ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
February 5th, 2020 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Steve Stone, called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. Christine Dawson, Historic Development Staff, called the roll as follows.

   **Members Present:** Catarina Echols, Craig Roberts, Joseph Rodrigues, Steve Stone, Gypsie Van Antwerp, and Jim Wagoner

   **Members Absent:** Robert E. Brown, Sr., Abby Davis, Kim Harden, and Andre Rathle

2. Mr. Rodrigues moved to accept the minutes from the January 15th meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Roberts and approved unanimously.

3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the Mid-Month COAs as written by staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rodrigues and approved unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant:** Susan Healy
   a. **Property Address:** 164 Roper Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 12/19/2019 (following consultation with Design Review Committee)

2. **Applicant:** Reyner Construction LLC
   a. **Property Address:** 1359 Dauphin Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 12/19/2019 (following consultation with Design Review Committee)
   c. Project: Replace windows with Spanish cedar types of same pattern as existing; enclose side porch with brick to match body of house; enclose rear porch with board-and-batten to create utility room.

3. **Applicant:** Michael Ulrich
   a. **Property Address:** 69 S Ann Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 12/20/2019 (following consultation with Design Review Committee)

4. **Applicant:** Mr. Paul Burch
   a. **Property Address:** 67 N Monterey Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 01/09/2020
   c. Project: Replace rotten fascia boards to match; reroof with charcoal gray architectural shingles. Install square pattern lattice as underpinning.

5. **Applicant:** William M. Jr, and Anna Moore
   a. **Property Address:** 200 Lanier Avenue
   b. **Date of Approval:** 01/09/2020

6. **Applicant:** Curtis Campbell
   a. **Property Address:** 1320 Azalea Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 01/10/2020
7. **Applicant:** Lyle B & Anita C. Stokley  
   a. Property Address: 1451 Government Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 01/14/2020  
   c. Project: Install metal round sign per design in file with vinyl letters.

8. **Applicant:** A & D Remodeling  
   a. Property Address: 12 N Dearborn Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 01/15/2020  
   c. Project: Termite damage repairs in-kind dimension, profile and material repair, replace and repaint to match existing.

9. **Applicant:** Claire Miller  
   a. Property Address: 1015 Old Shell Road  
   b. Date of Approval: 01/16/2020  
   c. Project: Erect metal five V-crimp shed roof on square posts at rear deck.

10. **Applicant:** Brady Bowman  
    a. Property Address: 19 Semmes Avenue  
    b. Date of Approval: 1/17/2020  
    c. Project: Repair rotten fascia to match, reroof weathered wood architectural shingles.

11. **Applicant:** John Wink  
    a. Property Address: 501 Eslava Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 1/17/2020  

12. **Applicant:** Dock McGuire  
    a. Property Address: 360 Adler Avenue  
    b. Date of Approval: 1/21/2020  
    c. Project: Reroof with asphalt shingles black.

13. **Applicant:** David Miller  
    a. Property Address: 124 Michael Donald Avenue  
    b. Date of Approval: 1/22/2020  
    c. Project: Install four-foot wood Gothic picket fence across front of property.

14. **Applicant:** David Miller  
    a. Property Address: 126 Michael Donald Avenue  
    b. Date of Approval: 1/22/2020  
    c. Project: Install four-foot wood Gothic picket fence.

15. **Applicant:** O’Gwynn LLC  
    a. Property Address: 204 Conti Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 1/23/2020  
    c. Project: Repair damaged balcony railing along Conti and Conception.

16. **Applicant:** Laurens Larson  
    a. Property Address: 254 N Jackson Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 1/23/2020  
    c. Project: Repair/replace termite damage, repair/replace windows to match original in material, profile and dimension. Repair damaged shutters to match original in material profile and dimension.

17. **Applicant:** Tim Wicker  
    a. Property Address: 1404 Old Shell Road  
    b. Date of Approval: 1/24/2020  
    c. Project: Add new roof charcoal black.

18. **Applicant:** John Ruzic  
    a. Property Address: 455 Marine Street
b. Date of Approval: 1/24/2020
c. Project: Rehabilitate building. Repair/replace rotten wood to match existing; replace front door with historically appropriate example; redeck front porch tongue and groove, add lattice panels; repaint; enclose NE corner to match siding elsewhere, retain corner board; add 8'x12' porch rear.

