A. CALL TO ORDER

B. CALL TO ORDER

1. The acting Chair, Steve Stone, called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
   
   Members Present: Steve Stone, David Barr, Bob Allen, Kim Harden, and Nick Holmes.

   Members Absent: Jim Wagoner, Robert Brown, John Ruzic, Catarina Echols, Carolyn Hasser, and Craig Roberts.

   Staff Members Present: Bridget Daniel, John Sledge, and Paige Largue.

2. Mr. Allen moved to approve the minutes of the December 19th, 2018 meeting. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

3. Mr. Barr moved to approve the Mid-Months as written. Mr. Holmes seconds the motion. The motion was approved with one in opposition, Mr. Allen

C. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. Applicant: Monahan 250, LLC
   a. Property Address: 250 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/10/2018
   c. Project: Repair stucco to match existing.

2. Applicant: Peter and Renea Burns
   a. Property Address: 50 St. Emanuel Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/10/2018
   c. Project: Install one hanging blade sign composed of metal. Blade will be 21”x39” in size and double sided. Six tenant panels 9”x17” will hang from blade sign.

3. Applicant: Protestant Episcopal Church
   a. Property Address: 115 S. Conception Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/11/2018
   c. Project: Repair rails in situ, add metal bar above to meet code height.

4. Applicant: Lynn Stewart
   a. Property Address: 1906 Springhill Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 12/11/2018
   c. Project: Repair and replace rotten wood to match in material, dimension, and profile. Repaint as per existing.

5. Applicant: Margaret Edwards
   a. Property Address: 159 Davitt Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/14/2018
   c. Project: Reroof with black shingles.

6. Applicant: Southern Poolscapes on behalf of Appleton and JF West
   a. Property Address: 111 LeVert Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 12/17/2018
   c. Project: Construct gunite pool 37’6” x 14’ in rear yard.

7. Applicant: Talitrum Acquisitions
   a. Property Address: 210 George Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/14/2018
   c. Project: Repair and replace wood siding to match in dimension, profile and material. Repair first story windows to match. Repair fire damaged wood siding, windows and doors.
to match previous windows/doors in dimension, profile and material. Repair wood decking to match existing tongue and groove in dimension, profile and material. Remove stairs on rear elevation. Install Juliette balcony on second story where steps were removed. On first story of rear elevation, switch the location of existing door and window. Construct new rear entrance steps leading to door.

8. Applicant: Weatherford’s Fountain and Lawn
   a. Property Address: 906 Palmetto Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/19/2018
   c. Project: Rebuild sidewalk.

9. Applicant: Randy Pope
   a. Property Address: 1105 Elmira Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/17/2018
   c. Project: Repair and replace wood deck to match. Repair wooden siding to match historic siding in dimension, profile and material. Construct wooden handrail in place of existing railing. Repaint to match existing. Reroof to match.

10. Applicant: Talitrum Acquisitions
    a. Property Address: 210 George Street
    b. Date of Approval: 12/17/2018
    c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles. Repaint in the following color scheme: Body and Trim: White; Muntins: SW-6256 Serios Grey; Porch Decking-dark grey; and Porch Ceiling-Valspar Dreamy Clouds.

11. Applicant: David Wilkins of Branch Towers III, LLC
    a. Property Address: 755 Monroe Street
    b. Date of Approval: 12/20/2018
    c. Project: Temporarily allow for one (1) communication tower on roof of building setback from parapet. Tower will be removed immediately after Mardi Gras.

12. Applicant: David Wilkins of Branch Towers III, LLC
    a. Property Address: 701 Dauphin Street
    b. Date of Approval: 12/20/2018
    c. Project: Temporarily allow for one (1) communication tower on roof of building setback from parapet. Tower will be removed immediately after Mardi Gras.

13. Applicant: David Wilkins of Branch Towers III, LLC
    a. Property Address: 169 Dauphin Street
    b. Date of Approval: 12/20/2018
    c. Project: Temporarily allow for one (1) communication tower on roof of building setback from parapet. Tower will be removed immediately after Mardi Gras.

14. Applicant: Mobile Roofing and Construction
    a. Property Address: 32 S. Lafayette Street
    b. Date of Approval: 12/21/2018
    c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in weatherwood.

