ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
September 18th, 2019 – 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 3:00 p.m. John Sledge, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
   
   **Members Present:** Robert Brown, Abby Davis, Catarina Echols, Kim Harden, Nick Holmes, Andre Rathle, Craig Roberts, Joseph Rodrigues, Steve Stone, Gypsie Van Antwerp and Jim Wagoner
   
   **Members Absent:** David Barr.
   
   **Staff Members Present:** Bridget Daniel, John Sledge, Marion McElroy and Flo Kessler.

2. Mr. Brown moved to approve the minutes of the September 4th, 2019 meeting. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

3. Mr. Wagoner moved to approve the Mid-Months as written. The motion was seconded and the Mid-Months were approved unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant:** Phoenix Restoration Services, Inc.
   
   a. **Property Address:** 107 Bradford Avenue
   b. **Date of Approval:** 08/27/2019
   c. **Project:** Home repairs to replace and match existing dimension, profile and material. Repairs due to tree limb damage: framing, painting and roofing. No change to footprint.

2. **Applicant:** All Service Painting and Construction, Inc.
   
   a. **Property Address:** 906 Charleston Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 08/29/2019
   c. **Project:** Repair or replace front porch deteriorated wood to match in dimension, profile and material. Repaint to match. Construct framed lattice screen and install above balustrade on side of porch.

3. **Applicant:** Patriot Home Construction Inc.
   
   a. **Property Address:** 210 George Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 09/03/2019
   c. **Project:** Reroof with architectural shingles in weatherwood.

4. **Applicant:** Liberty Roofing Company Inc.
   
   a. **Property Address:** 200 Marine Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 09/05/2019
   c. **Project:** Reroof with architectural shingles, 23 squares, in charcoal.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2019-38-CA:** 202 Government Street
   
   a. **Applicant:** Mr. Timothy J. Spafford of Architecture and Design, Inc. on behalf of Mr. Brad Custred
   b. **Project:** Alteration of Façade: Remove existing vehicular entrance and window. Install storefront system on a front facade.
   
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
2. **2019-39-CA: 600 Church Street**
   a. Applicant: Mr. David Rowe of David Rowe Fine Home on behalf of Mr. David H. Crowder

   *WITHDRAWN. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.*

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

2019-38-CA: 202 Government Street
Applicant: Mr. Timothy J. Spafford of Architecture and Design, Inc. on behalf of Mr. Brad Custred
Received: 8/29/2019
Meeting: 9/18/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: T5.2
Project: Alteration of Façade: Remove existing vehicular entrance and window. Install storefront system on a front façade.

BUILDING HISTORY

This mid-twentieth century building was previously the Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Building. It has undergone a number of alterations over the years.

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 July 16, 2008 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time, the installation of a coiling garage door was approved. Plans had previously been approved on January 9, 2006 for the installation of iron galleries, roll up garage doors, installation of additional windows, and stuccoing a façade. The proposed scope of work includes the demolition of an existing garage door and window, and installation of new storefront on the first floor of the front façade.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
1. “Preserve the key character-defining features of a historic commercial façade.”
2. “Retain an original bulkhead as a decorative panel.”
3. “Locate a new storefront in the same plane as it was historically.”
4. “Design a wall to be compatible with the architectural style of the house/building and existing walls in the district.”
5. “When building a solid wall, use a finish and material that is similar in texture, mass, and durability to historic walls in the neighborhood.”
6. “Visually connect the street and building.”
7. “Where evidence does not exist, use a contemporary interpretation of a traditional storefront.”
C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):
   1. Work will be executed on the South (front) façade elevation.
   2. Remove one multi-paned window.
   3. Remove garage roll up door.
   4. Install new storefront system (See Section E-3 on page A4.2).
      a. The system sequence of openings will be as follows: window, door, window, door, window, window.
      b. The doors will feature transoms above.
      c. The windows will feature a bronzed panel bulkhead below and multi-paned transom above.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the alteration of a front façade on non-contributing building.

