ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
November 7th 2018 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The acting Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
   Members Present: Harris Oswalt, John Ruzic, David Barr, and Nick Holmes.
   Staff Members Present: Bridget Daniel, John Sledge, Marion McElroy and Paige Largue.

2. Mr. Ruzic moved to approve the minutes of the September 19th and October 3rd meeting. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

3. Mr. Ruzic moved to approve the Mid-Months. The motion received a second and was approved.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. Applicant: Deborah Bethea
   a. Property Address: 1767 Old Shell Road
   b. Date of Approval: 10/10/2018
   c. Project: Repair back porch deck.

2. Applicant: City Management
   a. Property Address: 805 Church Street
   b. Date of Approval: 10/11/2018
   c. Project: Ninety day temporary approval for two container boxes

3. Applicant: Dan Harris of Harris Remodeling and & Contracting Inc.
   a. Property Address: 75 S. Ann Street
   b. Date of Approval: 10/11/2018
   c. Project: Replace existing French doors leading rear patio with metal doors to match.

4. Applicant: Norris and Carolyn Turner
   a. Property Address: 1213 Elmira Street
   b. Date of Approval: 10/12/2018
   c. Project: Remove lean-to that is not original to the building and is in danger of collapse. Repair house where lean-to was attached to match in dimension, profile, and material.

5. Applicant: Diana Allen
   a. Property Address: 274 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 10/12/2018
   c. Project: Repair, replace fire-damaged windows as needed to match in material, profile, and dimension.

6. Applicant: William and Patricia Jones
   a. Property Address: 1122 Montauk Street
   b. Date of Approval: 10/12/2018
   c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood to match original in material, profile, and dimension.
7. Applicant: Keith Sherrill  
   a. Property Address: 806 Monroe Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 10/12/2018  
   c. Project: Paint one storefront sign in location of previous sign to say "Crystal Ice Company." Paint directional signage on door. Paint mural to say "Haint Blue Brewing Company" on secondary elevation.

8. Applicant: PC Wave LLC  
   a. Property Address: 1507 Government Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 10/15/2018  
   c. Project: Reconstruct damaged port cochere from ghost marks and images, based on drawings. Port cochere is located on eastern side of residence.

9. Applicant: Patrick Welk of Optera Creative  
   a. Property Address: 3 S. Royal Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 10/15/2018  
   c. Project: Install one double faced suspended hanging blade sign. Sign will be 48" x 14" in dimension and composed of screen-printed wood or wood composite.

10. Applicant: Patrick Welk of Optera Creative  
    a. Property Address: 109 Dauphin Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 10/15/2018  
    c. Project: Install one (1) individual storefront sign composed of painted metal or metal composite. Sign will say, "The Haunted Bookshop."

11. Applicant: Mobile Arts and Sports  
    a. Property Address: 151 Dauphin Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 10/15/2108  
    c. Project: Reroof with 5 V galvalume.

12. Applicant: Browning Properties  
    a. Property Address: 258 State Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 10/16/2018  
    c. Project: Reroof shadow grey.

13. Applicant: Todd Fowler  
    a. Property Address: 1054 Elmira Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 10/16/2018  
    c. Project: Construct 14X16 foot rear mudroom and walk-in closet, to match house in materials siding dimension, and roof pitch. Add door at rear of the addition. To be built on piers. No windows.

    a. Property Address: 1508 Dauphin Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 10/17/2018  
    c. Project: Replace deteriorated first floor columns that can not be repaired, and are damaged from structural issues due to the infill of a porch on the second floor, with fiberglass columns to match in dimension, profile and material.

15. Applicant: Frank Callahan  
    a. Property Address: 1316 Old Shell Road  
    b. Date of Approval: 10/19/2018  
    c. Project: Reroof with timberline shingles.

16. Applicant: Douglas Wilson of Wilson’s Pool Design on behalf of Joan LaGrave  
    a. Property Address: 1566 Monterey Place  
    b. Date of Approval: 10/22/2018  
    c. Project: Install in ground pool in back yard with decorative paver work.
17. Applicant:  Harold Allen of Harold Allen’s Home Improvement on behalf of State Street, LLC
   a. Property Address:  255 N. Jackson Street
   b. Date of Approval:  10/22/2018
   c. Project:  Repair and replace damaged wood, including soffits and fascia, to match in dimension, profile and material. Repair roof to match.

