ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES  
April 17th 2019 – 3:00 P.M.  
Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Steve Stone, called the meeting to order at 3:25 p.m. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
   
   **Members Present:** Steve Stone, Jim Wagoner, Kim Harden, Catarina Echols and Craig Roberts.  
   **Members Absent:** Robert Brown, Nick Holmes, and David Barr.  
   **Staff Members Present:** John Sledge, Bridget Daniel, Paige Largue, Marion McElroy and Flo Kessler.

2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Wagoner seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

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

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant:** Jackson Properties and Construction, LLC  
   a. **Property Address:** 64 Hannon Avenue  
   b. **Date of Approval:** 3/26/2019  
   c. **Project:** Reroof with black architectural shingles to match existing.

2. **Applicant:** Enoch Aguilera, Jr.  
   a. **Property Address:** 1118 Government Street  
   b. **Date of Approval:** 3/27/2019  
   c. **Project:** Repair/replace rotten wood to match original in material, profile and dimension; repaint house per original paint scheme.

3. **Applicant:** Michael Kennedy  
   a. **Property Address:** 1056 Palmetto Street  
   b. **Date of Approval:** 3/29/2019  
   c. **Project:** Reroof with architectural shingles in neutral/brown color.

4. **Applicant:** Palmer Hamilton  
   a. **Property Address:** 1055 Augusta Street  
   b. **Date of Approval:** 4/1/2019  
   c. **Project:** Reroof with charcoal shingles.

5. **Applicant:** G&K Enterprises  
   a. **Property Address:** 57 N. Ann Street  
   b. **Date of Approval:** 4/1/2019  
   c. **Project:** Repair roof to match existing. Repair and replace deteriorated wood to match existing in dimension, profile, and material. Repaint in neutral color scheme. Repair wooden windows to match in dimension, profile, and material. Re-gravel existing parking pad area in the rear.

6. **Applicant:** Todd Fowler  
   a. **Property Address:** 805 Government Street  
   b. **Date of Approval:** 4/1/2019  
   c. **Project:** Repair with 5V or standing seam metal roof.

7. **Applicant:** Daniel McLeave  
   a. **Property Address:** 1010 Old Shell Road  
   b. **Date of Approval:** 4/2/2019  
   c. **Project:** Add rail at steps to match that on porch in material, dimension and profile.
7. **Applicant: Daniel McLeave**
   a. Property Address: 1012 Old Shell Road
   b. Date of Approval: 4/2/2019
   c. Project: Add plain one inch square rail at front porch, add plain iron rail at steps.

8. **Applicant: David Buchanan**
   a. Property Address: 1155 Government Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/3/2019
   c. Project: Repair deteriorated wood to match. Repair wooden windows to match in dimension, profile, and material. Reinstall gutters. Repaint to match existing.

9. **Applicant: Mary Margaret and William Monahan**
   a. Property Address: 223 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/4/2019
   c. Project: Secure and mothball building.

10. **Applicant: David Naman**
    a. Property Address: 155 Dauphin Street
    b. Date of Approval: 4/4/2019
    c. Project: Repair deteriorated materials to match in dimension, profile and material. Repaint to match.

11. **Applicant: Enen Yu**
    a. Property Address: 114 Espejo Street
    b. Date of Approval: 4/5/2019
    c. Project: Foundation work to sills, will not show from street.

12. **Applicant: Sydney Betbeze**
    a. Property Address: 1008 Texas Street
    b. Date of Approval: 4/8/2019
    c. Project: Remove rotten wood on south facade and siding; replace with material to match existing in profile and dimension. Sand, prep and repaint porch decking as existing. Repaint facade as existing.

**MIDMONTHS ON APRIL 3rd AGENDA:**

1. **Applicant: Paul Davis**
   a. Property Address: 3 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 3/12/2019
   c. Project: Build ADA ramp, raised slope.

2. **Applicant: Chris Huff**
   a. Property Address: 11 Semmes Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 3/13/2019
   c. Project: Erect 4’ metal fence from south side of sidewalk to front plane of house. Erect 6’ lattice from plane of house to another 30’.

