7 of this document.

3. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:

   i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure:
      1. This property was built circa 1920. This building is listed as a 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. The dwelling adds to the built density of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District and Semmes Avenue.

   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. The wood farmed structure has a bungalow influence, but the building is not an stellar example of a particular style and does not contribute much to the historic aesthetic of the neighborhood or street.

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 single family residence will be constructed at a later date.

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 December 15, 2017 for $32,500.00.

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. The current owner purchased the property with the intention of rehabilitating it. However, rehabilitation has proved too costly. The owner would now like to demolition the property and construct a new single family residence.

viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;

1. To staff’s knowledge, the property has not been put up for sale in the past year.

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. A single family residence would be constructed to fit the neighborhood and street. One thousand and five hundred dollars (1,500) have been spent on plans to date.

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. The owners have provided a performance bond between the city and themselves.

xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.

1. A structural engineer report executed b Barton and Shumer Engineering, LLC has been provided.

2. See other 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.
5. Return at a later date for approval of single family residence (see submitted plans and images).

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the demolition of a deteriorated residential building which is listed as a contributing building in the Old Dauphin Way National Register Historic District. 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.

15 Semmes Avenue is listed as a contributing building located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The jerkinhead roof is an Arts and Crafts stylistic feature, but does not lend to the house’s importance. The building is of minor importance to the neighborhood architecturally. The front façade fenestration is disproportionate to the façade width.

This wood frame building is in an extremely advanced state of disrepair. Conditions extend far beyond cosmetic concerns. The house is a liability due to life safety issues. According to an engineer’s report provided by the applicant, there is severe damage to the foundation, structural framework, floors, walls, and roof which deem it uninhabitable.

While house contributes to the built density and rhythmic sequencing of the landscape, it does not lend to historic character or physical experience of Semmes Avenue. Other residences on the street include bungalows, four-squares, Victorian, and Classical Revival homes. The building is not part of a stylistic assemble. 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. A new single family residence will be constructed. The owners are working with staff to construct a residence that fits along the streetscape. The new construction would be consistent with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2) Staff does not believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Jacob, owner’s representative, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. The applicant stated Ms. Largue addressed the application in full but he would be happy to answer any questions from the Board. Mr. Hartley stated the City has been issuing citations o this property prior to
their purchase. He noted the applicant is working with the City Code Enforcement.

Mr. Ruzic clarified for Mr. Allen that the application before the Board was for demolition only and that plans were provided as part of an application. Mr. Ruzic then stated the applicant would return before the Board with a full set of plans for new construction.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. Mrs. Sydney Betbeze, project manager of Restore Mobile, spoke in opposition of the application. Mrs. Betbeze referred to Restore Mobile’s revitalization efforts and purchasing blighted properties to rehabilitate into affordable housing. Ms. Betbeze continued by stating her concern for the current administration and their practices involving preservation and blighted properties. Mrs. Betbeze then asked the Board if they would consider their practices for demolitions and new constructions. She referenced the reconstruction of a property located at 522 Dauphin that was approved two years ago and still have not been rebuilt.

Mr. Oswalt asked the applicant if he would consider selling the property to a non-profit. Mr. Hartley replied yes. Mrs. Betbeze expressed the difficulties in a non-profit purchasing property and suggested donating the property or trading.

Mr. Allen noted the property was purchased almost a year ago and that a structural engineer report was completed well after that. He asked the applicant if the intent was to rehabilitate the house. Mr. Hartley responded that was the intent. Mr. Hartley then explained the property was purchased by the applicant onsite before purchased, but after obtaining a structural report realized the extensive nature of the damage. Mr. Hartley explained the company’s process of customizing and rehabilitating homes.

Mr. Allen asked if the property was occupied when purchased. Mr. Hartley responded the property was empty and that they assumed the foundation was in better shape. Mr. Holmes noted the foundation height being very low to the ground. He explained that if you rebuilt the foundation as is, it would have the same issues with moisture and termites.

Mr. Oswalt suggested the applicant donate the property to Restore Mobile in exchange for another lot. Mrs. Sydney said she would have to look into the details. Mr. Hartley said it would have to make sense financially.

Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

Ms. Largue informed Mr. Hartley that he could withdraw the application; holdover the application for two weeks or 30 days to research an exchange with a non-profit; or the Board could vote on the application. Mr. Hartley requested to hold the application over for two weeks.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-38-CA: 301 Government Street
Applicant: Twin Hotels, LLC
Received: 10/10/2018 (Held over from November 7th meeting)
Meeting: 11/7/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: T5.2
Project: Remove existing port cochere. Construct new canopy.