18. Applicant:  Jerry Jackson
   a. Property Address:  1400 Church Street
   b. Date of Approval:  10/23/2018
   c. Project:  Repaint body: gray; trim: white. Repair wooden windows. Where can not repair, replace to match existing in dimension, profile, and material. Replace existing wooden doors and sidelights to match in dimension, profile, and material. Where not original, install metal doors or custom extruded aluminum windows to match existing in dimension and profile. Construct one story ancillary building based on MHDC stock drawings with hipped roof, hardiplank lap siding. Door will be located on south elevation and a window will be located on east.

19. Applicant:  Joseph Smith
   a. Property Address:  450 Dexter Avenue
   b. Date of Approval:  10/23/2018
   c. Project:  Repaint house body--Gibraltar; door--fabulous grape; shutters Morning Fog, trim--white. Build privacy fence, six feet.

20. Applicant:  Monahan 250, LLC
   a. Property Address:  250 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval:  10/23/2018
   c. Project:  Repaint balcony existing color.

21. Applicant:  David Naman
   a. Property Address:  260 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval:  10/23/2018
   c. Project:  Repair as per existing.

22. Applicant:  Jacqueline Bryant
   a. Property Address:  1552 Eslava Street
   b. Date of Approval:  10/24/2018
   c. Project:  Reroof.

23. Applicant:  Elizabeth Walmsley
   a. Property Address:  300 Chatham Street
   b. Date of Approval:  10/24/2018
   c. Project:  Reroof with architectural shingles, Shakewood.

C. APPLICATIONS

1.  2018-38-CA:  301 Government Street
   a. Applicant:  Twin Hotels, LLC
   HELDOVER. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

   a. Applicant:  J. Travis Russell and Margaret Thigpen
   b. Project:  Addition Related: Construct new addition off northwest corner of residence.
   APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
   a. Applicant: Vance McCown Construction on behalf of Archbishop of Mobile, A Corporation Sole
   b. Project: Partial Demolition and Rehabilitation Related: Demolish later rear addition and construct rear elevation. Repair and replace to match existing. 
   
   
   APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

   a. Applicant: David F. Jones of the Crump Firm on behalf of Heritage Land & Development Company, LLC
   b. Project: Rehabilitation Related: Repair and replace existing materials on historic buildings. Create new opening on North elevation to access the plaza.
   
   APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. **OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Ms. Largue announced the next meeting will be held on December 5th, 2018. There is one application submitted.

2. Mr. Stone suggested attaching attendance records to the meeting reminders. He stated current issues the Board is having with making quorum.

3. Ms. Largue announced that on December 20th an appeal will made concerning the denial of an application on 52 S. Julia Street.

4. Mr. Roberts reported on a presentation that occurred a couple of weeks ago for Commissioners and Board Members. The topic of the presentation was the roles and duties of the MHDC and the ARB. He noted the importance of reaching out to Council members.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-38-CA: 301 Government Street
Applicant: Twin Hotels, LLC
Received: 10/10/2018
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 September 2, 2009 for approval of a monument sign, according to the MHDC vertical files. 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 width.
   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

This application involves demolition of a port cochere and the construction of a new canopy on a non-contributing building. 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 (B-5).

CLARIFICATIONS

1. Will brick veneer be utilized in any location other than the brick plinths of the canopy?
2. What is the transparency of the polycarbonate?

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-8) Staff believes this application as proposed would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district only if the polycarbonate does not look like glass. Staff notes EIFS is typically inappropriate in historic districts, however the application proposed is not on a wall or primary building. Polycarbonate is not typically employed in historic districts. Staff does not believe it will impair the building, site or district if it gives the appearance of traditional glass. Staff recommends denial unless the applicant can provide a sample of the polycarbonate and can prove it imitates glass.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Ms. Largue a sample of the ribbed polycarbonate to the Board. Mr. Roberts asked to see more images that represented the canopy roof. Ms. Largue passed a brochure to the Board. Mr. Stone inquired as to the specific specifications of the product. Without further information, Mr. Stone suggested holding over the application.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt 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 holds over the application for
more clarification.