19. Applicant: John Ruzic
   a. Property Address: 457 Marine Street
   b. Date of Approval: 1/24/2020
   c. Project: Rehabilitate 457 Marine per 455 Marine. Repair/replace rotten siding to match; redeck tongue and groove front porch; replace front door with historically appropriate example; repaint; reroof; enclose NE corner to match siding, retain corner board; add rear porch and steps with railing. Add lattice panels.

20. Applicant: Shree Krishna Hospitality
   a. Property Address: 255 Church Street
   b. Date of Approval: 1/24/2020
   c. Project: Reroof small section leaking roof.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2020-01-CA: 2308 Ashland Place Avenue
   a. Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. John Vallas
   b. Project: Demolish fire-damaged residence
   APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2020-02-CA: 1412 Brown Street
   a. Applicant: Mr. Dennis Langan
   b. Project: Remove trees; install 6’ privacy fence; replace existing deck with raised deck covered by roof extended from rear elevation; install lighting under eaves; relocate existing shed
   CONCEPTUALLY APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

3. 2020-03-CA: 12 Oakland Terrace
   a. Applicant: Mr. Douglas Kearley, Architect for David and Debra Murrow
   b. Project: Construct new carport
   APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

4. 2020-04-CA: 1116 Palmetto Street
   a. Applicant: Ms. Lucy Barr on behalf of Coleman Meador
   b. Project: Construct one-story rear addition
   APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

5. 2020-05-CA: 1550 Government Street
   a. Applicant: Wrico Signs, Inc. on behalf of Winn Dixie
   b. Project: Install two signs on supermarket building façade
   WITHDRAWN. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

D. OTHER BUSINESS

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for February 19, 2020.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2020-01-CA: 2308 Ashland Place Avenue
Applicant: John and Lesley Vallas
Received: 1/11/2020
Meeting: 2/5/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R1
Project: Demolition of single-family residence

BUILDING HISTORY

According to the Ashland Place National Register nomination form, the house was constructed in 1921. The structure is described as “one story [sic] frame—Craftsman—narrow weather boarding above window sills—wide weather boarding below windows—raised basement—irregularly massed—gable roof—bracketed gable ends—projecting gabled porch over entrance—narrow square posts—9/1 windows—casement windows—screened projecting porch on west end… designed by Clarence L. Hutchisson, Sr.” C.L. Hutchisson, Sr., was a well-respected early twentieth-century Mobile architect.

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 (ARB) in October 2005, when the ARB approved the installation of a 6’ wood picket privacy fence along the western property line.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (Guidelines) state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.”
   2. “Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.”
   3. “Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.”
   4. “Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties in the same block or across the street, or properties throughout the individual historic district.”
   5. “Consider the future utilization of the site.”
   6. “If a development is proposed to replace the demolished historic structure, determine that the proposed replacement structure is consistent with the guidelines for new construction in
C. Scope of Work (per submitted application):

1. Demolish existing, fire-damaged residence.
2. Replace demolished house with new construction residence; plans currently at conceptual stage.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of the existing, fire-damaged residence on the property, which was struck by lightning on September 19, 2019. Field examination revealed significant damage to the roof structure and attic of the building. A fire and water damage inspection/assessment was performed for the applicant in November 2019 by Barton & Shumer Engineering. As noted in the report of that inspection/assessment, the purpose of the work was to document structural issue with the house to determine if it would be feasible to repair the house, or if total reconstruction would be necessary.

The report noted the following damage and structural issues.

1) The entire front roof sustained damage beyond repair… The entire main house roof framing will need to be replaced.
2) Fire damage spread to second floor/ceiling, interior and exterior walls, destroying most of the second floor… Majority of the front ceiling and second floor and decking will need to be replaced. Interior and exterior damaged studs, sheathing, and windows will need to be replaced.
3) Water damage to the main floor resulted in buckling of the hardwood floors and saturation of the subfloor… The entire hardwood flooring and most of the subfloor would need to be replaced…
5) There is obvious deflection and movement in the remaining second floor framing and walls… Some of this movement could have been caused by the weight of water from [extinguishing] the fire… Addition[al] movement could have occurred once the lath and plaster were removed from interior studs. Without the plaster, the load-bearing studs are not brace[d] and can buckle.1

As a result of the damage caused by the fire and water used to extinguish the fire, in addition to pre-existing termite damage, Barton and Shumer prescribed the following repairs if so desired.

