A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. John Sledge, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
   **Members Present:** Harris Oswalt, Bob Allen, Catarina Echols, Kim Harden, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, and John Ruzic.
   **Members Absent:** Robert Brown, Jim Wagoner, Carolyn Hasser, and Nick Holmes.
   **Staff Members Present:** Bridget Daniel, John Sledge, and Flo Kessler.

2. Mr. Stone moved to approve the minutes of the November 7, 2018 meeting as amended with Mr. Oswalt’s attendance corrected. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the Mid-Months. There was discussion regarding Item #9 and the sign variance approval. Mrs. Kessler confirmed for Mr. Allen that the Board of Adjustment granted the variance on size. Mr. Stone stated the sign size was allowed by the variance and then approved by staff. Mr. Roberts questioned the order of permitting the sign. Mr. Stone explained. Mr. Sledge stated staff was not overreaching and that the variance was issued for the size of materials from the ARB only, and that the materials and location were approved by staff. Mr. Stone motioned to approve all mid-months except no. 9 and revisiting it at the next ARB meeting. The motion was approved with one in opposition, Mr. Allen.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant:** John D. Naman
   a. **Property Address:** 258 Dauphin Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 10/29/2018
   c. **Project:** Repaint wall and reglaze windows.

2. **Applicant:** Linda Maldanato
   a. **Property Address:** 1203 Selma Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 10/30/2018
   c. **Project:** Install gutters.

3. **Applicant:** Lou Evans of Delta Construction on behalf of Randall Wieck
   a. **Property Address:** 1255 Texas Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 10/31/2018
   c. **Project:** Replace deteriorated wood on porch to match in dimension, profile and material.

4. **Applicant:** Gene Coffee
   a. **Property Address:** 1564 Bruister Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 10/31/2018
   c. **Project:** Repair wooden foundation to match in dimension, profile and material.

5. **Applicant:** Robert Maurin of Maurin Architecture
   a. **Property Address:** 1105 Dauphin Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 11/01/2018
   c. **Project:** Construct small 75 sq. ft. addition off northwest corner of house. Addition will not be seen from public view. Addition will be clad with wood siding and
shingles to match existing house. Addition will differentiate from the main house with shed roof. Reconstruct ADA ramp off back porch. Install mechanical equipment behind rear elevation. Repaint house to match existing.

6. **Applicant:** Chris Holmes Construction, LLC  
   a. Property Address: 950 Palmetto Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 11/01/2018  
   c. Project: Remove siding to allow for foundation repair. Reuse brick from northeast corner foundation pier over CMU to stabilize corner. Reinstall siding or replace to match in dimension, profile and material.

7. **Applicant:** Andre Malloy  
   a. Property Address: 300 George Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 11/02/2018  
   c. Project: Repair and Repaint exterior with Sherwin Williams Paint - SAW2821 Downing Stone for exterior siding; SW2849 Westchester Gray for porch decking; Trim, Columns and Porch Ceiling possibly SW7008 Alabaster or SW7007 Ceiling Bright White.

8. **Applicant:** John Gillespie  
   a. Property Address: 964 Palmetto Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 11/05/2018  
   c. Project: Repair/replace deteriorated wood siding and porch elements such as tongue and groove decking. Replace unoriginal columns and railing with MHDC stock designs and round columns to match photographic evidence. Repaint body in white or light grey. Repaint shutters and porch decking to match.

9. **Applicant:** Donna Flowers  
   a. Property Address: 308 Michigan Avenue  
   b. Date of Approval: 11/09/2018  

10. **Applicant:** Michael Burkhead of KPGCo  
    a. Property Address: 103 Dauphin Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 11/09/2018  
    c. Project: Replace equipment in same location on roof. Equipment will not be visible from right of way.

11. **Applicant:** Derek Thomas of Thomas Industries, Inc.  
    a. Property Address: 356 Dauphin Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 11/16/2018  

12. **Applicant:** Huang Guosheng  
    a. Property Address: 1117 Church Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 11/16/2018  
    c. Project: Repaint house De Tonti White, trim St. Anthony St. Gray.

13. **Applicant:** Bonnie Adams on behalf of Great South Services, LLC  
    a. Property Address: 356 Rapier Avenue Apt C  
    b. Date of Approval: 11/19/2018  
    c. Project: Replace windows in rear units to match existing, replace wood as necessary, and replace any broken panes on front units.

14. **Applicant:** Amelia Kennedy on behalf of 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.
15. Applicant: David Naman
   a. Property Address: 104 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 11/20/2018
   c. Project: Secure metal awning, replace broken glass.

16. Applicant: David Naman
   a. Property Address: 108 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 11/20/2018
   c. Project: Replace temporary wall, secure openings, repaint exterior plywood.

C. APPLICATIONS
1. 2018-38-CA: 301 Government Street (HELDOVER)
   a. Applicant: Twin Hotels, LLC
   **HELDOVER DUE TO INCOMPLETE APPLICATION. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

   a. Applicant: Mr. Lyle Stokely and Mr. Blane Stokely
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

3. 2018-43-CA: Lot at corner of Common Street and Caroline Avenue
   a. Applicant: Mr. Douglas Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. Stephen May
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

4. 2018-44-CA: 955 Augusta Street
   a. Applicant: Mr. Douglas Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Ms. Joanna Coley
   b. Project: Construct rear porch and new shed.
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

5. 2018-45-CA: 1005 Augusta Street
   a. Applicant: Mrs. Virginia and Mr. Preston Reeder
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

D. OTHER BUSINESS
1. Mr. Sledge announced the next meeting will be held on December 19th, 2018. There are two applications submitted.