BUILDING HISTORY

This 16 story building was constructed in 1975 as a Sheraton hotel per records.

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 December 5th 2018 for approval of the demolition of a port cochere and construction of a canopy, according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time, the application was held-over due to an incomplete application. The proposed scope of work includes demolishing an existing port cochere and constructing a new canopy to replace it.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
1. “Alterations to non-historic commercial buildings must be compatible with the historic district.”
2. “7.29 Design changes to a non-historic commercial building to be compatible with the district.”
3. “Design an alteration to retain a placement and orientation that is compatible with the district.”
4. “Design an alteration to appear similar in massing and scale with historic commercial buildings in the district.”
5. “Use building elements that are of a similar profile and durability to those seen on historic buildings in the district.”
6. Maintain a solid-to-void ratio on building walls that is similar to those seen on historic buildings in the district.”
7. “…see the next section on New Commercial Construction when considering alterations to non-historic commercial buildings in locally designated historic districts.”
8. “For the corridor and interior neighborhood contexts, building elements used in new commercial construction can potentially impact the historic district, but these elements are less critical than overall building placement, massing and scale described above.”
9. “7.45 Use building materials that are compatible with the surrounding context.”
10. “7.46 When using masonry, ensure that it appears similar in character to that seen historically.”
11. “Consider using cast concrete details that are designed to be similar to stone trim elements.”
12. When considering demolitions: “Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.”
13. When considering demolitions: “Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.”
14. When considering demolitions: “Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.”
15. When considering demolitions: “Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street or properties throughout the individual historic district.”
16. When considering demolitions: “Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.”
17. When considering demolitions: “Consider the future utilization of the site.”

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

1. Remove existing port cochere on East elevation and construct new port cochere.
   a. The canopy will be overall 39’10” in width and 38’8” in depth.
   b. Canopy will be constructed in the same footprint as the previous port cochere.
   c. The canopy will be constructed of metal (steel), and modular polycarbonate.
   d. The canopy will be supported by columns constructed of steel covered by EIFS to look like stucco.
   e. The plinth base of the columns will be clad in brick veneer.
   f. The columns will be 11’10” in height and 3’0” in width.
   g. The roof system will be constructed of polycarbonate resting on metal supports.
   h. The roof system will be 4’0” on height.
   i. The columns will be painted to match a previously approved color scheme.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application involves demolition of a port cochere and the construction of a new canopy on a non-contributing building. The application was reviewed at the November 7th 2018 meeting of the Architectural Review Board. The application was held over at that meeting for further clarification on the canopy roof material. The application was then heard again on December 5th, 2018 and held over due to an incomplete application.

When reviewing applications for partial demolition, the following principle criteria are taken into account: significance, condition, impact on the street and district, and nature of proposed redevelopment. The structure dates circa 1975 when the hotel was constructed (See B-12). The removal of the structure, while in good condition, does not adversely affect the 16 story hotel or the streetscape along the primary street frontage (Government Street) (See B-15). The structure would be demolished and a new canopy would be constructed.
The structure would be in close proximity to a non-contributing building. Adjacent to the East of the structure is a masonry and brick parking garage for Mobile County and the Admiral Hotel (See B-4). Adjacent to the west of the Holiday Inn is a parking lot for the Mobile Carnival Museum. The structure would face Government Street Presbyterian Church, a national landmark.

Placement, massing and scale, façade elements and materials must be compatible with the district. The structure would be located on a secondary frontage (Joachim Street) and setback from Government Street. As to orientation, the structure engages Joachim Street as its principle vehicular artery (See B-3). The one story 15’10” structure will be constructed in the same footprint as the previous port cochere. The structure will not be attached to the 16 story hotel. As to materials, the drawings of the proposed building depict a brick veneer plinth and EIFS (stimulated stucco) column treatment supporting a metal structure with polycarbonate sheathing. Materials that simulate historic materials may be considered on new structures in historic districts (See B-5).

Polycarbonate is not a material typically approved for additions on historic structures. The proposed use of the polycarbonate is a canopy installed above ground, and on a non-contributing property (See B-5). The Board has been provided with four images of Holiday Inn canopies using the proposed ribbed polycarbonate. A fifth image of a canopy using glass and aluminum from the same manufacturer of the Holiday Inn canopies has been provided as well. Staff has confirmed that a sample of the ribbed polycarbonate sent in by the applicant is proposed for the roof of the canopy. Staff notes that on September 13, 2018 the Consolidated Review Committee reviewed an application for the polycarbonate canopy and it was denied.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-5) and B (1-8) Staff believes this application as proposed would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends denial as proposed.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

No one was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Largue informed the Board the applicant requested the application be held over for clarification on material specification.