ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
February 6th 2019 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The acting Chair, Bob Allen, called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
   - Members Present: David Barr, Robert Brown, Bob Allen, Kim Harden and Craig Roberts.
   - Staff Members Present: John Sledge, Bridget Daniel, Paige Largue and Marion McElroy.
2. Mr. Barr moved to approve the minutes of the January 16th 2019 meeting. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.
3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the Mid-Months as written. Mr. Brown seconded the motion. The motion was approved with one in opposition, Mr. Allen.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. Applicant: Geoffrey Peacock
   a. Property Address: 1120 Old Shell Road
   b. Date of Approval: 1/10/2019
   c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood to match existing, repaint white per existing.

2. Applicant: David Brazell of Sun Coast Roofing
   a. Property Address: 10 Gladys Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 1/10/2019
   c. Project: Reroof to match existing asphalt shingles.

3. Applicant: Sharon Dixon
   a. Property Address: 1327 Spring Hill Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 1/10/2109
   c. Project: Erect eight foot privacy fence around rear of property and 16’ rolling gate on Julia Street side. Property abuts a commercial property.

4. Applicant: Wendell Quimby
   a. Property Address: 571 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 1/11/2019
   c. Project: Install one 3’x3’ painted metal hanging blade sign on corner of building.

5. Applicant: Julia Norman
   a. Property Address: 1664 Government Street
   b. Date of Approval: 1/10/2019
   c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles, terra cotta color.

6. Applicant: Belvoir Smith
   a. Property Address: 415 Michigan Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 1/11/2019
   c. Project: Reroof with asphalt shingle roof, cottage red.

7. Applicant: Michael E. Chadwell of Spring Hill Landscaping, LLC
   a. Property Address: 1566 Monterey Place
   b. Date of Approval: 1/14/2019
   c. Project: Construct 6’ wooden dogeared fence along the perimeter of the property in the rear yard behind the front plane of the house. Fence is replacing an existing fence. Repair deteriorated soffit and fascia of existing pool house to match existing.
8. Applicant: Glen Seale
   a. Property Address: 170 Hannon Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 1/15/2019
   c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles, charcoal gray.

9. Applicant: Mary Simmons
   a. Property Address: 114 Michael Donald Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 1/14/2019
   c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood on porch to match existing.

10. Applicant: Poarch Band of Creek Indians
    a. Property Address: 304 Government Street
    b. Date of Approval: 1/17/2019
    c. Project: Repaint old newspaper bay as per existing.

11. Applicant: Brad Christensen
    a. Property Address: 401 Civic Center Drive
    b. Date of Approval: 1/17/2019
    c. Project: Technology upgrade.

12. Applicant: Gary Dickson of Dickson Brothers Construction
    a. Property Address: 206 Tuttle Avenue
    b. Date of Approval: 1/18/2019
    c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in neutral color.

13. Applicant: Melton Ott
    a. Property Address: 922 Conti Street
    b. Date of Approval: 1/18/2019
    c. Project: Reroof with architectural single sin slate.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2019-04-CA: 3 Dauphin Street
   a. Applicant: Identity Signs on behalf of Mr. Skipper Tonsmiere
   b. Project: Signage Related: Install 2’0” x 20’0” wall sign constructed of painted foam.
   APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2019-05-CA: 1 N. Royal Street
   a. Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. J. Patrick Courtney III
   b. Project: Alteration Related: Remove window and install storefront door in same location.
   APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2019-06-CA: 118 Bush Avenue
   a. Applicant: Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.
   b. Project: Demolition Related: Demolish a deteriorated contributing residence.
   DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2019-07-CA: 15 Gladys Avenue
   a. Applicant: Mr. Darrel J. Williams on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Bradley J. Sadler
   APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Mid-Months

A discussion concerning the mid-months ensued. Mr. Allen expressed his concern for items 10 and 11 on the Midmonth Resolution regarding the construction of one story ancillary structures both pre-fabricated and custom. Ms. Largue explained staff approves only one level ancillary structures that meet the Guidelines and align with the approved one story ancillary plans on file at the MHDC offices. She noted that even the pre-fabricated sheds must meet the material requirements. Ms. Largue then stated she would search for an average size one story garage for the Board to evaluate restricting the size that staff can approve. MR. Roberts agreed it was something to consider. Mr. Allen then stated his concern for item 7 regarding public view. Ms. Largue stated that currently staff considers public view on a case by case basis. She elaborated by saying if a alteration is in the first half of a home, then it is probably in public view and therefore the project would come to ARB. Mr. Brown stated his concern that staff has been approving new construction. Ms. Largue stated the only thing staff may approve that is new construction would be ancillary buildings, or the renewal of a COA for new construction that was approved within the last three years. She noted if any changes have been made to the previously approved plans, it goes back before the Board.

