ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA
June 19th 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 June 5th, 2019.
3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs Granted by Staff

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant: Paul Schuler of Franchise Management Services
   a. Property Address: 1562 Luling Street
   b. Date of Approval: 5/23/2019
   c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in “white mist.”

2. Applicant: Barja Wilson
   a. Property Address: 1000 Old Shell Road
   b. Date of Approval: 5/23/2019
   c. Project: Jack and level, rework piers as necessary, facing with brick or stucco; replace
decking as needed to match original; replace rotten siding as needed to match original in
material, dimension, and profile; repaint body dark blue, door honey wheat, trim white;
replace non-historic aluminum window on rear with aluminum clad wood; and replace
broken window in rear with aluminum clad wood.

3. Applicant: Jordan Davidson
   a. Property Address: 5 S. Monterey Street
   b. Date of Approval: 5/24/2019
   c. Project: Erect three and a half foot picket fence in front yard.

4. Applicant: Jordan Davidson
   a. Property Address: 5 S. Monterey Street
   b. Date of Approval: 5/24/2019
   c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in black.

5. Applicant: All Weather Roofing and Construction, LLC
   a. Property Address: 108 N. Julia Street
   b. Date of Approval: 5/24/2019
   c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in black.

6. Applicant: All Weather Roofing and Construction, LLC
   a. Property Address: 1153 Caroline Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 5/24/209
   c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in pewter gray.

7. Applicant: Harold Lily
   a. Property Address: 857 Elmira Street
   b. Date of Approval: 5/28/2019
   c. Project: Reroof.

8. Applicant: Neese properties, LLC
   a. Property Address: 1312 Brown Street
   b. Date of Approval: 5/28/2019
   c. Project: Repair, replace rotten wood to match existing in material, dimension, and
profile. Reroof
9. Applicant: McGill Toolen Catholic High School
   a. Property Address: 1501 Old Shell Road
   b. Date of Approval: 5/28/2019
   c. Project: Reroof Eton Hall with modified bitumen.

10. Applicant: Abby Kilborn and Robert Johnson
    a. Property Address: 103 Beverly Court
    b. Date of Approval: 5/28/2019
    c. Project: Replace existing metal roof on back porch 5V or standing seam coated galvalume metal.

11. Applicant: James Daughtery
    a. Property Address: 58 N. Monterey Street
    b. Date of Approval: 5/30/2019
    c. Project: Reroof charcoal black.

12. Applicant: All Saints Church
    a. Property Address: 1257 Government Street
    b. Date of Approval: 5/31/2019
    c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood including soffits, sills, eaves and columns to match existing in dimension, profile and material. Repair existing windows and copper downspouts to match. Install storm windows to fit brick molds. Remove dormers on unoriginal portion of building. Replace metal doors with metal door, glazed and paneled, with simulated divided lites. Clean stucco and brick. Repaint stucco. Clean landscaping.

13. Applicant: John Motley
    a. Property Address: 59 S. Julia Street
    b. Date of Approval: 5/31/2019
    c. Project: Remove interior chimney toward rear of house, replace roof with charcoal black shingles.

14. Applicant: Lindsey Taylor
    a. Property Address: 14 Kenneth Street
    b. Date of Approval: 5/31/2019
    c. Project: Remove interior chimney toward rear, replace roof with charcoal black shingles.

15. Applicant: Tillmon Brown
    a. Property Address: 13 N. Dearborn Street
    b. Date of Approval: 5/3/2019
    c. Project: Finish work initially ARB approved 6/18/08, a wood fence between stucco piers, and an open air addition to rear of building. All specs identical to previous approval in file. Additionally, deconstruct brick archway south side of building to prevent collapse from a bad crack. Clean brick, rebrick with lime/sand mortar mix to match original configuration, repaint brick to match. Original brick was covered in tar and then painted.

16. Applicant: Roy Isbell
    a. Property Address: 910 Government Street
    b. Date of Approval: 5/31/2019
    c. Project: Exterior Termite Damage Repairs: Repair and Replace to match existing.

17. Applicant: Cross Properties
    a. Property Address: 400 Charles Street
    b. Date of Approval: 6/3/2019
    c. Project: Renew COA dated 4/18/2018 for rehabilitation of house and small addition. This was previously approved by ARB.

18. Applicant: Stone Beach Holdings, LLC
    a. Property Address: 1157 Spring Hill Avenue
    b. Date of Approval: 5/31/2019
    c. Project: Install temporary construction for no more than six months.
19. **Applicant:** The Guild LLC, Jesse Burks  
   a. Property Address: 1008 Elmira Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 6/4/2019  
   c. Project: Repair/replace siding and wood elements to match in dimension, profile and materials. Repaint.