3. **Applicant: Pee Realities**
   a. Property Address: 168 S. Broad Street
   b. Date of Approval: 3/13/2019

4. **Applicant: The Guild**
   a. Property Address: 1014 Old Shell Road
   b. Date of Approval: 3/14/2019
   c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood and repaint to match existing.

5. **Applicant: Rebecca Barnes**
   a. Property Address: 57 Fearnway
   b. Date of Approval: 3/15/2019
   c. Project: Reroof with asphalt shingles.

6. **Applicant: The McAleer Tunstall Co., LLC**
   a. Property Address: 450 Government Street
b. Date of Approval: 3/18/2019  
c. Project: Reroof with TPO system.

7. **Applicant: William Huff of Huff Enterprises, LLC**  
a. Property Address: 1002 Selma Street  
b. Date of Approval: 3/18/2019  
c. Project: Reroof with asphalt singles to match.

8. **Applicant: John Harold**  
a. Property Address: 34 Hannon Avenue  
b. Date of Approval: 3/21/2019  
c. Project: Demolish small pre-fabricated shed on property. Construct one story garage with one vehicular bay. Garage will be clad with hardiplank side to match lapsiding on the main house. Knee braces and rafter tails to match main house will be employed. A prairie style garage door ill be located on the front elevation. A paneled metal door will be located on a side elevation. The garage will be located on the rear corner portion of the lot. Garage will be painted to match house.

9. **Applicant: LeRoy Anderson**  
a. Property Address: 1055 Elmira Street  
b. Date of Approval: 3/19/2019  
c. Project: Renewal of COA dated April 4, 2019 to conducting repairs and alterations to a non-contributing house.

10. **Applicant: Laura Bertolini**  
a. Property Address: 1721 Dauphin Street  
b. Date of Approval: 3/20/2019  
c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood to match original in material, profile and dimension, repair front and rear concrete steps, repaint to match.

11. **Applicant: Jeff DeQuattro**  
a. Property Address: 1260 Texas Street  
b. Date of Approval: 3/22/2019  
c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood to match original in material, profile and dimensions; repaint all to match existing.

12. **Applicant: Lola’s Inspiration, LLC**  
a. Property Address: 209 Dauphin Street  
b. Date of Approval: 3/22/2019  
c. Project: Repaint to match the body of existing.

13. **Applicant: John Klotz**  
a. Property Address: 354 Dauphin Street  
b. Date of Approval: 3/25/2019  
c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood to match original in dimension and profile. Repaint to match.

14. **Applicant: Manuel Masonry Construction**  
a. Property Address: 124 Houston Street  
b. Date of Approval: 3/25/2019  
c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingle sin neutral color.

15. **Applicant: Steven Laney II**  
a. Property Address: 1150 Texas Street  
b. Date of Approval: 3/26/2019  
c. Project: Reroof, repair/replace rotten wood to match existing in material, profile and dimension, replace front doors with solid four panel, add metal rail at front steps, add metal gutters, add deck to east rear along ell, remove non-historic window in non-historic saltbox addition on ell and open into four panel door onto deck.
D. APPLICATIONS
   a. Applicant: Mr. DeMarkus Burroughs Boykin, Sr.
   b. Project: Demolition Related: Demolish a contributing residence.

HELD OVER.

2. 2019-18-CA: 934 Conti Street
   a. Applicant: Mr. Stephen May on behalf of May Restorations, Inc.
   b. Project: Relocation Related: Relocate an existing house located out of district on Springhill Avenue to Conti Street.

APPROVED CONCEPTUALLY. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

   a. Applicant: Mack McKinney of McKinney WHLC Architecture on behalf of Les Robinson, LLC
   b. Project: New Construction: Construct new commercial building and conduct site improvements

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS
   1. Ms. Florence Kessler reported to the Board that a citation and notice of the violation of the code had been sent to the property owners at 1654 Government Street.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-15-CA: 352 S. Broad Street
Applicant: Mr. DeMarkus Burroughs Boykin, Sr.
Received: 4/1/2019
Meeting: 4/17/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

Two residences appeared on the 1904 Sanborn map for this site. A residence on the 1925 Sanborn map is has similar footprint to the current residence. Tax records show a significant increase between 1927 and 1928. The current configuration of this bungalow dates from 1928 and was constructed or reconfigured for W. B. Grimes and family.