2. Mr. Stone asked if a property at 358 Gordon Street in Leinkauf had been demolished. Mr. Sledge commented that Municipal Enforcement had proceeded with demolition. Mr. Stone mentioned the previous demolition requests to the Board from the City of Mobile Municipal enforcement had received denials. He went on to explain that in these instances the City move forward with demolitions. Mr. Allen referenced the history behind a demolition request on LeMoyne Avenue. He then asked If the city steps in before the buildings are beyond stabilization. Mr. Ruzic noted on many properties the Board recommended to secure due to their uniqueness. Mr. Allen stated the history of the City working with the property owners of LeMoyne Avenue. Mr. Ruzic referenced another blighted property that had been secured. He went onto explain the issues with transients breaking into properties. He noted one property the city stepped in and someone claimed to be an heir. Mr. Ruzic explained the City did not proceed further. A discussion ensued over the City’s process regarding blight and demolitions. Ms.
Harden noted the City and its departments have different criteria for demolitions. Mrs. Kessler stated she was not familiar with the demolition process. Mr. Jamie Betbeze asked if the City had a system of checks and balances regarding demolitions. A discussion continued between Mr. Stone, Ms. Harden, and Mr. Betbeze. Ms. Harden stated there are at least two things staff reviews for emergency demolitions: ongoing blight and complaints. Mr. Allen asked if the ARB could be part of the demolition process if the building is historic. Ms. Harden replied she thought it was possible. Ms. Harden explained if a lien was placed on the property it would not go to the city but the owner. Ms. Elizabeth Stephens, of the Downtown Mobile Alliance, inquired as to the contact for emergency demolitions. Ms. Harden responded Mr. Todd McLung was the contact but he has moved departments and noted turnover within the City. Mrs. Harden confirmed she did not know his background or who was in charge for Ms. Stephens. Mr. Stone suggested someone from the department over demolitions come and speak with the ARB. Mr. Ruzic replied to Mr. Allen the notice of emergency demolition for 358 Gordon Street was informational.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:06 P.M.
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 November 7th 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 for clarification on the canopy roof. 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.

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 (B-5).

CLARIFICATIONS

1. Will brick veneer be utilized in any location other than the brick plinths of the canopy?
2. What is the transparency of the polycarbonate?

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-8) Staff believes this application as proposed would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district only if the polycarbonate does not look like glass. Staff notes EIFS is typically inappropriate in historic districts, however the application proposed is not on a wall or primary building. Polycarbonate is not typically employed in historic districts. Staff does not believe it will impair the building, site or district if it gives the appearance of traditional glass. Staff recommends denial unless the applicant can provide clarification of the polycarbonate and can prove it imitates glass.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. The Board viewed a sample of the proposed ribbed polycarbonate. Mr. Roberts requested more images of other canopies such as the proposed.

Mr. Allen noted the application had been previously held over. Mrs. Kessler responded staff can send a written notice to the owner with a decision, or denial. Mr. Stone commented that staff had been corresponding with the applicant. Mr. Allen noted the 45 day period of which the Board should act on the application, which was received October 10, 2018.

Mr. Roberts stated the material sample was confirmed by staff as the product proposed for use as a canopy. Mrs. Daniel confirmed no other sample was sent by the applicant to the office. Mrs. Harden stated polycarbonate is typically not an acceptable material in historic districts and viewed the sample. Mr. Roberts stated his need to see an example of the canopy with polycarbonate.
Mr. Allen and Mr. Stone inquired if the Board voted to deny the application would the decision be appealed by the applicant. Mrs. Kessler replied it would depend on the applicant if they wished to file an appeal. Mr. Allen asked if it would be acceptable to holdover the applicant a second time given the ordinance or if it could be withdrawn. Mr. Stone noted the applicant was not present to withdraw the application.

A discussion ensued about appeals and the status of the application. Mrs. Kessler stated an appeal before the Council is not a viable option. Ms. Kessler commented the board can approve or reject within the 45 days after receiving a complete application. She noted the applicant had not submitted a complete application.

Mr. Stone commented the Board needed photos of what is being built with confirmation of samples. Mr. Sledge noted Ms. Largue has been corresponding with the applicant. He stated in her communications, the applicant confirmed the sample provided which was to be utilized. He explained the ribbed sample is the brand standard. At the previous meeting no one was present to confirm. Mr. Ruzic read the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts regarding acceptable materials which states plastic is not an acceptable material, but glass is a acceptable material. Mr. Roberts stated the building still has to meet material standards, but continued by noting the design should be compatible with both the district and the contemporary building on the property. Mr. Stone suggested holding over the application as an incomplete application.

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. Ruzic moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the Board holds over the application due to an incomplete application and requests more representative images and samples.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-42-CA: 1451 Government Street
Applicant: Mr. Lyle Stokely and Mr. Blane Stokely
Received: 11/5/2018
Meeting: 12/5/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-1
Project: Renovate a non-contributing commercial building. Construct new pavilion and greenhouse. Conduct site improvements.

BUILDING HISTORY

This non-contributing property was most recently used as the recycling center for the City of Mobile.

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 2, 2105 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time a metal roof was approved for installation. The proposed scope of work includes an addition located at the northwest corner of the house.