1. **Applicant:** Mobile Fence Company  
   a. Property Address: 1255 Dauphin Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 6/6/2019  
   c. Project: Continue wooden fence, 8' in height, along eastern perimeter and southern perimeter of lot. Construct 8' metal fence along western and northern perimeter of lot along streets. On northern perimeter, install pedestrian and vehicular gate. Property is public institution. Lot being fenced is parking.

D. APPLICATIONS

1. **2019-22-CA: 1507 Government Street**  
   a. Applicant: Daryl J. Williams of Daryl J. Williams and Associates on behalf of Mike Catanese of PC Wave, LLC  
   b. Project: Alteration Related: Repair damage from removed port cochere on East elevation to match West elevation.

2. **2019-23-CA: 661 Dauphin Street**  
   a. Applicant: Jim Walker on behalf of Dauphin Management, LLC  

3. **2019-24-CA: 602 Church Street**  
   a. Applicant: Jim Walker on behalf of James And Woodrow Walker  

D. OTHER BUSINESS
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2019-22-CA: 1507 Government Street
Applicant: Daryl J. Williams of Daryl J. Williams and Associates on behalf of Mike Catanese of PC Wave, LLC
Received: 6/3/19
Meeting: 6/19/19

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Alteration Related: Repair damage from removed port cochere on East elevation to match West elevation.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one and a half story brick veneered house with neoclassical elements dates from 1905. The front façade features a double door entrance and floor length windows.

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 February 7, 2018 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time a request to repair the east elevation to match the west elevation was denied and a fountain was approved. In October 2018, a drawing to reconstruct the port cochere was submitted and approved administratively.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Design Review Guidelines are applicable to changes to building exteriors and site features of properties within Mobile’s locally designated districts.”
   2. “Changes to properties in locally designated historic districts that are covered by these guidelines include the following: Site planning elements (fences, free-standing lighting, paving, etc.); and repairs, replacements, and alterations to historic buildings.”
   3. “Significant features and stylistic elements should not be removed to the extent possible.”
   4. “If disassembly is necessary for repair or restoration, use methods that minimize damage to original materials and facilitate reassembly.”
   5. “If replacement of a historic element is required, replace the historic element in kind, or with a product that is similar in visual character and durability to the original.”
   6. The following is the preferred sequence of improvements: preserve, repair, reconstruct, replace or compatible alteration.
7. “For most historic resources, the front façade is the most important to preserve intact. Alterations are rarely appropriate. Many side walls are also important to preserve where they are highly visible from public streets. By contrast, portions of a side wall that are not as visible may be less sensitive to change.”

8. “The distinguishing original qualities or character of a historic building, structure, or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. Historic materials are significant and shall not be removed. The removal or alteration of any historic landscaping features, materials, or distinctive architectural features should be avoided.”

9. Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in physical character and durability. Composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities should appear similar to the original material. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical or pictorial evidence.”

10. “Maintain significant historic facades in their original form.”

11. “Use alternative or imitation materials that match the style and detail of the original material to replaced damaged non-primary building materials.”

12. Acceptable replacement for historic materials include those that “are the same as the original, or that appear similar in finish, scale, style and detail.”

13. “An alteration made without approval may be required to be removed. Any after-the-fact approval, if it is granted, will be handled on a case-by-case basis.”

14. “Preserve the original roof form of a residential structure. Avoid a new roofing system that permanently damages or alters an existing roof.”

15. “New landscaping features should be consistent in character with landscaping seen in the historic district.”

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

1. Repair northern portion of east elevation (previously damaged and removed) to match northern portion of west elevation in dimension, profile and material.

STAFF ANALYSIS

On December 19, 2017, the Mobile Historic Development Commission (MHDC) received a Service Request Order (SRO) concerning the construction being completed without a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) being displayed for work being performed. Mr. John Sledge, staff of MHDC, went to the site and issued a Notice of Violation (NOV). Noticed at this time was the removal of the port cochere. The applicant’s tenant responded immediately to the NOV and explained via phone to Ms. Largue the port cochere had been damaged by a moving truck and had collapsed and debris was removed. Ms. Largue met with Mr. Mike Catanese, owner, on January 10, 2018 and discussed the guidelines and policy of the ARB. The applicant, Mr. Catanese, appeared on February 7, 2018 before the Board for repair work. The Board denied the application for repair work and approved a foundation. In October 2018, drawings were submitted to reconstruct the port cochere and approved at staff level.

The applicants request to repair the damages from the removal of the port cochere on the east elevation to match the facade west elevation. The owner intends to reconstruct the port cochere at a later date. The property on Government Street is one of few remaining residential type buildings. The port cochere was original to the house as evidenced in the 1925 Sanborn Insurance maps. The Secretary of Interior’s Standards and Mobile’s Historic District Guidelines state characterizing features of a historic façade shall “not be destroyed” (See B1-8). The port cochere was a prominent feature on both primary and secondary façades, particularly during the 18th and 19th century. The passageway was constructed to provide
occupants of a carriage or vehicle protection. Primary facades are sensitive to alterations and should be maintained in their original form (See B1-7 and B1-10).