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 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.

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

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

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

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

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

k. Consider the future utilization of the site.

l. 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. Portions of this property possibly date from 1905. The present configuration dates from 1928. This building is listed as a contributing structure in the Old Oakleigh Garden 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 Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

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 framed structure is a bungalow which once made up a largely residential avenue. This house sits on an inner lot between two residences.

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, and the applicant would return at a later date for approval of a new residence based on plans submitted with this application.

vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition:
   1. N/A.

vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner:
   1. The owner initially sought to rehabilitate the property but is seeking to demolish the residence and rebuild due to cost.

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.

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. Elevations and site 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. A performance bond and line of credit has been obtained.

xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board:
   1. Structural Engineer report provided.
   2. See other submitted materials.

2. Post demolition or relocation plans required. In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

C. Scope of Work:
1. Demolish a residence.
2. Remove the debris from the site.
3. Stabilize the site.
4. Return to ARB for approval of full construction plans based on drawings submitted.

STAFF ANALYSIS

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

352 S. Broad Street is listed as a contributing building located within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. It is an example of a bungalow built or altered to its current condition in 1928. The residence exemplifies the trends spurred by growth and streetcar lines in the neighborhood during that period. Broad Street is first seen on the Goodwin and Haire map of 1824. The street was the furthest boundary of the city at that time. The street evolved from the urban grid seen at the core of the city into a
more spacious lot size and grid. By the late 19th century Broad Street was a key thoroughfare complete with a trolley line. The residences on Broad Street are a reminder of the splendid and active avenue. This wood frame building is in an advanced state of disrepair. Staff conducted an on-site inspection of the exterior on ground and noted termite damage and deteriorated wood. The southern elevation has extensive fire damage to he wall and portion of the roof. According to a blight survey completed in 2018, the property was not deemed a danger to the right of way, or neighboring structures. The aforementioned report indicated fire damage, roof damage, and water penetrating structure. A structural engineer’s report was submitted and stated the structure was compromised due to fire damage, termite damage, and framing issues.

The house contributes to the built density, rhythmic sequencing of the landscape, and to historic character and physical experience of Broad Street. As an inner block dwelling, the building is only viewed from head on or an oblique angle. The house is part of an intact residential block face of Broad Street.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished and debris would be removed. The applicant would return to the Board with an application for new residential construction based on drawings submitted

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2) Staff does believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends denial.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. DeMarkus Boykin, Sr., owner, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed Mr. Boykin and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. Boykin explained the home was formerly his great-grandmother’s residence and he originally planned on rehabilitating the house. He further explained there was more extensive damage than he thought and noted the chimney detaching from the house, lead paint and a structural engineer report received which stated the house was in a deteriorated state of disrepair. Mr. Boykin noted he originally spoke with Cart Blackwell after inheriting the property.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. Mr. Jamie Betbeze, representative of the Oakleigh neighborhood, stated his opposition to demolishing the property. Mr. Betbeze expressed the residence was salvageable. He noted 210 George Street as an example of a historic home with extensive fire damage that has been restored. Mr. Betbeze also stated he did not think the plans provided met the Guidelines or the ordinance requirements for demolition. Mr. Boykin stated he provided what staff directed him to provide. Mr. Stone responded the ordinance is loose as to what it refers to as “construction plans.”

Mr. Roberts thanked Mr. Boykin for providing plans with a level of detail and all information provided.