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

Applicant: J. Travis Russell and Margaret Thigpen
Received: 10/22/2018
Meeting: 11/7/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Addition Related: Construct new addition off northwest corner of residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to the materials in the MHDC vertical files, this Arts and Crafts informed house dates circa 1930. With its simple lines, and substantial porch sequence, the dwelling possesses the ingredients of an American “bungalow.”

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 2, 2105 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time a metal roof was approved for installation. The proposed scope of work includes an addition located at the northwest corner of the house.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Design an addition so there is the least possible loss of historic fabric and so the character-defining features of the historic building are not destroyed, damaged or obscured.”
   2. “Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site (site topography, character-defining site features, trees, and significant district vistas and public views) are retained.”
   3. “Wherever possible, construct an addition in such a manner that, if the addition were to be removed, the essential form and integrity of the historic structure would be unimpaired.”
   4. “Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material and character of the property, neighborhood and environment.”
   5. “Design the building components (roof, foundation, doors and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
   6. “Maintain the relationship of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building.”
   7. “Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color and/or wall plane. Alternative materials, such as cement fiberboard, are allowed when the addition is properly differentiated from the original structure.”
8. “If the style of an addition is different than the original, use a style that is compatible with the historic context.”
9. “Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.”
10. “Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.”
11. “Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.”
12. “Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights of an addition to those of the historic building.”
13. “Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.”
14. “Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.”
15. “Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.”
16. “Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.”
17. “Utilize an alternative material for siding as necessary, such as cement-based fiber board, provided that it matches the siding of the historic building in profile, character and finish.”
18. “Use a material with proven durability.
19. “Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.”
20. “Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.”
21. “Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.”
22. “Do not use a faux stucco application.”
23. “Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.”
24. “Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze boards, moldings or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.”
25. “Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.”
26. “If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the addition.”
27. “Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.”
28. “Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.”
29. “Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.”
30. “Design the scale of a doorway on an addition to be in keeping with the overall mass, scale and design of the addition as a whole.”
31. “Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.”
32. “Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.”
33. “Match foundation height to that of the original historic building.”
34. “Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.”
35. “Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.”
36. “Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.”
37. “Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original structure.”
38. “Use a material for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.”
39. “Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the original historic structure.”

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

1. Construct rear addition at northwest corner of residence.
   a. The addition will be setback 8’3” from the northern perimeter lot line.
   b. The addition will comprise a rectangular composition.
   c. The addition will be 13’9” in width and 37’9” in depth overall.
   d. The foundation treatment will match that of the existing house.
   e. The walls will be hardiplank to match dimension and profile of lapsiding or wooden siding to match.
   f. Windows will be wood to match existing in composition.
   g. Corner-boards will be employed.
   h. A gable roof will surmount the house.
   i. The roof will be sheathed in metal to match the existing house.
   j. Kneebraces and rafter tails will be employed to match existing.
   k. The addition will be painted to match the existing color scheme.

2. East (façade) Elevation
   a. The elevation will be 13’3” in width.
   b. A prairie style wooden window will punctuate the center of the elevation.

3. North (side) Elevation
   a. The elevation will be 37’9” in depth.
   b. The fenestration sequence will be as follows from East to West: window, window, small window.

4. West (rear) Elevation
   a. The elevation will be 13’9” in width.
   b. The elevation will not feature fenestration.

5. South (side) Elevation
   a. The elevation will be 26’7” in depth.
   b. The elevation will be punctuated by two windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for an addition informing the side and rear elevation of a residential building. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, the construction of addition will not impair the overall site conditions (See B-2).

A new addition would engage with and extend from the rear portion of the North elevation. By virtue of its situation on the lot and design the addition is subordinate to the contributing building (See B-9 and B-10). The proposed addition is an enclosed space. It is designed as to afford compatibility with existing fabric (See B-38). Foundation elevation would be maintained and would feature brick veneer to match that of the existing foundation (see B-12). The proposed siding would match the finish of the existing in dimension and profile (See B-21). Changes in wall plane differentiate the addition from the historic fabric (See B-23). The new fenestration on the addition is of a prairie style design to match that of the house and the neighborhood (See B-21). A gable roofing form with kneebraces and rafter tails to match existing is proposed.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-38) Staff does not believe this application would not impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends the application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Travis Russell and Ms. Margaret Thigpen, owners, were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Roberts pointed out a correction in the agenda.

Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicants and asked if they had any clarifications, comments or questions. The owners stated Ms. Largue addressed the application in full.
Ms. Thigpen clarified for Mr. Roberts the six-over-six windows seen on the rear elevation exist.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt 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 building or the district and that the application be approved.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: November 8, 2019
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-40-CA: 404 Government Street
Applicant: Vance McCown Construction on behalf of Archbishop of Mobile, A Corporation Sole
Received: 10/25/2018
Meeting: 11/7/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.2
Project: Partial Demolition and Rehabilitation Related: Demolish later rear addition and construct rear elevation. Repair and replace to match existing.

BUILDING HISTORY

The “Schroeder Home” was constructed in 1849 by banker Henry A. Schroder.

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 10, 1990 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time burglar bars were approved for installation on a mid-month basis. The proposed scope of work includes demolition on a later addition, construction of a new rear elevation and repair work.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. When considering demolitions: “Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.”
   2. When considering demolitions: “Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.”
   3. 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.”
   4. 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.”
   5. When considering demolitions: “Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.”
   6. When considering demolitions: “Consider the future utilization of the site.”
   7. “The removal of substandard alterations which are not compatible to the original building may be allowed.”
8. “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.”

9. “A building generally presents four elevations. These often are key character-defining elements of a property, but the degree of significance may vary from wall to wall. The front is the most important aspect of a building, but the Architectural Review Board has purview over all exterior surfaces of a property. Historic walls that are key to defining the significance of a property should be preserved.”

10. “Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.”

11. “Use original materials to replace damaged materials on a non-primary façade when possible.”

12. “The ARB will consider the use of green building materials, such as those made with renewable and local resources to replace damaged materials on a non-primary façade if they do not impact the integrity of the building or its key features.”

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

14. “Replace exterior finishes to match original in profile, dimension and materials.”

15. “Acceptable replacements for historic materials: “Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in finish, scale, style, and detail are acceptable. These often include: stucco, wood, brick, stone, cast stone, wood (lap siding, shingles, board and batten) and other materials original to the building, which are not listed above.”

16. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, materials and details should be maintained.”

17. “Patch and replace damaged areas of an existing roof.”

18. “Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.”

19. “Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, Mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.”

20. “Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible. For repair of window components, epoxies and related products may serve as effective solutions to material deterioration and operational malfunction.”

21. “When a historic window is missing on a key character-defining wall, use a historically accurate replacement.”

22. “Maintain the relationship of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building.”

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

1. Conduct in-kind repairs.
   a. Gently power wash brick.
   b. Repair and re-point bricks where necessary to match existing brick and mortar.
   c. Clean and repaint iron work. Replace section of missing rail to match.
d. Repair deteriorated wood work to match existing in dimension, profile and material.
e. Repair wooden windows to match.
f. Repair door ways by replacing deteriorated wood and repairing plaster.
g. Re-roof with timberline asphalt shingles in similar color to existing.

2. Remove a later addition.
   a. Addition dates circa 1956 which is not contemporaneous with the main house, (c. 1848 with later alterations) including structure on roof.
   b. Plant sod on the location of former addition.

3. Construct North (rear) Elevation (where later addition has been removed.)
   a. Remove roof exit and install shingles.
   b. Foundation will match brick skirting found on building.
   c. Walls will be sheathed in hardiplank siding to match lapsiding.
   d. Four wooden windows found on the East (side) elevation of the 1956 addition will be refurbished and repurposed.
   e. Two of the windows will be repurposed on the second story.
   f. The other two windows will flank a new rear entrance.
   g. Construct a rear entrance.
      i. Steps will lead to a covered landing.
      ii. The landing will afford access to the entrance door.
      iii. The door will be wooden.
      iv. A roof sheathed in shingles will be supported by boxed columns and cover the landing.
   h. Construct a new basement entrance.
      i. entrance will be wood framed with hardiplank siding
      i. A concrete sidewalk will lead from the rear entrance to existing concrete.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application calls for alterations and removal of a later addition to a contributing residence. Most of the proposed scope of work would impact the North (a rear) Elevation. The alterations to the existing building will be minimal. Existing doors, windows, brick and mortar, and other deteriorated features on the original portions of the house would largely be repaired (See B-8).