15. Applicant: Demouy General Contracting, Inc.
    a. Property Address: 412 Dauphin Street
    b. Date of Approval: 12/26/2018
    c. Project: Repair stucco on West elevation and repaint to match.
D. APPLICATIONS

1. **2019-01-CA: 1750 Old Shell Road**
   a. Applicant: Mr. Taylor Atchison of Galt’s Gulch on behalf of Mr. Riccardo Goddard
   b. Project: Fenestration Related: Alter previously approved window configuration for new construction to match neighboring historic building.
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

2. **2019-02-CA: 453 Marine Street**
   a. Applicant: Mr. Brandon Jackson
   b. Project: Demolition Related: Demolish a contributing residence.
   **HELD OVER. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

3. **2018-47-CA: 15 Semmes Avenue (HELD OVER)**
   a. Applicant: Mr. Jacob Hartley of Prime Design Homes, LLC on behalf of SSK Asset Management, LLC
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

   a. Applicant: Twin Hotels, LLC
   **HELD OVER. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

D. OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Largue stated the ordinance required a new chair to be chosen at the last meeting in December and take into effect the first of the year. She explained due to the lengthy meeting on December 19th, a vote did not occur and needs to take place. The Board wished to proceed with the nomination. A motion was made by Mr. Allen to nominate Mr. Stone as Chair of the Board for the 2019 year. The motion received a second by Mr. Holmes and was granted.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-01-CA: 1750 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Mr. Taylor Atchison of Galt’s Gulch on behalf of Mr. Riccardo Goddard
Received: 12/21/2018
Meeting: 1/2/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-contributing (New construction underway)
Zoning: R-3
Project: Fenestration Related: Alter previously approved window configuration for new construction to match neighboring historic building.

BUILDING HISTORY

Apartments are currently being constructed on the western portion of a former public school building. The eastern portion is defined by a former school building significant for its Arts and Crafts articulation.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on October 18, 2017 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time a four, three story multi-family buildings were approved for construction. The proposed scope of work includes changing a nine-over-nine light pattern to a six-over-six light pattern on previously approved elevations.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Design exterior building walls to reflect traditional development patterns of nearby historic buildings.”
   2. “Locate and design windows to be compatible with those in the district.”

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

   1. Install six-over-six aluminum clad windows where nine-over-nine windows had been previously approved on four multi-family units.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the approval of six-over-six aluminum clad windows where nine-over-nine had been previously approved by the Board. The new multi-family housing mimics architectural features found on the neighboring Old Shell Road Lofts. The lofts feature six-over-six lite pattern with multi-pane transom. The six-over-six lite pattern would still be compatible with the neighboring property (See B-2).
STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Taylor Atchison, representative, 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. The applicant stated the project was formerly reviewed and approved with nine-over-nine windows. He explained the developer reached out to change the windows to a one-over-one configuration. He further explained he informed the developer the change needed to be reviewed by the Board, and six-over-six light pattern would fit the neighborhood and neighboring building better than one-over-one configuration. He stated the six-over-six window will be the same size and profile of the neighboring Old Shell Road Lofts windows.

Mr. Atchison clarified for Ms. Harden that the overall window size of the proposed six-over-six window will remain the same as the previously approved six-over-six window. Mr. Stone noted the light pattern was the only change proposed. Ms. Harden noted the alteration to the proposition of glass to window will fit the existing size opening.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

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. Holmes 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 by Mr. Allen and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Holmes moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board does not believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district.

The motion received a second by Mr. Barr and was approved unanimously.

CERTIFICATE EXPIRES: January 4th, 2020
APPLICABLE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-02-CA: 453 Marine Street
Applicant: Mr. Brandon Jackson
Received: 12/12/2018
Meeting: 1/2/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

This bungalow was constructed circa 1920.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on September 14, 2000 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time a railing for the front porch was approved by the Board. The proposed scope of work includes the demolition of a contributing residence.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

k. Consider the future utilization of the site.

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

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

i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure:

   1. This property was built circa 1920. This building is listed as a contributing structure in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. It holds little architectural merit nor historical significance.

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

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

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

   1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced or acquired.

iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood:

   1. The wood farmed structure has a bungalow influence, but the building is not a stellar example of a particular style and does not contribute much to the historic aesthetic of the neighborhood or street.
v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property after the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
   1. If granted demolition approval, the house would be demolished, debris would be removed, the lot would be leveled, seed would be planted, and a single family residence will be constructed at a later date.

vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition:
   1. The date the current owner acquired the property is February 15, 2017 for $6,500.00.

vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner:
   1. The property has stood vacant for a number of years. The current owner purchased the property with the intention of rehabilitating it. However, the building was extremely deteriorated and the roof has caved in.

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

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

x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures:
   1. A single family residence would be constructed to fit the neighborhood and street at a later date. No amount has been spent on plans that staff is aware of.

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. N.A.