Mrs. Kristen Gustin, neighboring property owner at 354 S. Broad Street, stated the residence at 352 S. Broad Street caught fire in recent years. She explained she understood the concern with cost, but noted
the street is an intact residential block face. She stated the drawings provided were nice, but the existing bungalow is salvageable and fits the neighborhood.
Mr. Roberts asked the owner if he would be interested in trying to sell the property. Mr. Boykin replied he was not interested in selling the property. He stated he has been pre-approved by the bank to build a new residence and feels the Board is being unfair. Mr. Roberts asked if he would be interested in saving the façade to keep the streetscape in tact. Mr. Roberts noted the proposed façade is similar to a bungalow but has a higher roof pitch. Mr. Roberts then suggested a camelback to get the additional space.

Mr. Boykin replied he requested the proposed plan have a brick porch like the current house, although it was originally a wood framed porch. Mr. Boykin also noted at one time the house was a Bed and Breakfast which impacted the floor plan.

Ms. Largue proposed the Board conduct a Design Review Committee on site sometime before the next ARB meeting on May 1st, 2019. Mr. Boykin was amenable to a Design Review Committee meeting. Mr. Roberts noted it was great Mr. Boykin wanted to live in the neighborhood.

Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, the application be heldover until the May 1st meeting to allow for a Design Review Committee onsite.

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

2019-18-CA:  934 Conti Street
Applicant:  Mr. Stephen May on behalf of May Restorations, Inc.
Received:  3/29/2019
Meeting:  4/17/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:  Old Dauphin Way
Classification:  Non-Contributing (Vacant Lot)
Zoning:  R-1
Project:  Relocation Related: Relocate an existing house located out of district on Springhill Avenue to Conti Street.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to the 1904 Sanborn Map overlay, a double residence was formerly on this site.

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 proposed scope of work includes a rear addition.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Consider whether or not a structure will be relocated within the same district and in a similar context.”
   2. “Relocation may be more appropriate when the receiving site is in the district. Relocated buildings shall be placed in situations that do not impair the architecture of the historical character of the surround.”
   3. “When relocating a building, maintain its general placement and orientation on the new site so as to maintain the architectural and the historical character of the streetscape and district.”
   4. “Preserve the original roof form of a historic residential structure.”
   5. “Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character.”
   6. “Do not relocate an original front stairway or steps.”
   7. “Repair and, when necessary, replace piers, foundations and foundation infill to reflect historic character.”
   8. Acceptable materials for foundation replacement materials include: “…stucco piers or infill; brick piers or infill; stuccoed concrete block; wood lattice or vertical picket infill.”
   9. “Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.”
10. “Use new roof materials to convey a scale and texture similar to those used historically.”
11. “If installing a new metal roof, apply and detail it in a manner that is compatible with the historic character of the roof, period and style.”
12. “Use standing seam metal, metal shingles or five v-crimp.”
13. “Original doors and openings, including their dimensions, should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights.”
14. Acceptable door materials include: “Wood panel; wood panel with glass lights; leaded glass with lead came; metal with a painted finish; other materials original to the building.”
15. “Preserve storefronts, cornices, turned columns, brackets, exposed rafter tails, jigsaw ornaments and other key architectural features that are in good condition.”
16. “When replacing historic details, match the original in profile, dimension, and material.”
17. “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.”
18. “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.”
19. “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.”
20. “Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material and character of the property, neighborhood and environment.”
21. “Design the building components (roof, foundation, doors and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
22. “Maintain the relationship of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building.”
23. “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.”
24. “If the style of an addition is different than the original, use a style that is compatible with the historic context.”
25. “Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.”
26. “Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.”
27. “Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.”
28. “Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights of an addition to those of the historic building.”
29. “Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.”
30. “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.”
31. “Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.”
32. “Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.”
33. “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.”
34. “Use a material with proven durability.”
35. “Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.”
36. “Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.”
37. “Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.”
38. “Do not use a faux stucco application.”
39. “Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.”
40. “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.”
41. “Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.”
42. “If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the addition.”
43. “Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.”
44. “Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.”
45. “Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.”
46. “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.”
47. “Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.”
48. “Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.”
49. “Match foundation height to that of the original historic building.”
50. “Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.”
51. “Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.”
52. “Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.”
53. “Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original structure.”
54. “Use a material for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.”
55. “Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the original historic structure.”
56. “Maintain alignment of front setbacks.”
57. “Maintain the rhythm of buildings and side yards.”
58. “Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
59. “Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
60. “Design piers, a foundation, and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.”
61. “Size foundations and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings.”
62. “Use building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.”
63. “Design building elements on exterior buildings walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements often include but are not limited to: balconies, chimneys, and dormers.”
64. “Use exterior building materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.”
65. “Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic windows.”
66. “Use traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.”
76. “Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.
77. “Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings.”
78. ”When using artificial materials, use a blind or shutter unit that has a thickness, weight and design similar to wood.”
79. “Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.”