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 affected portion of the North elevation is in relatively good condition; however it is not an original component. The portion, a later addition dating to 1956, is not contemporaneous with the main house (See B-1). By nature of its location, the removal of the later addition will not impact the streetscape or other historic buildings in the neighborhood (See B-4 and B-5). Sod will be planted once the addition is removed.

A new rear wall would engage with earlier portions of the house. By virtue of its situation on the lot, relation to the house, and design the wall is not a significant character defining elevation (See B-9). The aforementioned elevation is so designed as to afford compatibility with and differentiation from the existing fabric (See B 13). The foundation elevation would be maintained and skirted with brick veneer (See B-13). Proposed fenestration will be repurposed from the demolished later addition. Said fenestration will be a six-over-six configuration and match that found on the main house (See B-18 and B-21). A new entrance will provide rear access to the main house. A new sidewalk will lead from the rear entrance to existing concrete.
CLARIFICATIONS

1. What is the design of the proposed ADA ramp?

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-21) Staff does not believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Jemmie Tucker present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Jemmie Tucker and Mr. Robin Rockstall, applicants and owner’s representatives, and asked if they had any questions, comments, or clarifications. Mr. Tucker stated Ms. Largue addressed the application in full.

Mr. Stone inquired as to the railing design on the ADA ramp. Mr. Tucker replied the railing will be metal similar to the ironwork on the building.

Mr. Roberts commended the work being performed. Mr. Roberts then asked why hardiplank was allowed on the rear elevation. Mr. Tucker explained the wall will be new and closing up a portion of the elevation where the later building was removed. Ms. Largue explained the existing wood siding will be repaired to match, but hardiplank is an approvable material on the new portion.

Mt. Tucker clarified a window location for Mr. Roberts.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Stone 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 building or the district and that the application be approved.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: November 8, 2019
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-41-CA: Merchants Bank (56-58 St. Joseph Street)  
Applicant: David F. Jones of the Crump Firm on behalf of Heritage Land & Development Company, LLC  
Received: 10/25/2018  
Meeting: 11/7/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: T-6  
Project: Rehabilitation Related: Repair and replace existing materials on historic buildings. Create new opening on North elevation to access the plaza.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Merchants National Bank, also previously known as “First National Bank,” is an Art Deco skyscraper designed by Chicago based firm Graham, Anderson, Probst and White. The upper stories are Art Deco while the ground floor features neoclassical elements. At the time of its completion in 1929, it was the tallest building in Mobile until 1965. The building is well known for its copper, pyramidal roof.

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 May 7, 2007 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time a sign package approved for Regions Bank. The proposed scope of work includes repair work and alteration of fenestration.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Preserve elements, both structural and decorative, that contribute to a building’s historic character.”
   2. “Retain the original openings, building material and proportions.”
   3. “Maintain the original roof configuration.”
   4. “When restoring a building, use photographic evidence wherever possible.”
   5. “Do not alter a building to appear older or younger than it is. Alter buildings to reflect the building’s period of significance.”
   6. “Do not use theme designs that do not reflect the original character of the building or the district.”
   7. “Respect the character of buildings within the context of a subject structure.”
   8. “Preserve the key character-defining features of a historic commercial façade.”
   9. “Preserve and repair original materials on a historic commercial building whenever possible.”
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10. “If brick repair is required, match the mortar color, consistency and strike to the original as closely as possible.”
11. Use replacement mortar that is as soft as or softer than the original. Type O mortar is required for historic soft brick.
12. “Use true stucco instead of an imitation material.”
13. “Do not use a rustic finish on masonry that will simulate aged masonry.”
14. “If necessary, replace a door in a fashion that is sensitive to the historic commercial character of the building.”
15. “Unless evidence exists from existing buildings or historic photographs, do not use a multi-pane design that divides the storefront window into smaller components.”
16. “Fit a replacement awning or shutter to the precise window or door opening.”
17. “If reopening an upper story window is not feasible, use a fixed shutter to define the original proportion of the window opening.”
18. “Design a replacement balcony or gallery to reflect the design of the original building. The ARB will consider modern balconies.”
19. “If a modern doorway is created, use metal with anodized or painted finish or varnished or painted wood.”
20. “If a historic sidewalk is damaged, replace the damaged portion to match the original.”

