A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Steve Stone, called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. Christine Dawson, Historic Development Staff, called the roll as follows.

   **Members Present:** Robert E. Brown, Sr., Abby Davis, Kim Harden, Andre Rathle, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, and Jim Wagoner.

   **Members Absent:** Catarina Echols, Joseph Rodrigues, and Gypsie Van Antwerp.

   **Staff Members Present:** Christine Dawson and Bridget Daniel

2. Mr. Brown moved to accept the minutes from the December 4th meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wagoner and approved unanimously.

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

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant:** Martin Douglas
   a. Property Address: 506 Monroe Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/09/2019
   c. Project: Repair/replace front porch railing to match existing in material, dimension, and profile; repair/replace lattice underpinning; rework existing storm shutters; repaint existing colors.

2. **Applicant:** Matt Young
   a. Property Address: 251 St. Anthony Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/09/2019
   c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood to match original in material, dimension and profile; repaint to match.

3. **Applicant:** Carolyn Jeffers
   a. Property Address: 108 Ryan Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 12/10/2019
   c. Project: Repairing and/or replacing front and rear doors to match existing in-kind dimension, material and profile. Remove and reinstall sunroom window after repairing seal. Also, repair and repaint stucco where needed to match existing.

4. **Applicant:** Ed Felt Thad Hartman
   a. Property Address: 1169 Elmira Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/10/2019
   c. Project: Secure and Stabilize structure with exterior repairs to be made at a later date. Also will cut grass and weeds and remove all trash and debris.

5. **Applicant:** William Edmonds
   a. Property Address: 22 Macy Place
   b. Date of Approval: 12/11/2019

6. **Applicant:** Elmore Family Properties
   a. Property Address: 301 S. Monterey Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/13/2019
   c. Project: Reroof asphalt shingles.

7. **Applicant:** Ryan Lewis
   a. Property Address: 161 Michigan Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 12/16/2019
c. Project: Remove broken driveway strips, install 13'x25' asphalt driveway inside privacy fence.

8. Applicant: Angus R III and Gretchen Cooper
   a. Property Address: 207 Lanier Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 12/16/2019
   c. Project: Construct iron fence with stucco pillars and toe wall per plans on file. Height 5.5’ maximum.

9. Applicant: Walter Reinhaus
   a. Property Address: 105 Michael Donald Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 12/16/2019
   c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood as necessary to match original in material, profile, and dimension. Repaint to match.

10. Applicant: Walter Reinhaus
    a. Property Address: 107 Michael Donald Avenue
    b. Date of Approval: 12/16/2019
    c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood to match original in material, profile, and dimension.

11. Applicant: James E. & Susan H. Crowson
    a. Property Address: 1110 Savannah Street
    b. Date of Approval: 12/26/2019
    c. Project: Renewal of previously issued COA (approved by ARB) to repair dormer by replacing rotten wood to match and replace vent on east side of dormer to match right side. Open enclosed porch addition on eastern portion of elevation. Install wooden balustrade. Remove awning window on rear elevation and larger window on later addition located to the rear of house. Install smaller wooden window on western portion of rear elevation. Remove rotten pergola. Construct one story carport conformed to stock guidelines. Elements on carport will match existing house in dimension, material and profile. Construct 6’ wooden fence at rear of lot to tie into existing fence. Install window in dormer with existing opening on East elevation, Northern portion.

12. Applicant: Maureen Henderson
    a. Property Address: 961 Church Street
    b. Date of Approval: 12/27/2019
    c. Project: Repair and/or replace rotten boards and repaint white to match in existing dimension, profile and material.

13. Applicant: John Gohres
    a. Property Address: 58 Semmes Avenue
    b. Date of Approval: 01/02/2020
    c. Project: Architectural asphalt singles, black.

14. Applicant: James Hood
    a. Property Address: 1206 Selma Street
    b. Date of Approval: 01/03/2020
    c. Project: Reroof with gaf asphalt shingles, slate color.

15. Applicant: Erin Wheeler
    a. Property Address: 257 Charles Street
    b. Date of Approval: 01/03/2020
    c. Project: Enlarge rear porch per plans in file.