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

1. Deconstruct and dismantle residence at 1107 Spring Hill Avenue outside a historic district.
   a. Property would be carefully moved and relocated to Old Dauphin Way historic district.
   b. Reassemble residence on an inner lot bound by Common Street, Conti Street, and Broad Street.

2. Reconstruct a residence.
   a. Residence will be orientated to Conti Street situated on an inner lot.
   b. Residence will be setback 17’0” from the front sidewalk.
   c. The residence is one story.
   d. The residence is a three bay, sidehall shotgun with a later wing addition.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application calls for the relocation of an existing residence into a historic district. A residence located at 1107 Springhill Avenue is threatened by demolition. The existing location is just outside of purview of the Architectural Review Board. The applicant would like to relocate the residence to an inner lot in a mostly residential area of the Old Dauphin Way historic district. When looking at the relocation of properties, one considers several items that are also taken into account when reviewing new construction.

With regard to placement, two components are taken into account – setback from the street and between buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state that new buildings should be responsive to and maintain alignment of traditional façade lines (See B 56.), as well as the rhythm of side & rear setbacks (See B-57). The property would be reconstructed on an inner lot in the vicinity of contributing residential buildings. The proposed placement will negotiate the existing historic buildings located to the east of the site (see survey).

While the building is being relocated, reviewing guidelines for new construction is crucial to ensuring the appropriateness of the residence to the neighborhood. The Design Review Guidelines state that mass - the relationship of the parts of the larger whole comprising a building - for new construction should be in keeping with arrangement and proportion of surrounding historic residences (B-58). The proposed house is a comprised of a porch-fronted three bay sidehall with offset wing in an eclectic style. The wing may be removed and relocated on the rear of the house, distinguished by corner boards. The building with its traditional massing and scale is suited to the architectural and historical traditions of the neighborhood (See B-59).

With regard to building components, the Design Review Guidelines call for responsiveness to traditional design traditions. The building is historic and features a side gabled front porch with offset wing. The composition and materials (wood siding, wood windows, standing seam metal roof), and rhythm of solid to void patterns is compatible with immediate and larger residential architectural vocabulary of the district.
(See B-73 and B-74). Deteriorated elements will be repaired when possible and replaced when necessary to match existing in dimension, profile and material (See B-16). The roof form will be maintained and a new metal standing seam roof will surmount the relocated building. Metal roofs are often appropriate for antebellum and Victorian cottages (See B-11). The brick pier with lattice infill foundation is reflective of traditional foundation elevations (See B-60) and dwellings on properties abutting the subject address.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-3) Staff does not believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends conceptual approval of the relocation of the residence, with the understanding a site plan and any revised elevations be submitted for full approval at the next ARB meeting on May 1st.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Douglas B. Kearley, architect and owner’s representative was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed Mr. May and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. May stated the house located at 1107 Spring Hill Avenue was threatened by demolition. He noted the proposed site for relocation use to have a residence on the lot before it burned.

Mr. Stone noted the house was two doors down from the recently relocated 137 Tuscaloosa Street house. Mrs. Harden confirmed Mr. May would return to the Board in two weeks for full approval with a site plan and elevation drawings. Mr. May replied the width of the house is currently 22’ and would fit well on the proposed lot. Mr. Stone stated the application was for conceptual approval of the relocation of the house.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

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

**FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. 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. Wagoner 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 issued for relocation with the condition that the applicant return to the Board by May 1st with site plan and elevation drawings.