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

1. Conduct repairs.
   c. Gently clean exterior.
   d. Re-caulk existing aluminum windows.
   e. Repair aluminum windows and replace to match where deteriorated beyond repair.
   f. Install glass guardrails on 14th and 16th floors.
2. Alter fenestration.
   j. Install metal louvers in existing window openings as indicated by drawings.
   k. Install aluminum and glass doors to access 14th and 16th floor balconies.
   l. Replace existing storefront system with new aluminum storefront system along entrances on West (façade) elevation (St. Joseph Street) and along entrance at south (side) elevation (St. Francis Street).
   m. Install new fenestration on North (side) elevation
      i. A set of three spandrel glass curtain wall systems will be installed.
      ii. The central system will feature an entrance that will access the plaza.
      iii. Five sets of aluminum, double windows will punctuate the third story.
      iv. The surface of the affected elevation will be stuccoed.
3. Conduct site improvements.
   a. Sidewalk elements such as granite curbing, slate tiles, and concrete will be repaired or patched in to match.
   b. Install aluminum and glass doors to access 14th and 16th floor balconies.
      Replace existing storefront system with new aluminum

STAFF ANALYSIS

The project encompasses the whole block bounded by St. Michael Street to the North, St. Francis Street to the South, and St. Joseph Street to the West. The project involves repair work, demolition of an architecturally insignificant building, and site improvements to parking lot. However, the Board is reviewing the properties facing St. Joseph Street. While an expansion of the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial district is awaiting approval, the current boundary is inclusive of the properties at 56 and 58
St. Joseph Street only. This application involves the alteration of a previously remodeled ground floor storefront, upper floors, and installation of new fenestration on a secondary façade for the properties located at 56-58 St. Joseph Street. Most of the proposed scope of work would impact the North (a side) Elevation.

Alterations to the elevations include conducting in-kind repairs. The building would be gently power-washed. Existing windows, brick and mortar, and other deteriorated features on the commercial structure would largely be repaired (See B-9). Site improvements involve repairing and replacing deteriorated components such as slate tile and granite curbing (See B-21).

With regard to the work proposed to the storefront, the subject storefront is not original to the building. Two sets of storefront entrances accessing St. Joseph and one storefront entrance facing St. Francis will be replaced with a new aluminum storefront system. No historic fabric would be lost. Doors will be installed in existing openings to access the 14th and 16th story balconies. Balconies will feature glass railings for safety. Said railings are differentiated from the building, but do not impact the integrity of the structure (See B-19).

The North (side) elevation faces a plaza. Fenestration will be installed on both the first floor and upper story. In terms of composition on the first floor, a tripartite grouping of fenestration comprised of spandrel glass storefront systems will be installed. An entrance will be centrally located in one of the three systems. Said work would be responsive to existing spandrel glass patterns seen on the West (façade) elevation (B-20). Five sets of double aluminum windows will be installed on the North elevation above the spandrel glass system. Windows will match the configuration and material of the existing one-over-one windows. The creation of an entrance to the plaza from would serve to visually connect the portion which the plaza fronts to the St. Michael Street which the elevation engages.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-9) 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. John Glassell, owner, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. Glassell replied Ms. Largue had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Roberts asked if the project includes adding lighting to the top floors. Mr. Glassell replied yes. Mr. Roberts responded he had designed lighting for the top when Regions owned the bank. He explained the lighting was a wonderful addition to the building. Mr. Glassell explained the lighting proposed and shared an image with the Board. Mr. Glassel further explained the lighting was designed to highlight the top floors, but not infringe on the penthouse and apartment units.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

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

**FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Stone 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. Stone moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board the application does not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and that the application be approved.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: November 8, 2019**