ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA
March 20th 2019 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes from March 6th, 2019.
3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs Granted by Staff

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant: David McConnell of David T. McDonald General Contractors
   a. Property Address: 113 Ryan Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 2/26/2019
   c. Project: Repair damaged siding on recent addition with hardi plank side to match existing in dimension and profile. Repaint to match.

2. Applicant: Timothy McKee
   a. Property Address: 1011 Augusta Street
   b. Date of Approval: 2/28/2019
   c. Project: Enclose existing rear porch to make sunroom. Wooden windows will be installed above wood panels between the outer bays of the West Elevation, and the single bay of the South elevation. Paint to match existing color scheme. Existing brick steps will remain.

3. Applicant: Kim Tew
   a. Property Address: 9 Semmes Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 2/28/2019
   c. Project: Repair/replace rotten siding, soffit, molding to match original in profile, dimension, and materials. Repaint to match existing.

4. Applicant: Chris Schwall on behalf of Dale Short
   a. Property Address: 12 S. Conception Street
   b. Date of Approval: 3/1/2019
   c. Project: Repaint trim/shutters in white or neutral color like black.

5. Applicant: MPT Inc.
   a. Property Address: 452 Michigan Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 3/6/2019
   c. Project: Install 5V Crimp metal roof.

6. Applicant: Irv Horton on behalf of Advantage Sign
   a. Property Address: 1260 Government Street
   b. Date of Approval: 3/6/2019
   c. Project: Install new face (double) to existing monument sign. Face will be painted aluminum. Logo and letter will be back lit for a halo effect. Sign will have digital LED lighting for cost of gas only. Install two logo( shell), backlit for halo effect, painted aluminum on two sides of the canopy.

7. Applicant: Grant Rockett on behalf of Apex Roofing
   a. Property Address: 56 N. Monterey Street
   b. Date of Approval: 3/7/2019
   c. Project: Reroof with CertainTeed Landmark Charcoal Black Architectural Shingles (50 Year Shingles).
8. **Applicant:** Alliance Roofing  
   a. Property Address: 1125 S. Saraland Blvd. 
   b. Date of Approval: 3/8/2019  
   c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in charcoal.  

9. **Applicant:** Lyn Manz-Walters  
   a. Property Address: 1150 Texas Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 3/8/2019  
   c. Project: Install 6' wooden privacy fence along west perimeter of lot not to exceed front plane of house.  

10. **Applicant:** Noel Mount  
    a. Property Address: 1403 Dauphin Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 3/8/2019  
    c. Project: Repaint body of house to similar existing color.  

11. **Applicant:** William and Autumn Porter  
    a. Property Address: 19 S. Ann Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 3/11/2019  
    c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood to match existing in dimension, profile, and material. Repaint to match existing.  

12. **Applicant:** 506 Eslava Street  
    a. Property Address: 506 Eslava Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 3/11/2019  

C. **APPLICATIONS**  
   1. **2019-15-CA:** 352 S. Broad Street  
      a. Applicant: Mr. DeMarkus Burroughs Boykin, Sr.  
      b. Project: Demolition Related: Demolish a contributing residence.  
   
   2. **2019-16-CA:** 50 Common Street  
      a. Applicant: Mr. Stephen May  

D. **OTHER BUSINESS**
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF REPORT

2019-15-CA: 352 S. Broad Street
Applicant: Mr. DeMarkus Burroughs Boykin, Sr.
Received: 3/1/2019
Meeting: 3/20/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition Related: Demolish a contributing residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

Two residences appeared on the 1904 Sanborn map for this site. A residence on the 1925 Sanborn map is has similar footprint to the current residence. Tax records show a significant increase between 1927 and 1928. The current configuration of this bungalow dates from 1928 and was constructed or reconfigured for W. B. Grimes and family.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. This property has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board according to the MHDC vertical files. The proposed scope of work includes the demolition of a contributing residence. The applicant will return at a later date to submit an application for the new construction.

B. This property has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board according to the MHDC vertical files. The applicant proposes the demolition of the derelict contributing building.

A. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:

1. Required findings; demolition/relocation. The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district.

2. The Design Review Guidelines state in pertinent part:
   a. This section provides general guidelines for consideration of demolition
of a historic structure. The demolition of historic structures is generally not allowed unless there are extraordinary circumstances. When demolition is proposed, consider the following general guidelines.

b. As an initial step, determine the significance of the historic structure. An analysis should be undertaken to determine if the historic structure retains its integrity. In some cases, a property previously identified as a contributing historic structure may no longer retain its integrity due to changes to the structure since the time it was originally determined to be historic.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

k. Consider the future utilization of the site.

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

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

   i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;

      1. Portions of this property possibly date from 1905. The present configuration dates from 1928. This building is listed as a contributing structure in the Old Oakleigh Garden District. It holds architectural merit and historical significance.

   ii. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;

      1. The dwelling adds to the built density of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

   iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;

      1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced or acquired.
iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
   1. The wood framed structure is a bungalow which once made up a largely residential avenue. This house sits on an inner lot between two residences.

v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area;
   1. If granted demolition approval, the house would be demolished, and the applicant would return at a later date for approval of a new residence based on plans submitted with this application.

vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
   1. N/A.

vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
   1. The owner initially sought to rehabilitate the property but is seeking to demolish the residence and rebuild due to cost.

viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
   1. To staff’s knowledge, the property has not been put up for sale.

ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
   1. N/A.

x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
   1. Elevations and site plans have been submitted.

xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
   1. A performance bond and line of credit has been obtained.

xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
   1. N/A.
   2. See other submitted materials.