With regard to the work proposed to the storefront, the subject storefront dates from 2006. Replacing one window and garage roll up door with aluminum storefront doors does not impact any historic fabric (See B-1). The installation of the storefront will feature bulkhead, display windows, and transom mimicking historic patterns. Its design compliments the existing storefront buildings along Government Street, and the neighboring Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District (See B-5).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Timothy J. Spafford of Architecture and Design, Inc. on behalf of Mr. Brad Custred, applicant, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed the applicant and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. Spafford stated staff had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Stone inquired about the color of the storefront. Mr. Stone, Mr. Roberts, Ms. Harden and Mr. Rodrigues agreed the colors needed to be consistent with the existing building by painting all the doors and windows the same color. The Board also stated the glass should be single pane insulated glass.

Mr. Spafford replied to the Board by stating the first floor space will be adapted into a coffee shop and barber shop with a clear partition dividing the spaces. He explained no alterations were to be made on the second floor, or the existing front door on the eastern portion of the first floor. He agreed to matching the windows to the existing second story window color, but noted it will be difficult to order storefront windows in that color.

Ms. Harden asked if the rollup door will be replaced and aligned with the door jam. Mr. Spafford confirmed for Ms. Harden the garage door on the eastern side would align with the door, but the right side will not due to a structural column.
No further discussion from the Board ensued at that time.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Stone 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 property or neighborhood and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

The motion received a second by Mr. Wagoner and was approved with one, Mr. Stone, in opposition.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-39-CA: 600 Church Street
Applicant: Mr. David Rowe of David Rowe Fine Home on behalf of Mr. David H. Crowder
Received: 8/15/2019
Meeting: 9/18/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: T5.1

BUILDING HISTORY

The property is a vacant lot.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board in 1985 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time, an existing historic residence on Spring Hill Avenue was approved to be relocated to the site. The proposed scope of work includes the demolition of an existing ancillary and new construction of an ancillary building.

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

1. Regarding the context of new design, there are three main types: “main street,” “commercial corridor,” and “interior neighborhood.”

2. “The second context for new commercial construction is the commercial corridor. This 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.”

3. “In more recent years, commercial projects have begun developing alongside historic residential buildings on this corridor. In some cases, an infill site may be on a block face already completely developed with non-historic commercial properties.”

4. “The third context is the Interior Neighborhood Context. This context is more rare in Mobile’s historic districts than “Main Street” and “Commercial Corridor.” This refers to new commercial construction that develops in the interior of a predominantly residential historic district.”

5. “This context (interior neighborhood) refers specifically to new. Small scale commercial construction that develops for corner-stores or other neighborhood-serving retail uses that are completely surrounded by residential structures. In most cases, commercial infill in this
context is like to develop on corner lots; however, interior commercial infill is also possible, and particularly in DeTonti Square and the Northern edge of Church street East. For this context, new commercial construction should strongly consider massing, scale, and orientation to ensure compatibility with nearby historic residential buildings.

6. 7.30 “Orient a new commercial building to be similar to that of nearby historic structures.”

7. “Place buildings in line with adjacent historic buildings in terms of relationship to the street. If a project is flanked by non-historic structures, refer to nearby historic structures.”

8. “Design side setbacks to be similar to those in adjacent historic buildings. If a project is flanked by non-historic structures refer to nearby historic structures.”

9. “Orient façades of new commercial buildings similarly to adjacent historic structures. In most cases, new commercial structures should be oriented to directly face the street.”

10. “Face primary building entries toward the public street.”

11. “Screen ancillary buildings or place them behind the primary building.”

12. “New commercial construction in the Commercial Corridor context should prioritize front setback distances and landscape design in front yards in order to establish compatibility with nearby historic residential structures, if any exist. New commercial construction in this context should also be sensitive to rear-adjacent historic residential structures.”

13. 7.33 “Place and orient new commercial construction at interior neighborhood locations to be compatible with that of adjacent historic residential structures and the district.”

14. “Establish front setbacks similar to those in adjacent historic residential development or historic residential development on the same block.”

15. “If off-street parking is provided, place it behind the building where possible.”

16. “Orient facades to be parallel with the street.”

17. “7.34 Design a building to be compatible with massing and scale with historic structures in the district.”

18. “Use vertical and horizontal articulation design techniques to reduce the apparent scale of larger building mass.