1) Replace the entire roof framing with new 2x8 rafters, 5/8” plywood deck, and hurricane ties.
2) Replace entire second floor framing, subfloor, and ceiling joists. Some of this floor and ceiling were destroyed by the fire. The remaining has shifted, dropped, or had water damage.
3) Straighten and/or replace any interior buckled studs, add blocking to mid-span.
4) New wall studs, plywood sheathing, vapor barrier, and siding will be need[ed] at all exterior fire damage locations.
5) Replace existing damaged windows with new code compliant rated ones.
6) Replace termite damaged sill plates and subfloor.2

The report states that replaced items must meet the current building code, the 2012 International Building Code (IBC). It is the opinion of Barton and Shumer that completing all necessary repairs to the house would exceed 50 percent of the value of the house. Under City of Mobile Code, “If an existing building is

---

1 Letter from Barton & Shumer Engineering, LLC to John Vallas, December 3, 2019, pp 1-2
2 Ibid, pp 2-3
damaged by fire or otherwise in excess of fifty (50) percent of its then physical value before such
damaged is repaired, it shall be made to conform to the requirements of this code for new buildings.” The
report continues with a list of additional structural repairs and improvements, including the installation of
hurricane strapping, ½-inch plywood to the entire perimeter of the house to allow for wind shear walls,
and reinforced masonry or concrete piers to supplement the existing brick piers, that would be necessary
to meet the 2012 IBC.

The report concludes that “the costs to repair and bring the house to current codes is [sic] not feasible and
will exceed 50 percent of the value of the home. It is our opinion that the existing house should be
removed, [sic] and [a] new house be built to meet current codes and architectural requirements of the
neighborhood.”

Staff notes that the 2012 IBC includes specific provisions for historic buildings, defined in the IBC as
“buildings that are listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, or designated
as historic under an appropriate state or local law.” As noted above, the property at 2308 Ashland Place
Avenue is a contributing property within the Ashland Place National Register Historic District. Chapter
34 of the IBC discusses existing buildings, including historic buildings. The chapter outlines “alternative
methods or reduced compliance requirements when dealing with existing building constraints” and
“allows for a controlled departure from full compliance with the technical codes, without compromising
the minimum standards for fire prevention and life safety features of the rehabilitated building.” Section
3409, Historic Buildings, states, “The provisions of this code relating to the construction, repair,
alteration, addition, restoration[,] and movement of structures, and change of occupancy shall not be
mandatory for historic buildings where such buildings are judged by the building official to not constitute
a distinct life safety hazard.” Therefore, the provisions of the IBC that apply to new construction and non-
historic structures do not necessarily apply to the property at 2308 Ashland Place Avenue. The upgrades
and improvements prescribed by Barton and Shumer in their December 2019 report may not be
mandatory for this property, based on the judgment of the building official.

The field inspection conducted by Staff revealed that much of the historic fabric and structure are intact,
including the brick piers, many wood windows, doors, and the majority of wood siding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-6) above, Staff believes the proposed demolition of the residence on the property would
not impair the historic character of the surrounding district. However, Staff recommends that the building
official be consulted regarding the application of specific life safety provisions of the 2012 IBC to this
property, as there may be creative ways to achieve the same ends while restoring the historic appearance
of the property and comply with City Code regarding historic structures. If restoration or rehabilitation of
the residence is found to be impractical following consultation with the building official, Staff
recommends approval of the application for demolition as submitted. Staff further recommends any
salvageable architectural features or building materials be collected prior to demolition of the structure.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

John Vallas was present to discuss the application. Mr. Vallas stated that it was a difficult decision for his
family to request demolition, as the house had been the only home in which he and his wife had raised
their five children. However, the severity of fire and water damage, including dousing the interior and
exterior of the house with contaminated water from the streets, left no alternative. Mr. Vallas detailed the
efforts he had made in an attempt to salvage the house, including gutting the interior to prepare it for
rehabilitation, investigating state tax credits, and consulting with engineers and architects. Mr. Vallas
further stated that he had consulted with the City Building Official in reference to the more relaxed application of building codes to historic buildings.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Stone asked Staff if the use of the word “however” in the recommendation meant that the recommendation is against granting the COA. Ms. Dawson stated that, as an organization charged with the preservation of Mobile’s historic resources, all alternatives to demolition should be explored. The word “however” was intended to introduce a third option, besides demolition or a costly, complicated restoration.