16. Applicant: Kevin Egan
    a. Property Address: 1130 Montauk Avenue
    b. Date of Approval: 01/06/2020
    c. Project: Rebuild rear deck to match existing.

17. Applicant: Rellim Contracting LLC
    a. Property Address: 261 Dauphin Street
b. Date of Approval: 01/06/2020
c. Project: Exterior Termite Damage Repairs, amount of damage unknown. Repair and replace to match in-kind dimension, profile and material. (Majority of repairs are for interior.)

18. Applicant: Ben Nelson
   a. Property Address: 15 Macy Place
   b. Date of Approval: 01/07/2020
   c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood to match original in material, profile and dimension, repaint to match.

19. Applicant: Mark Fillers
   a. Property Address: 1 N. Royal Street
   b. Date of Approval: 01/08/2020
   c. Project: Revised for 2nd story window.

C. APPLICATIONS

   a. Applicant: Mitchell Signs, Inc. on behalf of Garner Dental Group
   b. Project: Remove existing monument sign and replace with new internally lit double-faced monument sign
   WITHDRAWN. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2019-56-CA: 7 N. Royal Street
   a. Applicant: Mr. Douglas Kearley on behalf of Mr. Jay Watkins
   b. Project: Remove temporary infill at former ATM location to install new wood door to vestibule
   APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2019-39-CA: 600 Church Street
   a. Applicant: Ms. Lucy Barr on behalf of Mr. David Crowder
   b. Project: New construction single-family residence
   APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019559-CA: 1754 Government Street
Applicant: Mitchell Signs, Inc. on behalf of Garner Dental Group
Received: 12/18/2019
Meeting: 1/15/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B1
Project: New Monument Sign

BUILDING HISTORY

According to the Mobile County tax assessor’s record, the building was constructed in 1965. The structure appears on the 1967 aerial photo of the area, supporting the tax assessor’s date. The one-story, brick veneered commercial building rests on a slightly raised foundation and is covered with a hipped roof. The property appears to retain its original steel windows on the north and south elevations. The windows on the east and west elevations were replaced circa 1990, and a handicapped accessibility ramp was added to the east elevation at approximately the same time.

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 (ARB) in December 2019, when the ARB approved the painting of the brick veneer exterior and the repainting of the trim and doors.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (Guidelines) state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Limit the area of a monument sign to 50 square feet (maximum of 25 square feet on each side).”
   2. “Limit the height of the monument sign to 8 feet. A monument sign should be visible, but clearly subordinate to the building.”
   3. “Where possible, design a monument sign to be compatible with the architecture of the associated building.”
   4. “Use lighting that is shielded and directed toward the sign. This lighting can be installed on the ground adjacent to a monument sign.”
   5. “Do not use an internally illuminated monument sign.”
   6. Acceptable sign materials include “painted or carved wood; individual wood or cast metal letters or symbols; stone, such as slate, marble, or sandstone; painted, gilded, or sandblasted glass; metal, provided it is appropriate to the architectural character of the building.”
7. Unacceptable sign materials include “whole plastic face” and “metal inappropriate for the architectural character of the building.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Remove existing monument sign.
2. Install a newly fabricated aluminum monument sign.
   a. The sign would measure 6 feet high by 6 feet wide.
   b. The total sign area would be 72 square feet.
   c. The sign would be internally lit with white LED bulbs.
   d. The sign text would be “Midtown Dental Studio Family Dentistry” and include the dentists’ names and the practice phone number on the east and west faces of the sign. The street number would appear vertically at the base on the north and south sides of the monument.
   e. The proposed colors to be used are black, white, gray, and silver.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the removal of the existing monument sign with an area of 48 square feet and the installation of a new monument sign with an area of 72 square feet. The proposed sign would be composed of aluminum.

The area of the proposed sign would not be in conformance with the Guidelines, as it would be larger by almost half of the 50 square feet allowed under the Guidelines (72 square feet) (B.1). The sign would conform to the 8-foot height limit (B.2). The proposed sign would be internally lit, which does not conform to the Guidelines (B.4, B.5).