The motion received a second by Ms. Harden and was approved unanimously.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS EXPIRATION DATE:** April 18, 2020
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-19-CA: 412 S. Broad Street  
Applicant: Mack McKinney of McKinney WHLC Architecture on behalf of Les Robinson, LLC  
Received: 4/1/2019  
Meeting: 4/17/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Non-contributing (Vacant Lot)  
Zoning: B-2  
Project: New Construction: Construct new commercial building and conduct site improvements.

BUILDING HISTORY

This property is currently a vacant lot.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. This property has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board according to the MHDC vertical files. The proposed scope of work includes constructing a single story commercial building and conducting site improvements such as a new parking lot.

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

2. “The second context for new commercial construction is the commercial corridor. This refers to new commercial construction built along arterials at the periphery of a predominantly residential historic district. An example is a new commercial infill project on a parcel facing Government Street or Springhill Avenue that is also located within a locally designated historic district.”

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

4. “The location of new commercial infill within the block face in this context should also be considered. Corner locations may require considerations that are not relevant at mid-block locations. For this context, new commercial construction should strongly consider front setback distances, landscaped setbacks, and the transition between the commercial project...
and rear-adjacent historic properties to ensure compatibility with the orientation of nearby historic residential buildings in the district.”
5. 7.30 “Orient a new commercial building to be similar to that of nearby historic structures.”
6. “Place buildings in line with adjacent historic buildings in terms of relationship to the street. If a project is flanked by non-historic structures, refer to nearby historic structures.”
7. “Design side setbacks to be similar to those in adjacent historic buildings. If a project is flanked by non-historic structures refer to nearby historic structures.”
8. “Orient façades of new commercial buildings similarly to adjacent historic structures. In most cases, new commercial structures should be oriented to directly face the street.”
9. “Face primary building entries toward the public street.”
10. “Screen ancillary buildings or place them behind the primary building.”
11. “New commercial construction in the Commercial Corridor context should prioritize front setback distances and landscape design in front yards in order to establish compatibility with nearby historic residential structures, if any exist. New commercial construction in this context should also be sensitive to rear-adjacent historic residential structures.”
12. 7.32 “Place and orient new commercial construction on commercial corridors to be compatible with that of adjacent historic residential structures and the district.”
13. “Establish front setbacks similar to those in adjacent historic residential development or historic residential development on the same block.”
14. “Orient façades to be parallel with the street or in the orientation of historic residential structures that are adjacent or on the same block. In some cases, the orientation should be north-south depending on the historic context.”
15. “For corner lots, align a sidewall with historic residential structures located to the rear of project. Offset sidewalls built close to the street edge to be in line with historic residential structures at the rear of the project.”
16. “7.34 Design a building to be compatible with massing and scale with historic structures in the district.”
17. “7.35 Design building massing and scale to maintain the visual continuity of the district.”
18. “7.36 Maintain traditional spacing patterns created by the repetition of building widths along the street.”
19. “New commercial construction in the Commercial Corridor context should exhibit massing and scale that is similar to adjacent and nearby historic residential structures in the district. The design of massing and scale of buildings should also consider relationships to rear-adjacent historic residential structures.”
20. “Break down building massing to create separate volumes that are similar to the massing of adjacent and nearby historic residential structures.”
21. “Limit the height of a building to be similar to those of adjacent and nearby historic residential structures.”
22. “Where the lot lines of a commercial structure and residential structure meet, step down the height of the commercial building to match that of the adjacent residential structure.”
23. “7.47 Where new commercial construction is located adjacent to historic residential structures, use building materials that are compatible with those materials used in nearby historic buildings.”
24. “Use a material that is reflective of nearby historic residential structures, including wood siding.”

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

1. Construct a commercial building.
   a. The building will be setback over 10’ from the Broad Street right of way.
   b. The building will comprise a square composition.
   c. The building will be 170’0” in width and 160’0” in depth.
d. The building will be three stories in height, with a four story section at the corner entrance.
e. The finished floor of the first floor will be 14’0” in height.
f. The walls will be clad in brick veneer.
g. A stone or simulated stone watertable will be employed.
h. The windows will be aluminum storefront and aluminum clad.
i. Downspouts will be employed on the West (rear) elevation.
j. Flat roof forms will surmount the building.