Mr. Rodrigues asked what was meant by “collecting” architectural features or building materials. Ms. Dawson clarified that it meant recovering any reusable elements. Mr. Vallas stated that the corbels were the only elements that could be salvaged due to water damage.

FINDING OF FACT

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

Mr. Wagoner stated his opinion that demolition of the subject property would, in fact, impair the historic character and integrity of the property and the neighborhood but the action was necessary.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Rodrigues and was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Wagoner moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the demolition of the house at 2308 Ashland Place Avenue would impair the integrity of the property and neighborhood, but the action was necessary due to the severity of damage to the house, and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Rodrigues and was unanimously approved.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2020-02-CA: 1412 Brown Street
Applicant: Dennis Langan
Received: 1/15/2020
Meeting: 2/5/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R1
Project: Remove trees around perimeter and in back yard, install 6’ wooden privacy fence to replace existing chain link fence, replace existing at-grade deck with raised deck, extend roof over existing rear addition to cover the rear doorway, relocate existing shed 25’ to the rear along property line, adjust “glass wall” at rear entrance to allow for a single floor level inside, and install lighting under the eaves.

BUILDING HISTORY

The subject property is a one-story, frame, hip-roofed center hall type house, constructed c. 1915. The property has been in the Langan family since construction.

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. Per the MHDC vertical files, this property has not appeared previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (Guidelines) state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Maintain a predominant appearance of a planted front yard/lawn.” (10.10)
   2. “Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood… Install a simple wood or wire fence… Design a fence located behind the front building plane not to exceed 72” in height.” (10.2)
   3. Acceptable fence materials include wood picket, wood slat, wood lattice, iron or steel, historically appropriate wire fences, and aluminum that appears similar to iron. (10.3)
   4. “Design lighting that is in character with the setting.
      a. When adding a new fixture, use one that is simple in character.
      b. Design lighting to be contained within a site and to not spill over to a neighboring property.
      c. Use incandescent light or a source that appears similar in character. Use a fluorescent or LED source provided source provide the color is similar to that of an incandescent
light. For residential projects, use an exterior light source that is in a color range at
3000 Kelvin temperature or below.
d. Limit the amount of landscaping lighting used on a site to the amount necessary for its
purpose for safety or the illumination of important site features.
e. Do not use a light source that creates a harsh glow or color.” (10.9)
5. “Lighting sources that produce a light similar in tone and brightness to original lighting
used for historic properties in the district are acceptable.” Acceptable lighting sources
include incandescent (low wattage), LED lighting that appears similar to an incandescent
light, mercury vapor, moon lighting, and dark sky (downward facing). (10.9)
6. “Lighting sources that produce a light incompatible in tone and brightness that is discordant
with properties in the district are unacceptable.” Unacceptable lighting sources include low
sodium and metal halide. (10.9)
7. “Design a rear porch so that its height and slopes are compatible with the original historic
structure.” (6.17)
8. “Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure.”
(6.18)
9. “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.” (6.18)
10. “Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building.” (6.18)
11. “Do not use a contemporary deck railing for a porch addition placed at a location visible
from the public street.” (6.18)
12. “Locate an accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the
district. These are traditionally located at the rear of the lot.” (9.2)