The Secretary of Interior’s Standards and Mobile’s Historic District Guidelines prefers for a feature to be repaired or reconstructed before being replaced (See B1-6). The Standards and Guidelines also state “significant features” of a building shall not be removed to the “extent possible” (See B1-3). However, if removal of a feature is necessary it shall be disassembled to diminish damage and aid in reassembly (See B-4). Said replacements must either match the existing in profile, dimension and material or match the material being placed in character, durability, scale, and detail (See B1-9 and B1-12).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-8), Staff does believe the first part of the application will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the properties or district. Staff recommends denial for this portion of the application.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF REPORT

2019-23-CA: 661 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Jim Walker on behalf of Dauphin Management, LLC
Received: 5/19/2019
Meeting: 6/19/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.1
Project: Addition Related: Construct gallery on front façade.

BUILDING HISTORY

The 1878 Atlas does not show a building on this site. The 1885 Sanborn map shows a brick building with umbrage. The 1904 Sanborn map shows the building in use as an auto repair business. Sometime sin the mid-century the façade was heavily altered. In the late 1990’s and early 2000’s, the storefront was restored to a historic appearance.

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 July 2002 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time, a restoration of the storefront was approved. The proposed scope of work includes constructing a gallery on the front façade.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Galleries in Mobile are defined as building elements that project from the façade to provide an outdoor deck with railings for upper floors that has supports that extend to the sidewalk.”
   2. “Galleries serve as important outdoor amenities for upper floors and provide shade and coverage for sidewalk areas.”
   3. “These elements are common on many buildings and are key features for a historic commercial building. Historic balconies and galleries should be preserved.”
   4. “Where replacement of a balcony or gallery is required, replace it in a fashion that preserves the key character-defining features of a historic building.”
   5. “Replace a historic balcony or gallery where documentation exists of its previous existence.”
   6. “Design a replacement balcony or gallery to reflect the design of the original building. The ARB will consider modern balconies.”
   7. Regarding ornamentation and detail: “Where exact reconstruction is not possible, use a simplified interpretation of the original design detail that maintains the scale and character of original or similar detailing used on buildings of the same period.”
8. “Use a replacement material that is visually compatible with the original.”

C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**
   1. Construct a one-story gallery.
      a. Gallery will be constructed of metal.
      b. The gallery will measure 7’9” in depth and 12’5” inches in height.
      c. The gallery will have columns 3” in diameter will capital and base.
      d. Decorative iron ornamentation will be employed.
      e. A section of the gallery on the western portion will be recessed to accommodate a lamp post.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the construction of a gallery on a contributing commercial building. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts defines a gallery as “are defined as building elements that project from the façade to provide an outdoor deck with railings for upper floors that has supports that extend to the sidewalk.” The proposed gallery does not have a railing above, however it is employs columnar supports.

A new gallery will be constructed. Mobile’s downtown is filled with galleries and balconies. The gallery will be constructed on a restored façade which possesses a storefront with transoms. Evidence seen on the 1885 Sanborn map shows a brick building with some form of umbrage over the sidewalk (See B-5). The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state to design a replacement balcony or gallery to reflect the original design of the building (See B-6). The gallery’s proposed ornamentation is appropriate for a building constructed before the 1861. The guidelines also state to design a gallery or balcony, “in a fashion that preserves the key character-defining features of a historic building” (See B-4). As designed, the transom windows are covered by ornamentation.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Consider removing the ornamentation from the proposed gallery.
2. Expose transom.
3. Consider an awning or abat vent.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-4) and B (1-7), as proposed, staff believes this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends the applicant return with a revised drawing addressing the transom windows and ornamentation.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2019-24-CA: 602 Church Street
Applicant: Jim Walker on behalf of James and Woodrow Walker
Received: 5/19/2019
Meeting: 6/19/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing (Main Residence)
Zoning: T-4
Project: Ancillary Related: Construct ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

The ancillary building will be constructed on the Fairley House property. The Fairley House, constructed in 1870, is a two-story building with brick façade and stucco side elevations constructed in the Federal style with cast iron gallery.

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 1994 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time, an application to rebuild porches and conduct repair work was approved. The proposed scope of work includes constructing an ancillary building.