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. Alterations of this type should follow closely the general guidelines below and the guidelines in the next section that cover new commercial construction in historic districts.”
   2. “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. Regarding new construction, a Commercial Corridor “refers to new commercial construction built along arterials at the periphery of a predominantly residential historic district. An example is a new commercial infill project on a parcel facing Government Street or Springhill Avenue that is also located within a locally designated historic district.”
   7. “Locate any ancillary buildings to the rear of the primary commercial building.”
   8. “Where the volume of new construction is larger than historic structures in the district, break down the massing into smaller components to increase compatibility.”
9. “Use vertical and horizontal articulation design techniques to reduce the apparent scale of a larger building mass.
10. “Incorporate changes in color, texture and materials.”
11. “Incorporate floor-to-floor heights that appear similar to those of traditional commercial buildings in Mobile.”
12. “Limit the height of a building to be similar to those of adjacent and nearby historic residential structures.”
13. “Use building materials that are compatible with the surrounding context.”
14. “Where new commercial construction is located adjacent to historic residential structures, use building materials that are compatible with those materials used in nearby historic buildings.
15. “Design a new sign to be compatible with the character of a building and the district.”
16. “New signs are restricted to a maximum of 64 square feet.”
17. “Use a sign material that is compatible with the materials of the building on which it is placed and the district. New materials that achieve the effect of traditional materials and lighting solutions will be considered on a case by case basis.”
18. “Acceptable sign materials include: “Painted or carved wood, individual wood or metal letters, stone, sandblasted glass, and metal.”
19. In advance of the front plane of a building … “Install a simple wood or wire fence. Heights of wooden picket fences are ordinarily restricted to 36”. Consideration for up to 48,” depending on the location of the fence, shall be given.”
20. “Face the finished side of a fence toward the public right-of-way.”
21. “Based on the chosen fence material, use proportions, heights, elements and levels of opacity similar to those of similar material and style seen in the historic district.”
22. For rear and non-corner side fences behind the front plane of the building: “Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72” in height. If the subject property abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property, a fence up to 96” will be considered.”
23. “Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.”
24. “Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.”
25. “Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district.”
26. “These are traditionally located at the rear of a lot.”
27. Acceptable accessory structure materials include: “wood frame; masonry; cement fiber based siding; installations (premade store-bought sheds provided they are minimally visible from public areas).”
28. Unacceptable materials: “metal, plastic and fiberglass except for greenhouse.”
29. “The Architectural Review Board encourages the construction of contemporary buildings and additions that do not impair the integrity of Mobile’s historic neighborhoods or historic buildings. Designing a building to fit within the historic character of a neighborhood requires careful thought. Preservation in a historic district context does not mean that the area must be “frozen” in time, but it does mean that, when new building occurs, it should occur in a manner that reinforces the basic visual characteristics of the district. This does not imply, however, that a new building must look old.”
30. “Rather than imitating older buildings, a new design should relate to the fundamental characteristics of the historic structures on a block while also conveying the stylistic trends of today. It may do so by drawing upon basic physical elements and features of nearby older properties. Such features include the way in which a building is located on its site, the manner in which it relates to the street and its basic mass, form and materials. When these design variables are arranged in a new building to be similar to those seen traditionally, visual compatibility results.”
31. “These basic design relationships are more fundamental than the details of individual architectural styles and, therefore, it is possible to be compatible with the historic context while also producing a design that is contemporary.”

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

1. Rehabilitate a non-contributing building.
   a. Remove plywood covering fenestration.
   b. Repair existing storefront windows to match.
   c. Construct painted steel structure along the North, East and Northern corner of the West elevation.
   d. Install vertical wood panels (stain to be determined) on steel structure.
   e. Install gooseneck lighting equidistant on vertical wood panels.
   f. North Elevation
      1) Remove existing overhead garage door in easternmost vehicular bay.
      2) Remove CMU in remaining vehicular bays.
      3) Install metal overhead doors in the aforementioned garage bays.
      4) Install fixed wooden screens and double sliding wood doors on eastern portion of elevation.
      5) Fixed screens and sliding barn doors will be composed of louvered wood at the base and 4 x 4 metal mesh screen on the top.
      6) The screen sequence on the elevation is as follows in an easterly to westerly direction: fixed-sliding-fixed-sliding-fixed.
      7) Construct tower element to be 19’0” in height and 8’0” in width and cladded with vertical wood boards. Sign smaller in size will be attached.
   g. East Elevation
      1) Remove door and frame on northernmost portion of elevation.
      2) The elevation will feature two sets of wooden screen swing gates.
   h. South Elevation
      1) Remove existing CMU infill as indicated on plan.
      2) Install two overhead metal doors on western portion.
      3) Install metal door between the two metal overhead doors.
      4) Remove door and frame on western portion of elevation and fill in with CMU.
      5) The elevation will feature three fixed screen panels and two sliding barn doors on the eastern portion.
      6) The sequence of the aforementioned will be as follows: fixed-sliding-fixed-sliding-fixed.

2. Construct a pavilion.
   a. The pavilion will be located on the southeast portion of the lot behind the existing building.
   b. The pavilion will be 48’0” in depth and 24’0” in width.
   c. The 5V crimp metal roof will be a butterfly shape.
   d. The roof will be supported by wooden posts.
   e. The central section of the roof will have a raised component.
   f. The walls be will clad in wooden screens to match the renovated building.
   g. The North elevation will feature three fixed wooden screen panels.
   h. The West elevation will also feature section sof fixed wooden screens.
   i. The South elevation will feature two screen panel swing gates with a fixed panel in between.