2. Next meeting will be February 20th
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-04-CA: 3 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Identity Signs on behalf of Mr. Skipper Tonsmiere
Received: 1/22/2019
Meeting: 2/6/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: T-6
Project: Related: Install 2’0” x 20’0” wall sign constructed of painted foam.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous research, this two-story masonry commercial building received its current façade in 1970. There is some evidence to support a mid-century masonry building being underneath the present façade.

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 November 19, 2008. At that time an application was made to demolish the building and construct a parking lot. The applicant withdrew the application before the meeting. The proposed scope of work includes the installing a storefront sign. An application was approved to install the sign by the Consolidated Review Committee.

B. The Design Review Guidelines state in pertinent part:
1. Pertaining to new signs: “This section provides guidelines for new signs on historic buildings, non-contributing buildings and for new construction within Mobile’s locally-designated historic districts. As with historic signs, new signs impact the character of the district. New signs should be designed to be compatible with the associated building and the overall district. Be aware that signage located within the Downtown Development District (DDD) must also meet the DDD Code.”
2. “Design a new sign to be compatible with the character of a building and the district.”
3. “When installing a new sign on a historic building, avoid damaging or obscuring the key architectural features.”
4. “Design a sign to integrate with the architectural features of the historic building.”
5. “New signs are restricted to a maximum of 64 square feet.”
6. “Use a sign material that is compatible with the materials of the building on which it is placed and the district. New materials that achieve the effect of traditional materials and lighting solutions will be considered on a case by case basis.”
7. “Do not use highly reflective materials for a sign. All plastic faced box signs are not allowed.”
8. “Where necessary, use a compatible, shielded light source to illuminate a sign.”
9. “A variety of sign types may be appropriate in Mobile if the sign contributes to a sense of visual continuity and does not over-whelm the character of the building façade.”
10. “A wall sign (also called a “flat sign”) is any sign attached to or painted on the outside face of a building. It is erected parallel to the face of the building on which it is supported and may include individual letters, cabinet signs or signs painted on the surface of a wall. Street level wall signs are located on the first floor of a building façade while upper level wall signs are located above the first floor, and may sometimes be painted onto non-primary façade faces.”
11. “Wall signs should be placed to align with signs on nearby buildings and should be relatively flush with the building façade, minimizing the depth of a sign panel or letters. They should sit within, rather than forward of, the fascia or other architectural details of a building, ideally within a panel formed by decorative moldings or transom panels where they exist.”
12. “When painting a new wall sign, use only board material (such as wood, metal or PVC composite) or a previously painted masonry surface.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):
   1. Construct wall sign to be 2’0” in height and 20’0” in width.
   2. Sign will be constructed of polyurethane foam with a 16% recycled plastic bottle content.
   3. Sign will read “Strayer University.”
   4. Sign will be installed above first floor windows.
   5. Goosenecks lamps will be installed over the sign.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the installation of a sign within the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial historic district. The sign has been approved by the Consolidated Review Committee on January 15, 2019 (see B-1).

When reviewing applications for signage, the Board may consider the following: type, location, and material. Signage should be compatible with the building and other signs found in the district (see B-2). The sign is considered a “wall sign” per the definition in the guidelines (See B-10). A wall sign is “attached to or painted on the outside face of a building. It is erected parallel to the face of the building on which it is supported and may include individual letters, cabinet signs or signs painted on the surface of a wall.” The sign is located above the first story windows. There are no significant architectural features on the building (See B- and 4). The sign will be composed of painted polyurethane foam with recycled content (see B-12). The Design Review Guidelines state to use board such as “wood, metal or PVC composite.” PVC is a lightweight, strong material composed of plasticizers. Polyurethane foam is a form of elastomers or artificial rubber that retains its strength and elasticity over levels of hardness.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-12) Staff does not believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Danielle Christensen , applicant’s representative, was present for the discussion.
BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Allen welcomed the applicant’s representative and asked if she had any clarifications, comments or questions.