C. Scope of Work (per submitted application and plans):

1. Remove “scrub” and other small trees along the east and north sides of the property and
in the back yard.
2. Install approximately 250’ of 6’ wood privacy fence to replace existing chain link fence
on the eastern side of the property, creating a courtyard.
3. Rework glass enclosure wall at rear (north elevation) entrance to eliminate floor level
change inside.
4. Replace existing deck with raised deck extending in front of rear entry.
5. Extend roof from rear bump-out addition to the rear entry, creating a covered doorway.
Roof to be covered in architectural shingles to match existing and with pitch to match
existing.
6. Install motion-detector and accent lighting (low wattage and directed downward) under
the eaves on all four elevations: 3-4 on east elevation (accent), 3 across front porch
(motion detector), 3-4 on west elevation (accent), and 2 on rear elevation (motion
detector).
7. Relocate existing shed approximately 25’ to the north of current location.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves multiple projects at a corner property in Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
These projects are as follows: removing 4-8” camphor, water oak, pin oak, and popcorn trees; moving an
existing shed away from the residence; installing privacy fencing in the rear and east side yards; raising
the existing deck on the rear (north) elevation; extending an existing roof to provide a covered rear
entrance, and installing security and accent lighting. The proposed changes are in conformance with the
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, as elaborated below. The trees proposed for
removal are not specimen types and would be replaced by pecan and citrus fruit trees, maintaining a planted lawn/yard (B.1). Replacement of the existing chain-link fence with a wood privacy fence is in keeping with the materials and dimensions outlined in the Guidelines (B.2-3). Extending the roof of the existing rear bump-out to create a covered rear entry will create an overhanging roofline that is compatible with the existing historic structure (B.9), and raising the deck level to that of the existing back door will match the deck foundation level to that of the existing house (B.7-8). The raised deck would be constructed with plain 2x4” pressure treated lumber, a material that is in keeping with the vernacular architecture of the house (B.10-11). The proposed installation of security and accent lighting under the eaves of the house is in character with the house’s setting and is in compliance with the Guidelines (B. 4-6). The relocation of the existing shed to the rear of the yard is in keeping with the historic location of accessory structures at the rear of lots (B.13).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-12) above, Staff does not believe the changes proposed in this application would impair either the architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Dennis Langan was present to discuss the application. Mr. Langan stated that the property had been in his family since its construction by his grandfather, and a twin structure was built next door by his grandfather’s cousin. His intent is to spruce up the property to make it more inviting and livable.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Van Antwerp asked whether the privacy fence would be visible from the street. Mr. Langan stated that it would, but it would be set behind the front plane of the house (Brown Street side). Ms. Van Antwerp asked if there would be plantings in front of the fence to buffer the view. Mr. Langan stated that was not his plan.

Mr. Roberts noted that the submitted plans were difficult to read, and that some details such as the balustrade design for the rear deck and specs for the deck piers were not presented.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Rodrigues moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application and during public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff Report as written.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Roberts and was approved unanimously.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the application be approved and a Certificate of Appropriateness issued, contingent on the submission of more detailed rear elevation drawings to the ARB for approval via e-mail.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Rodrigues and was unanimously approved.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2020-03-CA: 12 Oakland Terrace
Applicant: Douglas Kearley, Architect, on behalf of David and Debra Morrow
Received: 1/15/2020
Meeting: 2/5/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R1
Project: New Construction: Construct two-bay carport

BUILDING HISTORY

The one-story frame, front-gabled bungalow type house was constructed c. 1920. The Craftsman style house features bracketed front and side gables, a porch roof supported by paired square columns on tall brick plinths, and multi-light windows in groups of two and four.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. According to the MHDC vertical files, this property has not appeared previously appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part, state the following.
   1. “A new accessory structure should be compatible with those in the district.”
   2. “Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.” (9.1)
   3. “Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district...traditionally located at the rear of a lot.” (9.2)
   4. “Materials that are compatible with the historic district in scale and character are acceptable. These often include wood frame, masonry, cement-based fiber siding [and] installations (pre-made, store-bought sheds, provided they are minimally visible from public areas).” (9.2)
   5. “Materials that are not compatible with the historic district in scale and character are unacceptable. These often include metal (except for a greenhouse), plastic (except for a greenhouse), [and] fiberglass (except for a greenhouse).” (9.2)

C. Scope of Work:
   1. Construct a wood-framed, two-bay carport on concrete slab.
a. The carport would be situated with its longer sides in a north-to-south direction and would measure 26’ by 21’.
b. The south-facing gable, the south wall of the storage area at the north end of the carport, and the north elevation would be clad in James Hardie shingled panels.
c. The east and west elevations would be open, punctuated by three square wood columns supporting the roof and a shallow storage area located at the north end of the elevations. The columns would be 10” square, and the walls of the storage area would be sheathed in James Hardie shingled panels. 1x4s would be used to create a screening effect between the columns. The roof’s rafter tails would be exposed on these elevations.
d. The storage area doors, visible from the south, would be located toward the east and west sides and would be six-paneled. A rectangular, operable, louvered Fypon vent would be located in the south-facing gable end, and the roof would be supported by four brackets.
e. The gabled roof would be covered with dimensional fiberglass/asphalt shingles.