As to materials, the Guidelines state that metals may be used if they are “appropriate to the architectural character of the building (B.6).” The associated building on the property was constructed in the mid-20th century, an era in which aluminum was used often. Therefore, the proposed sign material is in conformance with the Guidelines.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-7) above, Staff believes the proposed monument sign would impair the historic character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends denial of the application as submitted.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Jessica Edwards and Sharley Hamm of Garner Dental Group were present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Ms. Edwards stated that they were willing to reduce the size of the sign to conform with the Guidelines. However, the applicant would still prefer to erect an internally lit sign because ground lighting tends to get broken by landscapers and vandals.

Mr. Stone inquired of Staff if there is any precedent for the ARB permitting internally lit signs. Neither Staff nor anyone on the Board could recall such a precedent.
Mr. Roberts noted that his biggest concern was the size of the sign, not the lighting, because there are ways to externally light signs using fixtures that are flush with the ground.

Mr. Stone noted that the street number appears on the plans on the side of the sign, not on one of the faces and technically constitutes additional signage. Mr. Stone recommended to the applicant that they withdraw the application and work with staff to present a new design that conforms to the Guidelines.

The applicant agreed to withdraw the application.

There was no further discussion at that time.

No members of the public were present to speak for or against the application. Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-39-CA: 7 N. Royal Street
Applicant: Mr. Douglas Kearley, Architect, on behalf of Mr. Jay Watkins
Received: 12/23/2019
Meeting: 1/15/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.2
Project: Remove temporary infill at former ATM location and install new wood door to vestibule

BUILDING HISTORY

The subject property is a two-story commercial structure known as the Stickney Building, constructed c. 1870. The building has housed restaurants, furnished rooms, a tailor shop, a hotel, a shoe store, clothing stores, a stationery company, an office supply company, and a travel agency, among other businesses.

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 (ARB) in June 2012. The ARB approved the installation of the ATM and signage at that time.

Per the MHDC vertical files, an application regarding this property appeared before the ARB in March 2012. At that time, the ARB approved the reconfiguration of the existing storefront, the installation of additional windows, and the construction of a balcony.

An application to install new transoms over new glazed openings on the first floor façade (east elevation), install a double-leaf entrance, construct a balcony across the façade, install seven new windows on the north elevation (right side), install a new exit door at the west end of the north elevation, and apply a stucco finish to the north elevation was approved by the ARB in March 2006.

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

1. Three typical building conditions are recognized by the Guidelines – Original Design Intact, Original Design Slightly Altered, and Original Design Significantly Altered. Buildings in the Original Design Slightly Altered category “have retained the basic character of the original design, but some elements have been removed or changed… new elements that are compatible
with a given design will be considered…In this case, avoid a conjectural renovation of the historic commercial building.”
2. “Preserve elements, both structural and decorative, that contribute to a building’s historic character.”
3. “Retain the original openings, building material[s] and proportions.”
4. “Preserve the key character-defining features of a historic commercial façade.”
5. “If necessary, replace a door in a fashion that is sensitive to the historic commercial character of the building.”
6. “Use doors with high proportions of transparent glass.”
7. “If a modern doorway is created, use metal with [an] anodized or painted finish or varnished or painted wood.”
8. “Design a replacement doorway to emphasize the commercial entrance.”
9. “Do not use a residential door for a commercial building.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

3. Remove temporary infill at former ATM location.
4. Install a wood paneled entry door in the created opening.
   a. Install interior walls to create a landing at the foot of existing interior stairs, separating the new entrance from the rest of the first floor.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the creation of a separate entrance for the second floor of the building. A small foyer will be created at the foot of the existing interior stairs by installing a wall between the foot of the stairs (at the south end of the first floor) and the central entry. The temporary infill, placed when the ATM was removed, would be replaced with a wood paneled exterior door to allow access to the second floor directly from Royal Street.

The subject property falls into the Original Design Slightly Altered category, as the historic second story fenestration with keystone lintels and surface scoring on the façade are largely intact. The first-floor storefront is no longer extant, but the fenestration pattern suggests that previous use of the structure (B.1).

The proposed door would be placed in the opening that mirrors a window opening at the north end of the façade (east elevation). The overall fenestration of the elevation recalls the rhythm of solids and voids of the historic storefront entry of the building, though the rhythm was not exactly replicated due to the installation of the ATM formerly located at the south end of the elevation. The proposed change would introduce an opening in the former ATM location; however, the opening would not be transparent (B.3, B.6).