19. “Incorporate changes in color, texture, and material.”

20. “7.35 Design building massing and scale to maintain the visual continuity of the district.”

21. “7.36 Maintain traditional spacing patterns created by the repetition of building widths along the street.”

22. 7.39 “New commercial construction in the Interior Neighborhood context, where small scale commercial buildings are constructed on corners in a residential neighborhood, should exhibit massing and scale that is similar to adjacent and nearby historic residential structures in the district.”

23. “Use massing that is similar to nearby historic structures.”

24. “Where larger building volumes are desired, break down building massing near the street to create separate volumes that are similar to the massing of adjacent and nearby historic residential structures.”

25. “Limit the height of a building to be equal or less to those of adjacent and nearby historic residential structures.”

26. “7.8 Use building materials that are compatible with the surrounding historic residential context.”

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

1. Construct a single family residence designed as a commercial building.”
   a. The building facade will be setback 11’0”-13’1” from the Church Street.
   b. The building will comprised of multiple square compositions.
   c. The overall building footprint will be an estimated 144’8” in depth, 83’0” in width at the rear elevation, and 41’6” in width on the front elevation.
   d. The walls will be brick.
e. A brick belt course will be employed.

f. The windows will be black aluminum clad.

g. A parapet wall will extend around the South (façade) and North (rear interior courtyard) elevation.

h. Gabled and hipped roof forms will surmount the building.

i. Architectural shingle sin a neutral color will sheath the roof.

2. South (Façade/abutting Church Street) Elevation (advanced portion)
   a. The North Elevation (advanced) will be defined by three bays.
   b. The North elevation will have a recessed porch on the eastern end, 8’0” in depth.
   c. The westernmost bay will have a paired six-over-six window below an inset brick with multi-paned window above spanning the width of the aforementioned window.
   d. The central bay will feature a paneled wood door under the porch.
   e. Above the door on the façade plane with be inset brick with multi-paned transom above.
   f. The brick insets will be rectilinear in design.
   g. A wrought iron railing will be employed on the porch.
   h. The parapet will be stepped and raked.
   i. The highest point of the parapet will be 26’3-1/2” in height.

3. South (interior of lot—not visible from public view) Elevation
   a. The South Elevation (interior) will feature portions in advance of or recessed planes.
   b. The western portion of the elevation will feature a 20’10” wall with no fenestration in advance of the other two portions.
   c. The central portion will be recessed from both the eastern and western portion and span 31’10”.
   d. The aforementioned portion will employ a paired window.
   e. The eastern portion will span in 14’0” in width and feature brick steps accessing a glazed door.

4. East (side) Elevation
   a. The East elevation roofline will feature change in height.
   b. The southern portion of the elevation will have fenestration as follows in a southerly to northerly direction: rectangular opening with metal grill; triple-paired window; single multi-paned window; single multi-paned window; triple-paired window.
   c. The northern portion will feature fenestration in the following southerly to northerly direction: paired six-over-six window; fixed paneled vehicular garage door; paired multi-paned window; paired vehicular glazed and paneled garage doors; and vehicular glazed and paneled garage door.

5. (side, interior) Elevation
   a. The North (exterior) Elevation will feature a false louver on the easternmost end.

6. North (rear, exterior) Elevation
   b. The North (exterior) Elevation will feature a false louver on the easternmost end.

7. North (rear, interior) Elevation
   a. A hyphen connecting a rear portion of the house and front portion will be located on the easternmost portion of the North (interior) elevation.
   b. A metal awning roof will extend from the hyphen to the western end of the interior elevation. The roof will 5V crimp or standing seam metal and supported by iron columns and brick column with balustrade between posts.
   c. Brick steps will access the porch.
d. Paired single pane windows will flank a glazed door under the porch.
e. There wall will feature a stepped and rake parapet.