3. Construct a greenhouse.
   a. The greenhouse will be adjacent to the pavilion.
b. The greenhouse will be 60’0” in width and 50’0” in depth.
c. Structure will be metal with plastic covering.
d. The structure will be movable in case of variable weather,

4. Conduct site improvements.
   a. Install new wheel stops and re-stripe existing parking.
   b. Install new concrete ramp on the East and West side of central retail space. Install railing.
   c. Install new concrete drive and connecting walkways to access Church Street.
   d. Construct new dumpster enclosure.
      1) Enclosure will be 10’0” in width and 12’0” in depth.
      2) Enclosure will be constructed of 6’0” wooden dog eared boards.
   e. Construct fencing along the perimeter of the lot.
      2) Fencing will vary in composition from metal to wooden and in height from 3’0” to 6’0”.
      3) See plan for further details.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the renovation of a non-contributing commercial property, construction of pavilion and greenhouse, and site improvements. The considerations for renovating a non-contributing property differentiate from that of a contributing property. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, alterations to the principal building will not negatively impact the property or historic district (See B-2). Repairs will be conducted on the existing elevations. The proposed materials for renovation include wood and metal. Wood and metal have been traditionally used throughout historic districts in both residential and commercial construction (See B-5). A steel structure (skeleton) will be placed around three elevations and vertical wood attached to the structure. This will serve as a slipcover for the existing fascia and not change the height of the building (See B-12). The materials will be incorporated in a contemporary style that fit the current massing and features of the building. The front façade massing will be defined by three areas: wooden screens, storefront, and vehicular bays. The three sections visually break up the massing of the building (See B-8). The change in material, textures, and colors will add visual interest to the building (See B-10). A new tower element will be installed and attached to the front façade. The tower will be constructed of the wood slats. A sign less than 64 square feet will be attached to the tower (See B-16).

Two ancillary buildings will be constructed on the southeast portion of the lot behind the existing building (See B-26). A pavilion will be located on the east side of and a greenhouse to the west side of the aforementioned corner. The pavilion will be contemporary in design with a butterfly roof. The walls will be constructed of wood screened panels with mesh transoms. Wood frame buildings are acceptable in an ancillary setting (See B-27). The greenhouse will be constructed of metal supports with plastic sheathing. Both buildings are one story in height and subordinate in size to the existing building. Materials such as plastics are acceptable when used for a greenhouse (See B-28).

Site improvements will be conducted. New wheel stops and striping will be installed on the existing site. Existing curb cuts will be utilized (See B-23). A new drive and perpendicular pathways will be installed and extend from an existing curb cut on Church Street to the existing concrete parking. A new fence will also be installed. The fence will vary in materials and height. Materials will range from metal to wood (See B-19) and range from 3’0” to 6’0” in height. Both materials and heights are acceptable in their proposed locations.
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 the application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Steve Stone recused himself from the meeting.

Mr. Blane Stokely, owner, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant, Mr. Stokely and asked if he had any comments, concerns or questions for the Board. Mr. Stokely replied the application was explained in full.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Allen asked if the proposed shed is existing. Mr. Stokely explained the shed is a greenhouse that is located behind the existing building facing Government Street. Mrs. Kessler responded a variance is needed for use. Mr. Stokely stated the variance had been obtained.

Mr. Allen asked if the existing building is going to be wrapped with the new material. Mr. Roberts commented a trellis look would be nice.

Mr. Allen asked if the garage doors were to be glass and used as open space or solid. Ms. Harden clarified the open area indicated on drawing A1.1. Mr. Roberts responded the open pavilion area would be located behind the existing building.

Ms. Harden commented all additions are behind the building. Mr. Stokely stated the vehicular bays will have garage doors. Ms. Harden explained both the greenhouse and pavilion will be constructed South of the exiting building. Mr. Stokely noted the pavilion will be open space. Ms. Harden replied both the greenhouse and pavilion would be open during business hours.

Mr. Allen he had driven past the property. Mr. Stokely said the current façade will be screened. Mr. Allen inquired as to the metal on the current fascia. Mr. Stokely stated the wood would be attached to the fascia. Mr. Stone stated the wood would be attached to a frame in front of the fascia. Mr. Allen viewed Mr. Stokley’s phone and asked if any renderings existed of the building. Ms. Harden referenced drawing A2.1 and noted that the staff report explained a steel structure will be placed around three elevations and wood would be attached to the structure. She also read the front façade will be defined by three areas: wooden screens, storefront, and vehicular bays.

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. 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 building or the district and that the application be approved.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: December 5, 2019
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-43-CA: Lot at corner of Common Street and Caroline Avenue
Applicant: Mr. Douglas Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. Stephen May
Received: 11/14/2018
Meeting: 12/5/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Vacant Lot
Zoning: R-1
Project: Relocation of an existing house located outside a historic district into the Old
Dauphin Way Historic District. Construct addition to the rear of the residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

The proposed location for single family residence located in a residential area of the Old Dauphin Way
historic district. The building currently is in situ right outside of the district’s boundaries.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on October 3rd, 2018
according to the MHDC vertical files. At that conceptual approval was given to relocate an
existing residence located outside the district into the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The
proposed scope of work includes relocating a residence into a locally reviewed historic district.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Consider whether or not a structure will be relocated within the same district and in a
      similar context.”
   2. “Relocation may be more appropriate when the receiving site is in the district. Relocated
      buildings shall be placed in situations that do not impair the architecture of the historical
      character of the surround.”
   3. “When relocating a building, maintain its general placement and orientation on the new
      site so as to maintain the architectural and the historical character of the streetscape and
district.”
   4. “Preserve the original roof form of a historic residential structure.”
   5. “Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character.”
   6. “Do not relocate an original front stairway or steps.”
   7. “Repair and, when necessary, replace piers, foundations and foundation infill to reflect
      historic character.”
Acceptable materials for foundation replacement materials include: “...stucco piers or infill; brick piers or infill; stuccoed concrete block; wood lattice or vertical picket infill.”

“Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.”

“Use new roof materials to convey a scale and texture similar to those used historically.”