   2. Post demolition or relocation plans required. In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

C. Scope of Work:
1. Demolish a residence.
2. Remove the debris from the site.
3. Stabilize the site.
4. Return to ARB with full plans based on drawings submitted.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the demolition of a deteriorated residential building which is listed as a contributing building in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into the account the following considerations: the architectural significance of the
building; the condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

352 S. Broad Street is listed as a contributing building located within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. It is an example of a bungalow built or altered to its current condition in 1928. The residence exemplifies the trends spurred by growth and streetcar lines in the neighborhood during that period. Broad Street is first seen on the Goodwin and Haire map of 1824. The street was the furthermost boundary of the city at that time. The street evolved from the urban grid seen at the core of the city into a more spacious lot size and grid. By the late 19th century Broad Street was a key thoroughfare complete with a trolley line. The residences on Broad Street are a reminder of the splendid and active avenue.

This wood frame building is in an advanced state of disrepair. Staff conducted an on-site inspection of the exterior on ground and noted termite damage and deteriorated wood. The southern elevation has extensive fire damage to he wall and portion of the roof. According to a blight survey completed in 2018, the property was not deemed a danger to the right of way, or neighboring structures. The aforementioned report indicated fire damage, roof damage, and water penetrating structure.

The house contributes to the built density, rhythmic sequencing of the landscape, and to historic character and physical experience of Broad Street. As an inner block dwelling, the building is only viewed from head on or an oblique angle. The house is part of an intact residential block face of Broad Street.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished and debris would be removed. The applicant would return to the Board with an application for new residential construction based on drawings submitted.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2) Staff does believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends denial.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2019-16-CA: 50 Common Street
Applicant: Mr. Stephen May
Received: 3/6/2019
Meeting: 3/20/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing (Vacant Lot)
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construction Related: Relocate existing house to vacant lot.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Amelia Stewart House at 137 Tuscaloosa Street is comprised of an 1835 rear portion and 1871 front addition. The rear portion was constructed in the Federal style while the front portion is a temple form Greek Revival imitating Oakleigh. After dismantling the house, both portions may date earlier.

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 6, 2019. At that time a request for the conceptual relocation of a residence was approved based on site plan. The proposed scope of work includes the relocation of a residence previously listed individually on the National Register of Historic Places to Old Dauphin Way.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
1. Regarding relocation: “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. “Where possible, relocate a building to a site that is similar in size as perceived from the street.”
5. “Regarding general preservation principles: “Do not try to change the style of a historic resource or make it look older than its actual age.”
6. “Regarding the construction of new residences: “Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
7. “Design exterior building walls to reflect traditional development pat-terns of nearby historic buildings.”
8. “Use exterior materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.”
9. “Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.”
10. “Design a new door and doorway on new construction to be compatible with the historic district.”
11. “Design piers, a foundation and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.”
12. “Use details and ornamentation that help new construction integrate with the historic buildings in the district.”
13. “Locate and design windows to be compatible with those in the district.”
14. “Design shutters and awnings to be compatible with the district.”

C. Scope of Work

1. Relocate portion of house dating from 1871 currently situated at 137 Tuscaloosa Street.
   A. Property would be carefully moved and relocated to Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
   B. Reassemble residence at lot at corner of Common Street and Conti Street.
      i. Building will be orientated to the Common Street situated on a a corner lot bound by Common Street, Conti Street, and Caroline Avenue.
      ii. The house will be situated as to negotiate the setbacks of neighboring properties as well as situating it to mimic the placement on the previous lot. (See Sheet C-1, Scheme A.)
      iii. The proposed house is harmonious with other structures in the Old Dauphin Way district.
      iv. The house will be sat upon a brick pier foundation with framed wooden lattice between.
      v. Wood siding will be repaired or replaced to match in dimension, profile and material.
      vi. Wooden windows will be repaired to match.
      vii. Wood columns will be repaired to match.
      viii. Deteriorated wood elements will be repaired or replaced to match the existing in dimension, profile, and material.
      ix. New fiberglass or asphalt shingles will be installed to replace the previous shingles.
      x. The East (front) Elevation will have a new wooden balustrade installed between columns based on existing ghost marks.
      xi. The West (rear) Elevation will be clad in wood siding to match existing. A four paneled wooden door will be located in the center portion of the elevation. Wooden stairs and stoop will access the aforementioned door.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the relocation and rehabilitation of an existing residence at 137 Tuscaloosa Street to a lot at the corner of Conti and Common Streets. The application has been brought before the Board authorized under the “Rules and Regulations Governing Proceedings for before the Architectural Review Board,” under section 6 (d) and section 8 (c) 2.

The building is currently individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places. 137 Tuscaloosa Street has been purchased for redevelopment (parking lot.) The proposed location of lot for relocation is
in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. Relocating the structure to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District will make it possible to potentially keep its National Register status (See B-1). The previous site at 137 Tuscaloosa Street is located near the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.

With regard to the relocation, the building will be moved to a vacant lot. Other examples of the Greek Revival style can be seen in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The residence will maintain the current rhythm of other structures in the district (See B-3). The house will also be on a larger lot, mimicking the larger lot size on Tuscaloosa Street (see B-4).

Regarding the elements of the building, the Greek Revival temple form structure has a central three bay structure with wings. The door and window patterns are similar to those found on Common Street. Existing items would be largely repaired or replaced to match the existing. These items include windows and siding. The rear elevation which previously connected to a earlier dated portion will be feathered in with wood siding to match the existing. The rear elevation is not in public view.

SUGGESTIONS

1. Consider placing blind shutters on the rear elevation to establish a rhythm seen on other historic homes in the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-1), Staff does not believe the relocation of the house will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the properties or district. Staff recommends approval of the application.