2. East (Facade/ Broad Street-facing) Elevation
   a. The southernmost portion of the façade will feature a four story tower.
   b. The first floor of the aforementioned section will feature aluminum storefront system comprised of window and transom above.
   c. Above the aforementioned transom will be a flat metal canopy.
   d. The second, third, and fourth floor of the tower section will feature a group set of three windows, multi-pane in configuration.
   e. The remaining expanse of the façade will be defined by seven bays.
   f. The first floor of the aforementioned section will feature recessed portions of brick veneer in each of the bays.
   g. The second floor and will feature a group set of three windows in each bay. The windows are multi-pane in configuration.
   h. The third floor will feature a grouped set of three windows with transom above in each bay.

3. South (side) Elevation
   a. The easternmost portion of the elevation will feature a four story tower.
   a. The first floor of the aforementioned section will feature aluminum storefront comprised of window and transom above.
   b. Above the aforementioned transom will be a flat metal canopy.
   c. The second, third, and fourth floor of the tower section will feature a group set of three windows, multi-pane in configuration.
   d. The central expanse of the façade will be defined by five bays.
   e. The easternmost bay of the central expanse will feature a recessed brick veneer on the first story, and paired windows on the second and third story.
   f. The remaining four (4) bays will feature similar fenestration patterns. See below.
   g. The first floor of the aforementioned section will feature recessed portions of brick veneer in each of the bays.
   h. The second floor will feature a group set of three windows in each bay. The windows are multi-pane in configuration.
   i. The third floor will feature a grouped set of three windows with transom above. Windows and transom will be multi-paned in configuration. South (rear) Elevation
   j. The fourth bay in the central expanse of the façade (going in an easterly to westerly direction) will feature a metal roll up door.
   k. A metal canopy will be suspended in the middle of the second story over the metal roll up door.
   l. The outer bay located on the western portion of the elevation will feature a storefront system.

4. North (side) Elevation
   b. The easternmost portion of the elevation will feature a four story tower.
   a. The façade will be defined by four bays on the eastern portion and three bays on the western portion. The western portion will be recessed from the eastern portion.
b. The first floor, second and third floor of the aforementioned section will feature recessed portions of brick veneer in each of the bays to mimic fenestration.

5. West (side) Elevation
   a. The West Elevation will feature no fenestration and be brick veneer.

6. Conduct site improvements.
   a. Install hard surfacing for new parking lot located on the Southern portion (Elmira Street facing) of lot.
   b. Site will have a total of seven parking spaces setback 20’0” from lot line.
   c. Install/ repair curb cuts on Elmira Street. Install gates at entrance and exit drives.
   d. Install metal fencing. Fencing will not be higher than 4’ in front of the building and gradual reach 6-8’ in height.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a commercial building on a corner lot. When reviewing applications for new commercial construction, the following principle criteria are taken into account: context; placement & orientation; massing; scale; façade elements; and materials.

New commercial design should conform to one of the following main typologies: main street, commercial corridor, or interior neighborhood. The property is located along a prominent arterial at the edge of the Oakleigh Garden historic district (See B-2). Buildings located in the commercial corridor context are in close proximity to historic residences.

Placement of commercial buildings in a commercial corridor context involves consideration setbacks and orientation (see B-4). Setbacks from the street and between buildings are taken into account. As to orientation, the building faces Broad Street, the principle vehicular artery, but its entrance engages Elmira Street. The way the proposed building is oriented mimics other commercial buildings along Broad Street including 450 Broad Street (See B-5). As the property is a corner lot, responsiveness to the setbacks of two street streets, Elmira Street in addition to Broad Street, is warranted. With regard to the front setback, the building is setback 10’0” from the Broad Street right of way, and setback over 40’0” from the Elmira Street right of way. When reviewing setbacks, landscaping is considered. Front setbacks within a 150’0” of the property include about 8’0” at 450 S. Broad Street (See B-11). The proposed setback of 10’0” closely mimics that of its south adjacent neighbor. Side setbacks in a commercial corridor context should respond to adjacent commercial structures (See B-15). The site plan shows a 20’0” setback to allow for landscaping to screen the parking area. The property west adjacent the proposed building is setback about 25’0” from the Elmira Street right of way. The side setback for the landscape buffer in front of parking responds to the historic setback seen on the neighboring lot.