“If installing a new metal roof, apply and detail it in a manner that is compatible with the historic character of the roof, period and style.”

“Use standing seam metal, metal shingles or five v-crimp.”

“Original doors and openings, including their dimensions, should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights.”

Acceptable door materials include: “Wood panel; wood panel with glass lights; leaded glass with lead came; metal with a painted finish; other materials original to the building.”

“Preserve storefronts, cornices, turned columns, brackets, exposed rafter tails, jigsaw ornaments and other key architectural features that are in good condition.”

“When replacing historic details, match the original in profile, dimension, and material.”

“Design an addition so there is the least possible loss of historic fabric and so the character-defining features of the historic building are not destroyed, damaged or obscured.”

“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.”

“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.”

“Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material and character of the property, neighborhood and environment.”

“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.”

“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.”

“If the style of an addition is different than the original, use a style that is compatible with the historic context.”

“Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.”

“Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.”

“Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.”

“Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights of an addition to those of the historic building.”

“Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.”

“Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.”

“Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.”

“Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.”

“Utilize an alternative material for siding as necessary, such as cement-based fiber board, provided that it matches the siding of the historic building in profile, character and finish.”
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34. “Use a material with proven durability.
35. “Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.”
36. “Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.”
37. “Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.”
38. “Do not use a faux stucco application.”
39. “Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.”
40. “Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze boards, moldings or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.”
41. “Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.”
42. “If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the addition.”
43. “Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.”
44. “Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.”
45. “Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.”
46. “Design the scale of a doorway on an addition to be in keeping with the overall mass, scale and design of the addition as a whole.”
47. “Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.”
48. “Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.”
49. “Match foundation height to that of the original historic building.”
50. “Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.”
51. “Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.”
52. “Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.”
53. “Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original structure.”
54. “Use a material for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.”
55. “Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the original historic structure.”
56. “Maintain alignment of front setbacks.”
57. “Maintain the rhythm of buildings and side yards.”
58. “Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
59. “Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
60. “Design piers, a foundation, and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
61. “Size foundations and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings.”
62. “Use building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.”
63. “Design building elements on exterior buildings walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements often include but are not limited to: balconies, chimneys, and dormers.”
73. “Use exterior building materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.”
74. “Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic windows.”
75. “Use traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.”
76. “Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.
77. “Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings.”
78. “When using artificial materials, use a blind or shutter unit that has a thickness, weight and design similar to wood.”
79. “Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.”

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

1. Deconstruct and dismantle residence at 1107 Spring Hill Avenue outside a historic district.
   a. Property would be carefully moved and relocated to Old Dauphin Way historic district.
   b. Reassemble residence at lot bound by Caroline Avenue, Common Street, and Conti Street.
2. Reconstruct a residence.
   a. Residence will be orientated to Common Street situated on corner lot.
   b. Residence will be setback 17’0” from the front sidewalk.
   c. Residence will have side setbacks of 7’0” and 4’6”.
   d. Rear setback will be 18’0”.
   e. The residence is one story.
   f. A new foundation comprised of brick piers will be constructed.
   g. Wood framed lattice will be installed between piers.
   h. Construct a set of wooden steps to access the entrance on the East (front) elevation.
   i. A new 5V Crimp metal roof will surmount the residence.
   j. Install gutters.
3. Conduct in kind repairs to residence.
   a. Repair and replace deteriorated wood elements to match in dimension, profile and material.
      1) Wood elements include, but not limited to: balustrade, cornice, siding, door and transom.
   b. Repair wooden windows to match and replace broken glass.
   c. North (side) Elevation
      1) Repair existing wood siding,
4. Construct new addition to rear of the house.
   a. Addition will extend from the West elevation of the residence.
   b. The addition will be 20’0” in depth and match the width of the front portion of the existing residence.
   c. Foundation will match brick skirting found on residence.
   d. Walls will be sheathed in wood siding to match existing lapsiding.
   e. A corner board will differentiate the existing residence from the new addition.
f. Wooden windows will be employed.
g. A 5V Crimp metal roof will extend over the addition.
h. North (side) Elevation  
   1) A repurposed wooden window will be centrally located on the elevation.
i. West (rear) Elevation  
   1) A repurposed six-over-six wooden window will be located centrally on the elevation.
j. South (side) Elevation  
   1) A 2’0” x 2’0” wooden diamond window will be located on the western portion of the elevation.
   2) A 3’0” x 7’0” wooden French door set will be constructed on the eastern portion of the elevation.
   3) Wooden stairs and landing will access the French doors.

5. Conduct site improvements.
   a. Expand existing curbcut located near northwest corner of property.
   b. Install gravel driveway to be 10’0” in width.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application calls for the relocation of an existing residence into a historic district. A residence located at 1107 Springhill Avenue is threatened by demolition. The existing location is just outside of purview of the Architectural Review Board. The applicant would like to relocate the residence to a corner lot in a mostly residential area of the Old Dauphin Way historic district. When looking at the relocation of properties, one considers several items that are also taken into account when reviewing new construction. The applicant currently has filed an application with the Planning Commission to subdivide the lot and orient the house to face Common Street with the Planning Commission.

When reviewing the relocation of a property, one takes into account several items which are also reviewed for new constructions. With regard to placement, two components are taken into account – setback from the street and between buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state that new buildings should be responsive to and maintain alignment of traditional façade lines (See B 56.), as well as the rhythm of side & rear setbacks (See B-57). The property would be reconstructed on a corner lot in the vicinity of contributing residential buildings. In accord with Design Guidelines, the setbacks reflect the historical character of the contributing aspects of the built landscape. The proposed placement negotiates the existence historic buildings located to either side and structures located across the street. The side setbacks are traditional in dimension.