Ms. Harden inquired as to the color of the sign. It was confirmed the sign would be “Cardinal Red” with white lettering. Mr. Roberts stated his concern with the bold color being next to two important buildings in downtown. Ms. Harden asked if there was a possibility to mute the color, or keep the logo in red, but the lettering in a more neutral color.

Ms. Largue asked if the applicant would be amenable to using a neutral color for the lettering and background and the logo and seal in red. She noted that it is encouraged to use historic colors on buildings, but not required when painting buildings. She further explained the Guidelines do not elaborate much on the color of signs. Ms. Christensen agreed to the neutral tones for the lettering and background, and noted she would have to discuss with the applicant.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Allen opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Allen 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 by Ms. Harden and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted with the agreement that the logo will be remain red, but the lettering and background be neutral.

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

2019-05-CA: 1 N. Royal Street
Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. J. Patrick Courtney III
Received: 1/24/2019
Meeting: 2/6/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.2
Project: Alteration Related: Remove window and install storefront door in same location.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Burke Building was originally a three story brick commercial building of Italianate design with an elaborate two-story cast iron gallery at the time of its construction in 1880. The building was significantly altered during a remodel in 1938. At that time the original first floor storefronts were removed. Other alterations occurred in 1986.

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 August 6, 1990 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time, an application to extend a cast iron gallery was approved. The proposed scope of work includes removing later storefront window and bulkhead and installing a storefront door.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. Regarding chapter 7, “This chapter builds on the general preservation guidelines in Chapter 5 with specific design guidelines for commercial properties, including: Contributing Structures. Rehabilitation and alteration of locally-designed individual historic commercial landmarks and contributing commercial structures in locally-designated historic districts.”
   2. “Historic commercial buildings sometimes have been altered significantly. Therefore the approach to renovating a historic commercial building can be more extensive than for a historic residential structure. When considering work on a commercial structure, respecting the original design character is of the utmost importance.”
   3. “Preserve elements, both structural and decorative, that contribute to a building’s historic character.”
   4. “Retain the original openings, building material and proportions.”
   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. “Building Condition 3. Original Design Significantly Altered. Buildings in this category generally have a plain front with no ornamentation or detail, and fail to relate well to adjacent historic buildings. If a covering hides original de-tail, removal of the covering and restoration of the original design is strongly encouraged. Where detailing has been removed, the development of an entirely new design that is compatible with the older buildings or reconstruction of the original façade based on photographic evidence is strongly encouraged. If removing an applied modern storefront that was placed over the historic storefront will damage the underlying historic façade, its removal is discouraged. Some alterations may have taken on historic significance in their own right. In these cases, preservation of this alteration or restoration to the original may both be options.”

7. “Preserve the key character-defining features of a historic commercial façade.”

8. “Repair an altered storefront to its original design.”

9. “Retain the original shape of the transom in a historic storefront.”

10. “Preserve and repair original materials on a historic commercial building whenever possible.”

11. “Preserve historic doorways in their original location and configuration.”

12. “Retain original recessed entries and other key features defining a historic entrance.”

13. “If a modern doorway is created, use metal with anodized or painted finish or varnished or painted wood.”

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

1. Alter the South (side, secondary frontage) Elevation
   a. Remove later storefront window located on the westernmost portion of the first floor.
   b. Install a 3’0” in width x 7’0” in height metal storefront door system.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application involves removing a later storefront window and bulkhead, and installation of a storefront door system in the opening. The property is located in the Downtown Development District and will be reviewed by the Consolidated Review Committee on January 31, 2019. The MHDC holds a façade easement on the property which was given in 1991. The applicant will still need to gain the approval of the MHDC Properties Committee for the alteration.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that when altering a contributing historic structure, the changes must respect the original character of the building (see B-2). The first story storefront has been altered from its original design. Removing the first story westernmost window will not harm any fabric that is original or has achieved significance (see B-7). The location of the door will maintain the height and rhythm of the windows (see B-9). The composition of the door is acceptable in a commercial district (see B-12).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-12) Staff does not believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval in full.
PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc., owner’s representative, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Allen welcomed the applicant’s representative and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. He replied Ms. Largue explained the application in full.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Allen opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Allen 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 by Mr. Brown 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 either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

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

2019-06-CA: 118 Bush Avenue
Applicant: Wells Fargo, Bank N.A.
Received: 1/24/2019
Meeting: 2/6/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition Related: Demolish a deteriorated contributing residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This cottage with was constructed circa 1905.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. This property has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board according to the MHDC vertical files. The last Certificate of Appropriate issued in the vertical files was for a roof replacement in 2008. The proposed scope of work includes the demolition of a contributing residence.