2. Conduct site improvements.
a. The carport would be placed upon a concrete slab and accessed via a concrete apron measuring 8’ by 20’ and an existing driveway.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application under review involves construction of a carport behind an existing house on an inner lot. The proposed carport clearly would be subordinate to the existing house, as it would have a much smaller footprint and be placed behind the house in such a way that it likely would not be visible from the street (B.2-3). The proposed carport would be compatible with the architecture in the neighborhood, as its architectural elements, including a front-gabled roof, roof brackets, shingle cladding, and a louvered vent in the front-facing gable, would echo those of the existing house on the property (B.1). Further, the proposed materials are in conformance with those outlined in the Guidelines (B.4).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B.1-B.5 above, Staff does not believe the proposed carport would impair the architectural or historical character of the existing house on the property or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. Mr. Kearley noted that his client may wish to use pavers on the apron at the entrance to the carport, and he would like for the COA to include that possibility to avoid making an amendment later.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Rodrigues asked whether anything would be done to the driveway, which currently is unpaved. Mr. Kearley answered he thought it would be paved in some manner, but he hadn’t been hired to address that. Mr. Stone noted that the driveway appears to be covered currently in crushed gravel, and Mr. Kearley confirmed that.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Wagoner moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application and during public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff Report as written.
The motion was seconded by Mr. Roberts and was approved unanimously.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Wagoner moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the application be approved and a Certificate of Appropriateness issued.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Roberts and was unanimously approved.
INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R1
Project: New Construction: Construct two-story rear addition

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story, frame American Foursquare type house was constructed c. 1913. The Victorian era details include turned porch posts supporting the double-gallery front porch and an engaged polygonal turret with multi-sloped roof at the southeast corner of the second floor.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. According to the MHDC vertical files, this property has appeared previously appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). A Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the installation of a new balustrade was issued in 1993.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part, state the following.
   1. “Place an addition so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.
      a. Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.” (6.9)
   2. “Design an addition to be compatible in massing and scale with the original historic structure.
      a. Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.
      b. Where possible, match the foundation and floor height of an addition to those of the historic building.” (6.10)
   3. “Design the exterior walls of an addition to be compatible in scale and rhythm with the original historic structure.
      a. Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.
      b. 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.” (6.11)
   4. “Clearly differentiate the exterior walls of an addition from the original historic structure.
a. Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.

c. Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.” (6.12)

5. “Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension, and composition. Modern building materials will be evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original historic structure on an individual basis, with the objective of ensuring the materials are similar in their profile, dimension, and composition to those of the original historic structure.

a. 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.

b. Use a material with proven durability.

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

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

e. Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.” (6.13)

6. “Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.

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

b. 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.

c. Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the … historic building and the district.” (6.14)

7. “Design roofs such that the addition remains subordinate to the existing historic buildings in the district.” (6.15)

8. “Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.

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

b. Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.

c. Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.

d. Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the … historic building.

e. 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.” (6.16)

9. “Design piers, foundations, and foundation infill on a new addition to be compatible with those on the historic building.

a. Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.

b. Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.

c. Match foundation height to that of the … historic building.

d. Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.

e. Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.” (6.19)

10. “Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure.

a. Match a detail on an addition to … the … historic structure in profile, dimension, and material.

b. Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original.

c. Use materials for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.
d. Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the … historic structure.” (6.20)

11. “Design a window on an addition to be compatible with the … historic building.
   a. Size, place, and space a window for an addition to be in character with the original historic building.” (6.21)