8. West (side) Elevation
   a. The West Elevation will be feature portions of the façade and advanced and recessed of each other.
   b. The southern portion will feature no fenestration. The southern portion’s south end will be punctuated by a porch supported by a brick column.
   c. The central portion (hyphen) will be recessed from 22’6” from the southern portion and 14’0” from the northernmost portion.
   d. The aforementioned section will feature two paired single-pane windows. One of the windows will be covered under the porch.
   e. The northernmost portion will be slightly in advance of the recessed central portion.
   f. The aforementioned portion will feature two sets of entrance doors and brick steps. A “dog ramp” and door will punctuate the northern end.

9. Conduct site improvements.
   a. Historic coping wall will remain as will the existing curb cut.
   b. Construct courtyard on the interior of the lot.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a new single family residence designed as an interpretation of a commercial building on a corner lot in the Church Street East Historic District. When reviewing applications for new commercial construction, the following principle criteria are taken into account: context; placement & orientation; massing; scale; façade elements; and materials. Of these criterions, the first three items should be considered strongly (See B-5).

New commercial design should conform to one of the following main typologies: main street, commercial corridor, or interior neighborhood. The property is located on a corner lot on a mixed-use street one block distant from a prominent artery of the Church Street East Historic District (See B-5). Buildings located in the interior neighborhood corridor context are in close proximity to historic residences. The Church Street East boundary is defined by Conti Street, Broad Street, Canal Street and Water Street. The period of significance is listed from 1834 to 1957. Uses found in this district are governmental, educational, religious, commercial and residential buildings. Commercial buildings take the form of hotels (LaClede Hotel, 150 Government), mixed use buildings (126 Government Street), and industrial facilities (Crystal Ice House 800 Monroe Street).

Placement of commercial buildings in interior neighborhood context involves consideration of setbacks and orientation (see B-6). Setbacks from the street and between buildings are taken into account. As to orientation, the building faces Church Street mimicking the residence adjacent west (See B-6). As the property is a corner lot, responsiveness to the setbacks of two street streets, Warren in addition to church Street, is warranted. With regard to the front setback, the building is setback no more than 13’0” from the Church Street perimeter lot line, and setback closely to the Warren Street perimeter lot line. The setback is close in line with the neighboring property, 602 Church Street. When reviewing setbacks, front setback and landscaping are of primary consideration. The site plan shows there will be no parking or vehicular drives on either frontage. Curb cuts will remain on the Warren Street side and provide access to a vehicular garage. The site plan also illustrates an interior courtyard space. Side setbacks in an interior neighborhood context should respond to adjacent historic structures (See B-8). Several residential structures in Church Street East such as the shotgun buildings are set closely to the side lot lines. The setbacks of the building respond to historic setbacks seen on Church Street and in the district.
Massing refers to the relationship between the component parts comprising a building. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that massing and scale of new commercial construction in an interior neighborhood context should appear to be similar to that of historic buildings in the districts (See B-17). Scale is related to massing. Traditionally, most historic commercial buildings were situated close to the right of way. The building proposed was inspired by a commercial building seen in a corridor context in the Automobile Alley historic district located at 451 St. Louis Street (Buick Building). This particular example is also responsive to other historic commercial buildings found in interior neighborhood or on small commercial corridors such as such as 2066 Old Shell Road. Both of these commercial buildings are rectangular in massing, and feature flat roof forms with parapet. The East (side, exterior) elevation’s massing is broken by a change in roof height and form (See B-24). In terms of height, the single story responds to historic buildings in the district (See B-22). The adjacent residence at 600 Church Street is two stories in height. The massing and scale of the proposed design is compatible with the district.

As to materials, the drawings of the proposed building depict a brick veneer treatment. Many 19th Century and early 20th century commercial buildings were faced with brick (See B-26). Historic storefront facades were often composed of bulkhead, window, and transom or clerestory window above. The proposed front elevation includes windows with clerestory window above. The windows are aluminum clad, an approvable material for new construction project in historic districts. The roof will be sheathed in neutral colored architectural shingles.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. What will the material of the interior courtyard doors be? (Approvable materials are wood, aluminum clad, or metal.)