B. 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.
g. Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind
in the neighborhood, county, or region.
h. Also consider the potential impact of demolition of the structure on the overall context
of the structure.
i. 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.
j. Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that
create a neighborhood.
k. When applicable, the project proposed to replace the structure proposed for demolition
should be considered.
l. Consider the future utilization of the site.
m. 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 1918. This building is listed as a contributing
         structure in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. It holds architectural
         merit and historical significance.
   ii. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the
       immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
      1. The dwelling adds to the built density of the Old Dauphin Way Historic
         District. It is also one of three similar residences in a row.
   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 is a Victorian cottage which makes up a
         residential street.
   v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed
demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the
   architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or
   environmental character of the surrounding area.
1. If granted demolition approval, the house would be demolished, debris would be removed, and the lot would be leveled and sodded. The property will be donated to the adjacent neighbor.

vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
   1. The property was foreclosed on July 13, 2018.

vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
   1. Due to the deteriorated condition of the residence, the owner decided not to market the property.

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 or listed in the MLS system.

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. No plans have been submitted.

xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
   1. 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.
   5. Sell vacant lot.

STAFF ANALYSIS

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

118 Bush Avenue is listed as a contributing building located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. It is an example of a Victorian informed cottage built circa 1905 (see B-2-b). This property is one of five constructed on the east side of Bush Avenue by Jett Bros. Contracting Company. The property has similar form and details as 114 and 116 Bush Avenue (see B-2-g and see B-2-j).
This wood frame building is in an advanced state of disrepair (see B-2-d). Based on a visit conducted by staff, an on-site inspection of the exterior noted termite damage, deteriorated wood, and deteriorated windows. The roof was covered by a tarp, which limited staff’s understanding of the extent of roof damage.

The house contributes to the built density, rhythmic sequencing of the landscape, and to historic character and physical experience of Bush Avenue. As an inner block dwelling, the building is only viewed from head on or an oblique angle (see B-2-i).

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be removed, site would be leveled, sod would be laid, and the site would be donated to a neighbor to include in their lot (see k and see B-2-l).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (2-a) Staff believes this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends denial.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Eric May, owner’s representative, was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Allen welcomed the applicant’s representative and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. May noted the roof on the residence has caused water damage.

Mr. Roberts asked if the Board usually required an applicant try listing the property for sale with MLS. Ms. Largue responded the Board has asked applicants to do so in the past. Ms. Harden noted the applicant initially tried to list, but the damage was too much according to the application. Mr. Roberts noted the listing of a property for six months is a good faith effort. Ms. Harden agreed the applicant should actively try to list the house, and mentioned there is a potential buyer who submitted a letter. Mr. May asked for the interested party’s information and Ms. Largue stated she would send it to him and the owner.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Allen opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Allen 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 by Ms. Harden and was unanimously approved.
DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does impair the historic building and building or neighborhood and a Certificate of Appropriateness be denied.

The motion received a second by Ms. Harden and was approved unanimously.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED REPORT

2019-07-CA: 15 Gladys Avenue
Applicant: Mr. Darrel J. Williams on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Bradley J. Sadler
Received: 1/21/2019
Meeting: 2/6/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Ancillary Related: Construct an outbuilding.

BUILDING HISTORY

This residence was originally constructed in 1915 as a bungalow. Significant alterations were made in 1987. Alterations included the reorientation of front entrance from the East to North elevation, removal of dormer, and infill of the East porch.

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 2001 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time a large addition was approved. The proposed scope of work includes a new ancillary building.

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

1. Regarding accessory structures: “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. Additional specialized guidelines are provided here. A new accessory structure should be compatible with those in the district.”

2. “Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.”

3. “Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district.”

4. “These are traditionally located at the rear of a lot.”

5. “Acceptable accessory structure materials include: “wood frame; masonry; cement fiber based siding; installations (premade store-bought sheds provided they are minimally visible from public areas).”