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 (per submitted site plan):
   1. Demolish a residence.
   2. Remove the debris from the site.
   3. Stabilize the site.
   4. Plant seed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the demolition of a deteriorated residential building which is listed as a contributing building in 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.

453 Marine Street is listed as a contributing building located within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The three-over-one window pattern is indicative of an Arts and Crafts influence.

This wood frame building is in an extremely advanced state of disrepair. Conditions extend far beyond cosmetic concerns. The house is a liability due to life safety issues. The roof has caved in causing the walls to bow out.

While house contributes to the built density and rhythmic sequencing of the landscape, it does not lend to historic character or physical experience of Marine Street. As an inner block dwelling, the building is only viewed from head on or an oblique angle.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be removed, site would be leveled, ground would be stabilized, and seed would be planted. The owner would like to build a single family residence. The new construction would be consistent with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Brandon Jackson, 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. The applicant explained the extremely deteriorated state of the building, including a collapsed roof and bowing walls.

Mr. Stone asked if the applicant intended on salvaging any materials. Mr. Jackson replied he would take it into consideration. Mr. Jackson then explained he plans to redevelop the property with a single family residence similar to others in the neighborhood. Mr. Stone recommended that if demolition was granted Mr. Jackson reach out to Restore Mobile to possibly salvage windows.

Mr. Jackson expressed his concern that the house could endanger a passing by pedestrian since it is on the verge of collapse. Mr. Stone explained the Board requires redevelopment plans (drawings) to have something on the lot that fits the area. Mr. Jackson provided more examples of what he would like to construct. Mr. Jackson confirmed for Mr. Stone that his intent is to occupy the proposed residence.

Mr. Allen expressed his concerned. He noted the building was clearly beyond saving, but noted the number of vacant properties in the area. Mr. Allen stated the Board is not supposed to entertain demolition applications without redevelopment plans to prevent loss of density.
Mr. Allen inquired as to Mr. Jackson’s timeline for redeveloping the property with a single family residence. Mr. Jackson replied one year to a year and a half. Mr. Allen stated that once an applicant is granted demolition, there is no enforcement to rebuild.

Mr. Stone asked the applicant if he was receiving code violation permits. He responded yes.

Mr. Allen asked about the city’s process regarding demolitions. Ms. Largue replied she is attending a blight coordination meeting with code enforcement officials on a weekly basis. Ms. Harden explained the previous process for demolitions which included the city determining if the project is a life safety issue and then returning with a redevelopment plan.

Mr. Jackson gave the Board a report from code enforcement. He then expressed he purchased the property with the intention of rehabilitate the residence, but due to the collapsed roof and other structural issue it is not salvageable. Ms. Harden explained normally an applicant would have to submit redevelopment plans, but recognized this was a life safety issue. Mr. Jackson stated his job limits his time to work on the property. He noted the other wonderful rehabilitations on the block.

Mr. Holmes explained the Board was faced with a technical issue. Mr. Allen again expressed the predicament of the Board requiring redevelopment plans in Chapter 44 the City ordinance. Mr. Allen requested a redevelopment plan as to adhere to the ordinance.

Mr. Jackson stated the property was bank owned when he purchased it and had to wait for a period to renovate the property. Mr. Stone asked if Mr. Jackson was past purchasing the property for a period of three years. Mr. Jackson replied he was past the redeeming period. Ms. Harden noted the hearing date for demolition before the city is on February 5th. Ms. Largue stated she would reach out to code enforcement and legal.

Mr. Stone stated to Mr. Jackson that in the past people have purchased stock plans from online to use as redevelopment plans. Mr. Jackson stated he liked the newly constructed residence on Chatham Street and he was searching online.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

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. Holmes 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 by Mr. Barr and was unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Holmes moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board hold over the application to allow for the applicant to obtain redevelopment plans and for legal questions to be answered.

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

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

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition Related: Demolish non-contributing residence. Construct new single family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This bungalow was constructed circa 1920.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on September 14, 2000 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time a railing for the front porch was approved by the Board. The proposed scope of work includes the demolition of a contributing residence.

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

D. 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:

4. 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.

5. The Design Review Guidelines state in pertinent part:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

k. Consider the future utilization of the site.

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

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

v. The historic or architectural significance of the structure:

1. This property was built circa 1920. This building is listed as a contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. It holds neither architectural merit nor historical significance.