While the building is being relocated, reviewing guidelines for new construction is crucial to ensuring the appropriateness of the residence to the neighborhood. The Design Review Guidelines state that mass - the relationship of the parts of the larger whole comprising a building - for new construction should be in keeping with arrangement and proportion of surrounding historic residences (B-58). The proposed house is a comprised of a porch-fronted three bay sidehall with offset wing in an eclectic style. The building with its traditional massing and scale is suited to the architectural and historical traditions of the neighborhood (See B-59).

With regard to building components, the Design Review Guidelines call for responsiveness to traditional design traditions. The building is historic and features a side gabled front porch with offset wing. The composition and materials (wood siding, wood windows, standing seam metal roof), and rhythm of solid to void patterns is compatible with immediate and larger residential architectural vocabulary of the district (See B-73 and B-74). Deteriorated elements will be repaired when possible and replaced when necessary to match existing in dimension, profile and material (See B-16). The roof form will be maintained and a
new metal standing seam roof will surmount the relocated building. Metal roofs are often appropriate for antebellum and Victorian cottages (See B-11). The brick pier with lattice infill foundation is reflective of traditional foundation elevations (See B-60) and dwellings on properties abutting the subject address.

A new addition would engage with and extend from the rear portion of the West elevation. By virtue of its situation on the lot and design the addition is subordinate to the contributing building (See B-26). The proposed addition is an enclosed space. It is designed as to afford compatibility with existing fabric (See B-21). Foundation elevation would be maintained and would feature brick veneer piers to match that of the existing foundation (See B-21). The proposed siding would match the finish of the existing in dimension and profile (See B-21). A corner board will differentiate the addition from the historic fabric (See B-23). The new fenestration on the addition is compatible with the period architectural style and existing materials of wood and glass (See B-22). The proposed roof extends from the existing roofing form and components of the soffit, fascia, and eaves will match the existing (See B-21).

With regard to landscaping, a new gravel drive will access an existing curb cut at the rear of the lot. Gravel is an approvable material in residential historic districts.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-21) Staff does not believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Pending the re-subdivision of the lot, Staff recommends approval of the application.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Douglas Kearley, 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, Mr. Kearley, and asked if there were any comments he would like to make, questions to ask, or concerns. Mr. Kearley stated an existing house was proposed to be relocated to the Common Street lot from Spring Hill Avenue.

Ms. Harden asked if the façade will face Common Street. Mr. Kearley replied yes. Ms. Harden asked if the only addition was in the rear. Mr. Kearley explained the front portion of the existing house was in good condition, but the rear would have to be rebuilt. Mr. Kearley confirmed the addition is to the rear of the house.

**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 building or the district and that the application be approved.
The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: December 5, 2019
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-44-CA: 955 Augusta Street
Applicant:  Mr. Douglas Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Ms. Joanna Coley
Received:  11/14/2018
Meeting:  12/5/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct rear porch and new shed.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Victorian residence featuring a sidehall plan, two bays, and a hipped offset wing was constructed in 1892. It was constructed by the Mutual Investment Company as a rental property. Its front façade exceptional wood detailing.

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, 1991 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time an application for a 8’ privacy fence was denied by the Board. The proposed scope of work includes constructing a rear porch and constructing a new shed.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:

1. “Design an addition so there is the least possible loss of historic fabric and so the character-defining features of the historic building are not destroyed, damaged or obscured.”
2. “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.”
3. “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.”
4. “Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material and character of the property, neighborhood and environment.”
5. “Design the building components (roof, foundation, doors and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
6. “Maintain the relationship of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building.”
7. “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.”
8. “If the style of an addition is different than the original, use a style that is compatible with the historic context.”
9. “Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.”
10. “Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.”
11. “Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.”
12. “Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights of an addition to those of the historic building.”
13. “Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.”
14. “Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.”
15. “Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.”
16. “Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.”
17. “Utilize an alternative material for siding as necessary, such as cement-based fiber board, provided that it matches the siding of the historic building in profile, character and finish.”
18. “Use a material with proven durability.”
19. “Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.”
20. “Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.”
21. “Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.”
22. “Do not use a faux stucco application.”
23. “Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.”
24. “Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze boards, moldings or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.”
25. “Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.”
26. “If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the addition.”
27. “Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.”
28. “Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.”
29. “Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.”
30. “Design the scale of a doorway on an addition to be in keeping with the overall mass, scale and design of the addition as a whole.”
31. “Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.”
32. “Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.”
33. “Match foundation height to that of the original historic building.”
34. “Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.”
35. “Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.”
36. “Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.”
37. “Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original structure.”
38. “Use a material for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.”
39. “Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the original historic structure.”
40. “Porches may be appropriate to add at certain locations. A new porch addition should remain subordinate to any original historic porches. In general, a new porch is best located to the side or rear.”
41. “Limit the height of a porch addition roofline so it does not interfere with second story elevations.”
42. “Design the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure.”
43. “Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure.”
44. “Design a porch addition roofline to be compatible with the existing historic structure. However, a porch addition roofline need not match exactly that of the existing historic building. For example, a porch addition may have a shed roof.”
45. “Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building.”
46. “Do not use a contemporary deck railing for a porch addition placed at a location visible from the public street.”
47. “Do not use cast concrete steps on façades or primary elevations.”
48. “Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.”
49. “Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district.”
50. “These are traditionally located at the rear of a lot.”
51. Acceptable accessory structure materials include: “wood frame; masonry; cement fiber based siding; installations (premade store-bought sheds provided they are minimally visible from public areas).”
52. Unacceptable materials: “metal, plastic and fiberglass except for greenhouse.”