7. New Residential Construction: “This section presents design guidelines for the construction of new residential structures in locally-designated
historic districts. These guidelines relate to the fundamental relationships of a building to its context, such as mass, scale and form. Designing a building to fit within the historic character of a neighborhood requires careful thought. Preservation in a historic district context does not mean that the area must be “frozen” in time, but it does mean that, when new building occurs, it should reinforce the basic visual characteristics of the district. This does not imply, however, that a new building must look old. In fact, imitating historic styles is generally discouraged.”

8. “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 tradition-ally, visual compatibility results.”

9. “Maintain the visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street.”

10. “Mass is established by the arrangement and proportion of a building’s basic geometric components. These include the main building, wings and porches, roof and foundation.”

11. “Use a building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.”

12. “Size foundation and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings.”

13. “Use a ratio of solid to void that is similar in proportion to those of nearby historic buildings.”

14. “Use exterior materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.”

15. “Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.”

16. “Design piers, a foundation and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.”

17. “Locate and design windows to be compatible with those in the district.”

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

1. Construct ancillary building.
   a. The building will be setback 37’0” from the right of way.
   b. The building will be constructed on grade to allow for vehicular access. Areas that are above grade will be sheathed in stucco.
   c. Raised brick stoops will be installed in front of entrances along the North (side) elevation and West (rear) elevation.
   d. The ceiling height will range from 8’0” for 12’0.”
   e. The porch addition will extend 16’0” from the South (rear) elevation and 11’7” pass the West (side) elevation.
   f. The walls will be clad in lapsiding to match the main house.
   g. Doors will be aluminum clad.
   h. Exposed rafter tails will match those found on the main house.
   i. Wooden columns will be 6” square and wrapped to match main house.
   j. The hipped and gable roof forms will be sheathed in architectural shingles. The porch and shed roof appendage will be sheathed will metal copper panels.
k. East (street-facing) Elevation
   1) The southern portion of the elevation will be in advanced of the northern portion.
   2) The southern portion of the elevation will feature four equidistant sets of faux shutters.
   3) The aforementioned portion will be surmounted with a hipped roof that truncates into a gable roof form.
   4) A gabled roof form will surmount the northern portion of the East elevation.
   5) A shed roof sheathed in metal will extend from below the aforementioned roof’s eaves.
   6) Three sets of equidistant faux shutters will be featured on the northern portion.

l. South (side) Elevation
   1) A set of three garage doors will be employed on the elevation.

m. North (side) Elevation
   1) A gable roof will truncate into a hipped roof.
   2) The westernmost portion of the elevation will feature a multi-paned door which will access a porch.
   3) Three sets of equidistant multi-paned doors will be installed on the central portion for the elevation under a gable roof form.
   4) The gable will feature a louvered vent (see specs).
   5) On the eastern portion of the eastern portion of the elevation will recess from the central portion and feature no fenestration.

m. West (side) Elevation
   1) The southern portion of the elevation will feature three sets of equidistant multi-paned doors.
   2) The northern portion of the elevation will feature a covered porch.
   3) The porch roof will extend from below the roof eaves of the of the gable roof form.
   4) The northern portion of the elevation will feature three equidistant sets of multi-paned doors which will access the covered porch.

2. Construct a vehicular drive.
   a. The driveway will extend from an existing curbcut.
   b. The driveway will be “paved” using crushed limestone.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application up for review calls for the construction of an ancillary building. The Design Review Guidelines outline criteria for new ancillary construction. The building will house a gym and garage. Said work would be subordinate to the body of the house (See B-2).

The building will be located on a large piece of property. The main house’s entrance was previously reoriented to face an adjacent property instead of Gladys Avenue. The location of the proposed building will be setback from the main houses primary and secondary façade line. The street-facing (East) facade will feature blind shutters to maintain a rhythm along Gladys Avenue (see B-2).

Building components of ancillary structure compliment the main house (see B-14). The square wooden columns, lapsiding, exposed rafter tails are designed to match that of the existing residence (see B-5). Materials employed, such as the aluminum clad doors, are approvable according to the Design Review Guidelines.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-7) 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. Darrel Williams, owner’s representative, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Allen welcomed the applicant’s representative and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. Roberts noted the ancillary building design was executed well.

Mr. Allen asked where the entrance to the garage would be located. Mr. Williams noted an existing curbcut will access the garage doors on the South elevation. Ms. Harden noted the East elevation faces the public right of way.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Allen opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Allen 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 by Ms. Harden 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 building and building or neighborhood and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

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