C. Scope of Work (per submitted application and plans):
   1. Construct a two-story addition with stoop and stairs to the back yard on the rear (north) elevation. The first floor would have a footprint measuring 19’-8” by 15’ and would contain a family room. The second-floor addition would be located at the northeast corner of the existing building, measure 13’-4” by 7’, and would contain a walk-in closet for the master bedroom.
   2. The walls would be clad in hardiplank siding, and the roofing will match the existing.
   3. The two windows and one door in the addition would be re-used from the existing building.
   4. The ceiling height would be 9’-1 1/8” on the first floor.
   5. The roof of the two-story addition would be hipped, and the one-story portion of the addition would have a rear-gabled roof.
   6. East Elevation
      a. The east elevation would be composed of three (3) bays, the two-story portion of the addition, the one-story family room, and the stoop.
      b. The central family room portion of the elevation would be punctuated by one (1) one-over-one window and two crawl space vents at the foundation level.
      c. The stoop and steps would extend approximately 9’ north of the addition’s northern plane. The appearance on the west elevation would be that of the rear-facing gabled roof, single porch support column, balustrade, and railing.
   7. North Elevation (rear)
      a. The north elevation would be comprised of (from east to west) the two-story addition, the one-story family room addition, and the rear-gabled stoop.
      b. Fenestration on this elevation would consist of one (1) one-over-one window and a glass door sheltered by the stoop. One (1) crawl space vent would be located at the foundation level.
   8. West Elevation
      a. The west elevation would consist of the stoop (single support column, railing, and balustrade) and the one-story family room addition.
      b. There would be no fenestration on this elevation. There would be two (2) crawl space vents at the foundation level.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 1116 Palmetto Street, is a contributing property located within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application under review involves construction of a rear addition to the existing house. The two-story portion of the addition would contain only a walk-in closet on the second floor. The one-story addition would contain a family room. A stoop on the north (rear) elevation would provide access to the back yard.

When considering additions to historic structures, particular attention should be paid to the placement, size, massing, and materials of the proposed addition. The placement of the proposed addition on a secondary elevation (the rear) is in conformance with the pertinent design guidelines (B.1). The size and massing of the proposed addition are subordinate to the existing house, and the floor levels are consistent with the existing structure (B.2-3). The proposed addition would be compatible with the existing house.
and the district, while remaining distinct through the use of a stepped-back wall plane; the addition would be stepped back from the existing eastern wall plane by approximately two and one-half feet (B.4), and the walls would be clad in hardiplank siding, a material of known durability and compatibility with the existing wood clapboard siding (B.5).

The roofs of the proposed addition would be subordinate to the existing roof, similarly uncomplicated, and sheathed in the same material as existing. Therefore, the roof design and materials would be in conformance with the Guidelines (B.6-7). The windows and door of the addition would be reused from the existing house, a precise following of the Guidelines (B.8, B.11). The addition would have little to no ornamentation or detailing to distract from the historic house (B.10)

CLARIFICATIONS

1. What are the proposed materials and configuration (piers or continuous) of the foundation?
2. What are the proposed materials and design of the crawl space vents?
3. What are the proposed materials of the stoop support columns, railing, and balustrade?

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B.1-B.8 and B.10 above, Staff does not believe the size, massing, placement, and materials of the proposed addition would impair the architectural or historical character of the existing house or the surrounding district. Staff recommends clarification on the questions listed above prior to approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Lucy Barr was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Wagoner inquired of Staff why the Staff recommendation called for approval of the application as submitted, when the application showed that HardiePlank siding would be used. Staff referred the Board to the section of the Guidelines wherein “alternative material for siding…such as cement-based fiberboard, provided that it matches the siding of the historic building in profile, character, and finish” is permissible for additions to historic buildings.

Ms. Barr made the following clarifications. The foundation would be continuous brick veneer. The crawl space vents would be standard, unelaborated aluminum. The support columns would be wood boxed columns, and the railing and balustrade would be composed plain wood.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion was seconded by Mr. Rodrigues and was approved unanimously.
DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the application be approved and a Certificate of Appropriateness issued.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Rodrigues and was unanimously approved.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2020-05-CA: 1550 Government Street
Applicant: Wrico Signs, Inc. on behalf of Winn Dixie
Received: 1/21/2020
Meeting: 2/5/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B2
Project: 2 Wall-Mounted Signs

BUILDING HISTORY

According to the Mobile County tax assessor’s record, the building was constructed in 1986. The structure appears on the 1990 aerial photo of the area, but a different building appeared on the 1980 aerial photo, supporting the tax assessor’s date.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

C. According to the MHDC files, this property has not appeared previously appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

D. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (Guidelines) state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Design a new sign to be compatible with the character of a building and the district.” (11.3)
   2. “New signs are restricted to a maximum of 64 square feet.” (11.5)
   3. “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.
      a. Do not use highly reflective materials for a sign. All plastic-faced box signs are not allowed.
      b. Design a sign to be subordinate to the building façade.” (11.7)
   4. “Where necessary, use a compatible, shielded light source to illuminate a sign.
      a. Consider direct lighting toward a sign from an external, shielded lamp when possible.
      b. Use a warm colored light to illuminate a sign when possible.
      c. If halo lighting is used to accentuate a sign or building, locate the light source so that it is not visible.
      d. If a back-lit sign is used, illuminate each individual letter or element separately.
5. Acceptable sign materials include “painted or carved wood; individual wood or cast metal letters or symbols; stone, such as slate, marble, or sandstone; painted, gilded, or sandblasted glass; metal, provided it is appropriate to the architectural character of the building.”

6. Unacceptable sign materials include “whole plastic face” and “metal inappropriate for the architectural character of the building.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted application and plans):

3. Install two (2) newly fabricated aluminum wall signs.
2. The first sign would be located toward the north end of the façade (east elevation).
   a. The sign would measure 10'-10” by 1'-5” and would consist of individual letters and a medical cross constructed of aluminum. Its total area would be 17 square feet.
   b. The sign would be painted white and read “Pharmacy.”
3. The second sign would be located toward the south end of the façade.
   a. The sign would measure 33'-2” by 5’ and would consist of individual letters and a “check” mark constructed of aluminum. Its total area would be 167 square feet.
   b. The sign would be painted white and read “Winn Dixie.”

4. The total area of the two signs would be 184 square feet.
5. The signs would be externally lit with LED bulbs.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application seeks approval of two wall signs that have already been installed.

A previously approved monument sign on this property measures 96 square feet in area. The total area of all three signs would be 280 square feet. The area permitted by the Guidelines for all signs on a single property is 64 square feet. The signs which have been installed on the property are not in conformance with the Guidelines, as their signage area exceeds 64 square feet in area (B.2).

As to materials, the Guidelines state that metals may be used if they are “appropriate to the architectural character of the building (B.3 and B.5).” The building on the property was constructed in the late 20th century, an era in which aluminum was used often. Therefore, the existing sign material is in conformance with the Guidelines.

The lighting provided for the signs directs light specifically to the signage and is, therefore, in conformance with the Guidelines B.4).

The two signs under consideration were installed without the benefit of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) from the ARB. A variance was issued by the Board of Zoning Adjustment (BOA) to allow the sign area in excess of that allowed for properties along Government Boulevard on June 7, 2019. Approval of the signs is subject to the following conditions.

1. Approval from the Architectural Review Board of all signage;
2. Obtain sign permits for all signs; and
3. Full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances.3

3 Letter from City of Mobile Board of Zoning Adjustment to Weinacker’s Plaza, LLC dated June 7, 2019
STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B.2 above, Staff believes the proposed/installed wall signs impair the historic character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends denial of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Wade Wright of Wrico Signs and Aaron Kaufman of Winn Dixie were present to discuss the application. Mr. Wright stated that Winn Dixie had hired a national sign company out of Florida to fabricate and install the signs. That company installed the existing signs without a permit. They later obtained a variance from the Board of Adjustment (BOA).

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone noted that the old signage looks like it was too large and asked whether the ARB had approved it. Staff stated that the old signage was approved by the ARB, based on a variance granted by the BOA, in 2010.

Mr. Kaufman apologized for the failure of the sign company previously hired to do the work to obtain the proper permissions before installing the signs.

Mr. Stone stated that if the new signage is equal to or less than in size what was previously approved, the signage installed without review would be acceptable. Mr. Wagoner noted that it might be less time-consuming for Winn Dixie to withdraw the application and resubmit a smaller design.

Mr. Stone recommended that the applicants work with staff to determine the measurements of the previously installed signage versus the previously approved signage area and to consider submitting a revised application with signage meeting the previously approved area.

The applicant agreed to withdraw the application.

There was no further discussion at that time.

No members of the public were present to speak for or against the application. Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:16 p.m.