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

1. Construct one story porch off rear elevation.
   a. Existing steps accessing an existing deck will be demolished.
   b. The porch addition will rest atop brick piers.
   c. Framed lattice will be installed between piers.
   d. The decking will be tongue and groove.
   e. Wooden columns will support a roof.
f. The balustrade will be constructed of three wooden slats.
g. The roof will extend off the existing roof.
h. The roof will be sheathed in shingles to match existing.
i. East (side) Elevation
   1) The new deck will connect to the existing deck.
j. South (rear) Elevation
   1) A 12’2” portion will be in advance of the deck on the western portion of the elevation.
   2) The aforementioned advanced portion will feature a gable with wooden shingles and half moon louvered vent.
   3) A set of wooden steps will access this advanced portion and deck.
   4) The westernmost portion of the roof will extend beyond the deck.
   5) The resulting overhanging roof will be supported by brackets to match the house.
k. West (side) Elevation
   1) Remove an existing small shed.
   2) Install framed lattice between columns and above balustrade.

2. Construct a shed.
   a. The shed will be constructed at the rear of the lot and orient to the Augusta Street.
   b. The shed will be 10’0” in height, 10’0” in depth and 8’0” in width
   c. The roof will sheathed in shingles or 5V crimp or standing seam metal.
   d. The walls will be sheathed in hardiplank with a geometric design.
   e. A multi-lite door will be centrally located on the North (façade) Elevation.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application up for review calls for the addition of an enclosed screened-in porch, and construction of a small ancillary building.

Regarding the new addition for the proposed residence, the extension of a porch, said work is located in the rear of the contributing building. For reasons of its situation on the lot, abutting buildings (ancillary on same property and next door buildings) and proposed location on the residence, the overall character of the property and environs would be retained and thus would be in keeping with Mobile’s Historic Districts Design Review Guidelines (See B-2.) The proposed addition would be constructed in such a manner that if removed at a later date it would not harm the historic portion of the house (See B-3). The porch addition maintains foundation heights (See B-43). The building components of portions of the addition compliment the main house and match the existing (See B-45). Rear and front porch treatments are designed to be complementary.

The new ancillary building would complement the main dwelling. The proposed ancillary building will be located at the rear of the property and small in massing and scale (See B-48). The regulating document goes on to outline criteria for new ancillary construction. Window types, door types, construction materials, and roof pitches would compliment the structure which gives the property significance (See B-51).

CLARIFICATIONS

Where is the location of the ancillary building on the rear lot?
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. Douglas Kearley, 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, Mr. Kearley, and asked if there were any comments he would like to make, questions to ask, or concerns. Mr. Kearley stated the proposed scope of work is an addition.

Mr. Stone asked if there is a drawing showing the existing elevation. Mr. Kearley replied no. Mr. Stone asked if wood was on the addition. Mr. Kearley responded yes with shingles in the roof gable to match the front façade gable.

Ms. Harden asked if the front of house faces South. Mr. Kearley replied the rear of the house is the South elevation.

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. Stone moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board the application does not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and that the application be approved.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: December 5, 2019
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-45-CA:  1005 Augusta Street
Applicant:  Mrs. Virginia and Mr. Preston Reeder
Received:  11/18/2018
Meeting:  12/5/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:  Oakleigh Garden
Classification:  Contributing
Zoning:  R-1

BUILDING HISTORY

This Gulf Coast cottage with Greek Revival styling is was original built in 1868 with additions c. 1880 and rehabilitation in 1960. The house is the oldest surviving house on Washington Square. The building has evolved throughout the years. Virginia Goulet constructed the nucleus of the house in 1868. The house evolved into a coastal cottage in 1875 when Columbia Randlette lengthened the façade and altered the roof. The has been referred to as the “Goelet House,” but is also referred to as the “Randelette-Beck-Behlen House.”

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 March 3rd, 2013 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time an application for a fence was approved by the Board. The proposed scope of work includes removing a rear deck, constructing a new rear porch with connecting carport, and construction of a storage shed.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Design an addition so there is the least possible loss of historic fabric and so the character-defining features of the historic building are not destroyed, damaged or obscured.”
   2. “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.”
   3. “Whenever 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.”
4. “Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material and character of the property, neighborhood and environment.”

5. “Design the building components (roof, foundation, doors and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”

6. “Maintain the relationship of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building.”

7. “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.”

8. “If the style of an addition is different than the original, use a style that is compatible with the historic context.”

9. “Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.”

10. “Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.”

11. “Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.”

12. “Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights of an addition to those of the historic building.”

13. “Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.”

14. “Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.”

15. “Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.”

16. “Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.”

17. “Utilize an alternative material for siding as necessary, such as cement-based fiber board, provided that it matches the siding of the historic building in profile, character and finish.”

18. “Use a material with proven durability.”

19. “Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.”

20. “Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.”

21. “Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.”

22. “Do not use a faux stucco application.”

23. “Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.”

24. “Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze boards, moldings or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.”

25. “Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.”

26. “If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the addition.”