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

1. The dwelling adds to the built density of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District and Semmes Avenue.

vii. 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.

viii. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood:
1. The wood farmed structure has a bungalow influence, but the building is not an stellar example of a particular style and does not contribute much to the historic aesthetic of the neighborhood or street.

vi. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
1. If granted demolition approval, the house would be demolished, debris would be removed, the lot would be leveled, seed would be planted, and a single family residence will be constructed at a later date.

vii. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
1. The date the current owner acquired the property is December 15, 2017 for $32,500.00.

viii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
1. The property has stood vacant for a number of years. The current owner purchased the property with the intention of rehabilitating it. However, rehabilitation has proved too costly. The owner would now like to demolish the property and construct a new single family residence.

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

x. 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.

xi. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
1. A single family residence would be constructed to fit the neighborhood and street. One thousand and five hundred dollars (1,500) have been spent on plans to date.

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

xiv. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
1. A structural engineer report executed b Barton and Shumer Engineering, LLC has been provided.
2. See other submitted materials.

2. Post demolition or relocation plans required. In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”
C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**
5. Demolish a non-contributing residence.
6. Remove the debris from the site.
7. Stabilize the site.
8. Plant seed.
9. Return at a later date for approval of single family residence (see submitted plans and images).

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

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

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

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

While house contributes to the built density and rhythmic sequencing of the landscape, it does not lend to historic character or physical experience of Semmes Avenue. Other residences on the street include bungalows, four-squares, Victorian, and Classical Revival homes. The building is not part of a stylistic assemble. As an inner block dwelling, the building is only viewed from head on or an oblique angle.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be removed, site would be leveled, ground would be stabilized, and seed would be planted. A new single family residence will be constructed. The owners are working with staff to construct a residence that fits along the streetscape. The new construction would be consistent with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Jacob Hartley, representative, 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. The applicant stated he had spoken with Ms. Betbeze of Restore Mobile and they had arranged an on-site meeting that she later had to cancel. He further explained it would be very difficult to obtain permits for
this building due to the extensive structural damage.

Ms. Harden asked if the roof had failed completely. Mr. Hartley replied it had not and explained the termite damage was evident in rafters and exposed studs. He further explained to make repairs to the walls the roof would have to be removed. He then explained if repairs were attempted to be made on the walls the foundation is low that the same fungus and termite issues will occur after repair. Ms. Largue noted she previously went through the building about a year ago there were multiple soft spots in the roof and floors.

Ms. Harden asked if they considered restoring the property. Mr. Hartley explained the original intent when the building was purchased and initially walked through was to restore the building. He further explained after further investigation the building was too compromised to be salvaged. Mr. Hartley clarified the home was purchased in December 2017.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

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. Holmes 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 by Mr. Barr and was unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Holmes moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board does believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district but the structure is not salvageable.

The motion received a second by Mr. Barr and was approved with one in opposition, Mr. Stone.

Mr. Hartley requested input on submitted redevelopment plans.

**CERTIFICATE EXPIRES: January 4th, 2020**
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

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

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

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

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Alterations to non-historic commercial buildings must be compatible with the historic district.”
   2. “7.29 Design changes to a non-historic commercial building to be compatible with the district.”
   3. “Design an alteration to retain a placement and orientation that is compatible with the district.”
   4. “Design an alteration to appear similar in massing and scale with historic commercial buildings in the district.”
   5. “Use building elements that are of a similar profile and durability to those seen on historic buildings in the district.”
   6. Maintain a solid-to-void ratio on building walls that is similar to those seen on historic buildings in the district.”
   7. “…see the next section on New Commercial Construction when considering alterations to non-historic commercial buildings in locally designated historic districts.”
8. “For the corridor and interior neighborhood contexts, building elements used in new commercial construction can potentially impact the historic district, but these elements are less critical than overall building placement, massing and scale described above.”

9. “7.45 Use building materials that are compatible with the surrounding context.”

10. “7.46 When using masonry, ensure that it appears similar in character to that seen historically.”

11. “Consider using cast concrete details that are designed to be similar to stone trim elements.”

12. When considering demolitions: “Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.”

13. When considering demolitions: “Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.”

14. When considering demolitions: “Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.”

15. When considering demolitions: “Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street or properties throughout the individual historic district.”

16. When considering demolitions: “Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.”

17. When considering demolitions: “Consider the future utilization of the site.”

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

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

STAFF ANALYSIS

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

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

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

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

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

No one was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Ms. Largue stated she had reached out to the client for more clarification and was unable to make contact. The Board noted the application was still incomplete and wished to hold it over.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

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. Holmes 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 by Mr. Allen and was unanimously approved.
DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Holmes moved that, based upon the staff not being able to contact the applicant for clarification the application be held over due to incomplete information.

The motion received a second by Mr. Barr and was approved unanimously.

CERTIFICATE EXPIRES: January 4th, 2020