1. “In general, the addition of a new accessory structure to a historic property or within a historic district should refer to guidelines for new construction presented in Chapters 6 and 7.”
2. “A new accessory or ancillary structure should be compatible with those in the district.”
3. “Design an accessory or ancillary structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.”
4. “Locate a new accessory or ancillary structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district. These are traditionally located at the rear of the lot.”
5. “Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture and finish to the original are acceptable. These often include: wood panel; wood panel with glass lights; leaded glass with lead cames; and metal with a painted finish.”
6. Regarding new construction, “New designs should relate to the fundamental characteristics of the historic houses on a block while also conveying the stylistic trends of today. It may do so by drawing upon the basic elements of a building that make up a part of the character of the property. Such features include the way in which a building is located on its site, the manner in which it relates to the street and its basic mass, form and
materials. When these design variables are arranged in a new building to be similar to those seen traditionally, visual compatibility results."

7. Regarding contemporary design, “The Architectural Review Board will pay particular attention to mass, scale, siting and overall design, but all elements will be considered. The design professional or owner must demonstrate that a contemporary structure will not materially impact the historic integrity of the surrounding district.”

8. Regarding compatibility, “successful compatible design will also consider the distinctive architectural character of the street, the neighborhood and the district.”

9. Regarding differentiation, “New construction should respect the historic character of the neighborhood through the considerations described above. Replication of a historic building is generally not appropriate, but will be considered.”

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

1. Construct a new ancillary building (a carriage house) and relocate existing fence.
   a. The ancillary building will be setback 6’2” from the front façade line and 11’3” from the eastern lot line.
   b. The ancillary building (carriage house) will be rectangular in massing.
   c. The carriage house will be 12’2-1/2” x 30’2-1/2” in size and will be two-stories in height.
   d. The floor will be raised and skirted by skinned CMU with faux vents interspersed.
   e. The walls will be clad with wooden lap-siding so as to match the siding found on the addition of the body of the main residence.
   f. Exterior will be painted to match the main dwelling.
   g. Windows will be multi-pane in configuration and composed of wood.
   h. Board and batten shutters will slide over doors and windows.
   i. Rafter tails will be exposed.
   j. A kneebrace will be employed under the eave of the West (side) Elevation.
   k. A complex gable roof (gable roof with shed roof addition) will surmount the carriage house.
   l. The roof will be sheathed in asphalt shingles matching those found on the body of the house.

2. South (front) Elevation
   a. A six-paned window will be located centrally on the first floor.
   b. A set of sliding barn shutters will be installed over the window.
   c. A two-over-two window will be installed centrally in the gable.

3. West (side) Elevation
   a. A central portion of the roof will be elevated.
   b. Rafter tails will be exposed.
   c. A set of three casement windows in a two-over-five configuration with two-over-two transom light above will be installed centrally on the elevation.
   d. Sliding shutters will be installed and able to close over the windows.
   e. A set wooden steps will access the West elevation.

4. North (rear) Elevation
   A four-over-four window will be installed centrally in the gable.

5. East (side) Elevation
   a. The East elevation will mimic the West elevation.
   b. A set of steps will access a wooden door on the northern portion of the elevation.
STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of an ancillary building, a carriage house, in the Church Street East district. The Design Review Guidelines state that new ancillary construction should be compatible with those in the district (See B-3.). New ancillary construction involves review of the following considerations: placement, scale, massing, façade elements, and materials so as to obtain compatibility between the new and the existing.

As to placement, the proposed new construction, a carriage house, would occupy a rear portion of the lot and would be located directly behind the main house. Ancillary buildings were constructed behind the front plane of residential buildings in general and in the rear of the (See B-5). The proposed building is located behind the front plane of the house, but not towards the rear. The side (East) setback of the garage will be in line with the current dwelling, while the hyphen will be inset in nature. The side setback of is permissible by reason of the Downtown Development District Code. The aforementioned taken into account, the proposed building’s placement is not compatible with traditional ancillary construction.

With regard to scale and massing, the Design Review Guidelines state that new ancillary construction should be subordinate to the main building (See B 3- 4.). The height of the building at 20’ 4-1/8”makes the proposed building subordinate to of the historic body of the house (See B-2.). The proposed two-story, the raised elevation (construction on skimmed CMU), and secondary use of the building cause for the design to be compatible with the context.

Façade elements are crucial to compatibility of compatible ancillary construction (See B-8). Exposed rafter tails will employed. Board and batten or “barn” door shutters are proposed. The existing main house has evidence of louvered shutters. With regard to materials to be employed on ancillary construction, the Design Review Guidelines allow for composite materials if said materials appear similar in texture and finish of the original (See B-6.). Wooden siding will be employed on the walls. Lapsiding is found on an addition of main residence. Roofing shingles will similarly match those surmounting the body of the house. The doors and windows will be constructed of wood.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Consider a simpler roof structure.
2. Consider removing sliding barn doors an shutters or using a louvered shutters.
3. Consider using a paneled door.
4. Consider boxing eaves on West and East elevation.
5. Relocate proposed site further into rear yard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-6), B (1-&, specifically siting) and B (1-8), as proposed, staff believes this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends the applicant return with revised site plan and elevation addressing location and façade elements.