27. “Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.”
28. “Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.”
29. “Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.”
30. “Design the scale of a doorway on an addition to be in keeping with the overall mass, scale and design of the addition as a whole.”
31. “Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.”
32. “Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.”
33. “Match foundation height to that of the original historic building.”
34. “Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.”
35. “Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.”
36. “Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.”
37. “Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original structure.”
38. “Use a material for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.”
39. “Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the original historic structure.”
40. “Porches may be appropriate to add at certain locations. A new porch addition should remain subordinate to any original historic porches. In general, a new porch is best located to the side or rear.”
41. “Limit the height of a porch addition roofline so it does not interfere with second story elevations.”
42. “Design the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure.”
43. “Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure.”
44. “Design a porch addition roofline to be compatible with the existing historic structure. However, a porch addition roofline need not match exactly that of the existing historic building. For example, a porch addition may have a shed roof.”
45. “Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building.”
46. “Do not use a contemporary deck railing for a porch addition placed at a location visible from the public street.”
47. “Do not use cast concrete steps on façades or primary elevations.”
48. “Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.”
49. “Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district.”
50. “These are traditionally located at the rear of a lot.”
51. Acceptable accessory structure materials include: “wood frame; masonry; cement fiber based siding; installations (premade store-bought sheds provided they are minimally visible from public areas).”
52. Unacceptable materials: “metal, plastic and fiberglass except for greenhouse.”
C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):

1. Construct one story porch connecting hyphen.
   a. An existing deck off the South elevation will be demolished.
   b. The hyphen will connect to the proposed carport.
   c. The porch addition will extend 16’0” from the South (rear) Elevation and 11’7” pass the West (side) Elevation.
   d. A hipped standing seam metal roof will surmount the porch addition.
   e. The roof will be supported by 8’x8” capped wooden columns.
   f. Mesh screen inserts will be fixed between columns.
   g. The decking will be tongue and groove.
   h. The foundation will be stucco over CMU.
   i. West (side) Elevation
      1) Paired columns will be constructed on the northernmost and southernmost portions of the elevation.
      2) The center of the elevation will feature the backside of a cooking counter.
   j. South (rear) Elevation
      1) Paired columns will be employed on the easternmost and westernmost corners of the elevation.
      2) Two equidistant sets of wood screen doors with steps will be constructed.
      3) A hyphen will extend from the pair of doors located on the western portion from the elevation.
      4) The hyphen will extend 8’4”.
      5) The hyphen will connect to the proposed carport.
      6) The hyphen will be surmounted by a standing seam metal roof.
   k. East (side) Elevation
      1) Paired columns will be employed on the southernmost corner of the elevation.
      2) A fireplace will be centrally located on the proposed elevation.

2. Construct a carport.
   a. The carport will be located south of the proposed porch.
   b. The carport will be constructed 3’5” from the west property line.
   c. The carport will be 22’0” in depth and 21’5” in width.
   d. The roof will sheathed in shingles or 5V crimp or standing seam metal.
   e. The roof will be supported by wooden columns that match the proposed porch.
   f. The carport will be open on all sides.

3. Construct a shed.
   g. The shed will be constructed at the rear of the lot on the rear southwest corner.
   h. The shed will be constructed 3’0” from the side and rear property line.
   i. The shed will be 45’0” in depth and 12’0” in width.
   j. The shed will feature a standing seam metal roof.
   k. The roof will be supported by wooden posts.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application up for review calls for the construction of a rear porch addition, the construction of a carport, and construction of a shed.

Regarding the new porch addition for the proposed residence, said work is located in the rear of the contributing building. For reasons of its situation on the lot, abutting buildings (ancillary on same property and next door buildings) and proposed location on the residence, the overall character of the property and environs would be retained and thus would be in keeping with Mobile’s Historic Districts
Design Review Guidelines (See B-2 and B-40) The proposed addition would be located off of an addition so would not disturb historic fabric. Said work would subordinate to the body of the house (See B-10). The lower height of the addition which the proposed work engages is observed and serves to further differentiate that which is recent and that which is historic (See B-15). The addition’s foundation height is slower lower than that of the existing house, but does not adversely impact the aesthetic (See B-43). Building components of enclosed space compliment the main house and match the existing (See B-45.). For example, round columns match that in design of the front porch on the existing dwelling. The additions roof is compatible with the existing roofline (See B-44).

Two ancillary buildings are proposed for the property. The Design Review Guidelines outlines criteria for new ancillary construction. A two vehicle carport will be constructed behind the main house. The carport will be connected to the new porch addition by hyphen. A large shed will also be constructed. Both the shed and carport will feature metal roof that match the proposed porch addition (See B-48). The columns on the carport supporting the roof will be wooden and round to match that of the porch addition (See B-42).

CLARIFICATIONS

1. What will backside of cooking counter be constructed of?
2. What size are the post supporting the roof on the shed?

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-43) 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. Preston Reeder, owner, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant, Mr. Reeder, and asked if there were any comments he would like to make, questions to ask, or concerns. Mr. Reeder replied no.

Mr. Stone asked if there was a photo of the existing rear elevation. Mr. Reeder replied he did not have a current photo. Mrs. Daniel noted staff was unable gain access to the rear yard.

Mr. Stone asked about the existing gable over the door on the rear elevation. Ms. Harden stated it was a hipped roof. Mr. Sledge noted the gable was on the back of the kitchen. Mr. Reeder confirmed the roof line of the rear elevation was a product of a previous addition.

Ms. Harden noted work was only being conducted on the rear elevation and to refer to the drawings. . Mr. Reeder confirmed the proposed scope of work alters the rear elevation. Mr. Reeder stated the porch will be covered and a new fence will be installed to meet the guidelines.

Mr. Allen asked about the small building seen in the drawings. Mr. Reeder stated it is a small shed. Mr. Allen asked the Board was presented drawings for the shed. Mr. Stone responded approval for the shed was not being reviewed on this application and that any additional work would have to obtain approval.
Mr. Reeder mentioned the shed will match the house.

Mr. Roberts inquired as to the fenestration. Mr. Reeder confirmed for the Board the windows were existing and a porch currently exists on the rear elevation.

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. Ruzic 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. Ruzic moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board the application does not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and that the application be approved.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date:** December 5, 2019