Massing refers to the relationship between the component parts comprising a building. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that massing and scale of new commercial construction in a commercial corridor context should appear to be similar to that of historic buildings in the districts (See B-16). Scale is related to massing. Traditionally, most historic commercial buildings were situated close to the right of way. The building proposed is based on a converted three story school building at 304 S. Broad Street (Broad Street Lofts) and other mid-century commercial buildings such as 450 S. broad Street, 454 S. Broad Street and 750 S. Broad Street (Pollman’s Bakery) seen in a corridor context within the Oakleigh Garden and Oakdale National Register Districts. Both of 304 S. Broad Street and the proposed building are rectangular in massing, feature flat roof forms, and employ groupings of multi-pane windows. In terms of height, the majority of the proposed building is three stories and responds to 304 S. Broad Street. The proposed building will feature a four story tower at the corner (See B-20).
As to materials, the drawings of the proposed building depict a brick veneer treatment. Many 19th Century and early 20th century commercial buildings were faced with brick (See B-23). Historic storefront facades were often composed of bulkhead, window, and transom or clerestory window above. The proposed storefront system includes partitioned window and transoms above. The materials and design then complement the character of the neighborhood.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Consider lowering the canopy over the roll up door on the South (side) elevation.
2. Consider placing two to three more storefront systems on the first floor of the East (front) elevation.
3. Consider lowering the height of the tower.
4. Return with signage plan. Signs can total no more than 64 square feet. Signs can be metal, metal composite, wood, wood composite and externally lit.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Pending the applicant’s response to non-binding recommendations, staff recommends the application based on B (1-12).

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Mack McKinney, architect and owner’s representative, was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed Mr. McKinney and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. McKinney explained the tower on the proposed commercial storage building was to break up the massing of the building. He noted the windows were based off a building along the Broad Street corridor. He explained the canopy on Elmira Street had to have a clearance of 13’6” and stated he and the owner would entertain more storefront along Broad Street. He stated the tower height was designed as so to be proportional with the building, but could consider lowering the height of it.

Mr. Jamie Betbeze, resident of Oakleigh, expressed his appreciation of the interesting design and efforts made by the architect and owner to make it fit the corridor. Mr. Betbeze then stated he supported staff’s recommendations for alterations the project.

Mr. Roberts requested a sample of the brick and windows proposed. Mr. McKinney stated he could bring of sample of the brick and aluminum clad windows. Ms. Harden asked if the fence was to be along Broad Street as seen in the plan. Mr. McKinney stated the fence would not be along Broad would begin behind the front of the building at a corner.

Mr. Stone expressed concern over the building’s entrance, stating the main entrance seemed to be on Elmira Street based on the drawings submitted. He also remarked the canopy was in between the windows, and the large expanse of brick on the first floor of the Broad Street elevation. Mr. James Hughes, owner, replied an entrance to the office is located on the corner of Broad Street and Elmira Street.

Mr. Wagoner asked if there were any plans to remove the live oaks along Broad and Elmira Streets. MR. Hughes replied the plan was drawn so to save any live oak trees, but the city had plans to remove one live oak in the right of way on Elmira Street.
No further discussion from the Board ensued.

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

**FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. 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 Mrs. Harden and was unanimously approved.

Mr. McKinney confirmed for Ms. Harden that the windows would only be tinted to the extent the energy code requires.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued with the condition that samples of the brick, aluminum clad windows, reduced height in tower, and added storefront be reviewed by staff.

The motion received a second by Ms. Harden and was approved unanimously.