SUGGESTIONS

1. Consider moving the multi-paned clerestory windows on the front elevation lower, and condensing the height of the brick insets below.
2. Consider adding more windows to the front elevation.
3. Consider lowering the header of the windows on the East (side) elevation.
4. Consider a door with square panel above a lower square panel.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff has made suggestions based on commercial context and warehouse design for the applicant to consider. Due to the massing, scale, orientation, and compatibility of materials to the neighborhood, Staff recommends the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. David Crowder and Mr. Criss Perry Crowder, owners, with Mr. David Rowe, representative, were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed the owners and representative and asked if they had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. Crowder stated staff had addressed the application in full.
Mr. Stone, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Holmes, Ms. Harden and Ms. Davis expressed the building plans are not consistent and stated they would like to view pictures and samples of the several proposed items. These items include garage door, entrance doors, windows, porch floor tile, and more.

Mr. Craig Roberts asked the location of the proposed decorative finials. Mr. David Crowder stated the finials will go back where they are. Mr. Crowder stated they would be located as indicated by dots on the elevation. He further explained the wood door will be solid, two panels, one rounded, with no metal grille. Ms. Davis responded the door panels needed to be squared. Mr. Roberts also stated the courtyard needs to be in the back yard, not the front. Mr. Crowder clarified the courtyard will be in the back. Mr. Crowder also stated the building would feature dark bronze windows both fixed and double hung. Mr. Steve Stone stated that while the proportions of the windows were square or vertical, the elevations lacked consistency and that the proposed bronze color would look good on the building.

Mr. Nick Holmes stated the ceiling appears to be running through the transom. Mr. Crowder responded there is a 14’ ceiling over the porch and explained the ceiling heights will change to allow for usable attic space. Mr. Crowder’s response confirmed for Mr. Holmes that the ceiling height will change for the front elevation. Mr. Holmes stated that the proposed plans look like two different buildings. Mr. Crowder explained the building is designed so that the front looks like a warehouse, but have a residence located in the rear of the building. Mr. Holmes commented on the depth of the proposed design and asked if there was any storage located in the rear portion. Mr. Crowder clarified yes, the parapet wall does eject out from the building; and noted the garage doors will be aluminum.

Mr. Steve Stone asked if the garage door would be a sectional to look like wood. Mr. Crowder responded the door will be horizontal wood with breaks on panel. Mr. Holmes commented the left garage door is finished above grade. Mr. Crowder responded that garage door is a false fixed door.

Mr. Roberts commented when trying to achieve a commercial Old Mobile sometimes less is more. He stated he did not think the recessed brick panels were necessary. Mr. Holmes stated he did not like the recessed panels. Mr. Holmes stated the neighboring residential structures and the design felt out of context. Mr. Roberts agreed. Mr. Stone expressed concern over the brick inserts Underneath he windows explaining there height was concerning and location to close to the gutter. Mr. Crowder responded originally they did not have that many windows explaining the Consolidated Review Committee (CRC) is requiring 58% windows to meet the requirements of the Downtown Development District Form Based Code. He further explained the windows were intentionally placed high to avoid any damage from Mardi Gras throws. Ms. McElroy agreed with the applicant that any changes will require them to return to the CRC.

Mr. Holmes agreed and stated the windows are placed too high and throw off the proportions of the other design elements. Ms. Harden agreed stating proportions of the windows on the rear elevation and rear porch are more balanced. Ms. Davis agreed.

Mr. Jim Wagoner commented he appreciated your concern about work. He explained he did not take any issue with the fixed garage door. He suggested the idea to incorporate something that looks old and new to make two distinct buildings look as one is a cool idea.

Mr. Joseph Rodrigues stated the right side is vertical and all brick. Mr. Roberts asked where the Government Street door was that is a flat steel door, and if it a stainless steel door. Mr. Crowder responded yes and it is next to the garage doors. Ms. Harden stated it needed to be a flush panel door by the garage door. Mr. Crowder asked if glass would be allowed on the Warren Street side. Mr. Roberts responded that would not be an issue.
The Board, staff and applicant discussed withdrawing the application and reviewing it with the Design Review Committee to help clarify any concerns with the plans regarding the guidelines.

No further discussion from the Board ensued at that time.

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

**FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Stone stated 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.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the property or neighborhood and is withdrawn at this time. The owners will meet with the Design Review Committee to discuss plans.