As to materials, the drawings of the proposal calls for a paneled wood door, which is in keeping with the Guidelines (B.7).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-9) above, Staff does not believe the changes proposed in this application would impair either the architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application.
BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Ms. Davis asked if the proposed door would be stained. Mr. Kearley stated that it would.

Mr. Stone stated that he did not think the indented entrance was appropriate.

There was no further discussion at that time.

No members of the public were present to speak for or against the application. Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application and during public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff Report as written.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Brown and was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the changes proposed by the applicant would not impair the historic integrity of the property or the district and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

Ms. Davis seconded the motion, and the application was approved on a 6-1 vote, with Mr. Stone voting against.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-39-CA: 600 Church Street
Applicant: Ms. Lucy Barr of Lucy Barr Designs on behalf of Mr. David Crowder
Received: 12/27/2019
Meeting: 1/15/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Vacant Lot
Zoning: T4
Project: New Construction: Construct single family residence

BUILDING HISTORY

The property is a vacant lot. A one-story frame dwelling is shown in this location on the 1904 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, and a structure appears in aerial photography through 1960. The property is obscured by tree cover in the 1967 and 1974 aerial photos, but the lot is clearly empty by the time of the next available photo, 1980.

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 (ARB) in September 2019. The ARB determined that the submitted design would impair the historic integrity of the neighborhood, and the application was withdrawn for discussion by the Design Review Committee.

Per the MHDC vertical files, an application regarding this property appeared before the ARB in 1985. At that time, an existing historic residence on Springhill Avenue was approved to be relocated to the site. The proposed scope of work included the demolition of an existing ancillary structure and the construction of a new ancillary building.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (Guidelines) state, in pertinent part:
1. Three typical contexts for new commercial construction projects in Mobile’s historic districts are described in the Guidelines: “main street,” “commercial corridor,” and “interior neighborhood.”
2. The third context, interior neighborhood, “refers to new commercial construction that develops in the interior of a predominantly residential historic district…refers specifically to new, small scale commercial construction for corner stores or other neighborhood-serving retail uses that are completely surrounded by residential structures. In most cases, commercial infill in this context is likely to develop on corner lots…For this context, new commercial construction should strongly consider massing, scale, and orientation to ensure compatibility with nearby historic residential buildings.”
3. “Place and orient new commercial construction at interior neighborhood locations to be compatible with that of nearby historic residential structures.”
4. “Establish front setbacks similar to those in adjacent historic residential development or historic residential development on the same block.”
5. “If off-street parking is required, provide it behind the building where possible.”
6. “Orient façades to be parallel to the street.”
7. “Design a building to be compatible with massing and scale with historic structures in the district.”
8. “Incorporate changes in color, texture, and material.”
9. “Use architectural details to create visual interest.”
10. “Design building massing and scale to maintain the visual continuity of the district.”
11. “Design a new structure to incorporate a traditional base, middle, and cap.”
12. “Maintain traditional spacing patterns created by the repetition of building widths along the street.”
13. “Proportion a new façade to reflect the established range of traditional building widths seen in Mobile.”
14. “New commercial construction in the Interior Neighborhood context, where small scale commercial buildings are constructed on corners in a residential neighborhood, should exhibit massing and scale that is similar to adjacent and nearby historic residential structures in the district.”
15. “Use massing that is similar to nearby historic structures.”
16. “Where larger building volumes are desired, break down building massing near the street to create separate volumes that are similar to the massing of adjacent and nearby historic residential structures.”
17. “Limit the height of a building to be equal or less to those of adjacent and nearby historic residential structures.”
18. “Use building materials that are compatible with the surrounding historic residential context.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Construct a single-family residence designed as a commercial building.
   a. The building facade would be set back a minimum of 11'-7” and a maximum of approximately 13’ from the Church Street right-of-way (ROW).
   b. The building would be basically rectangular in shape.
   c. The overall building footprint would be an estimated 143'-4” in depth, 43'-2” in width at the front elevation (Church Street), and 45’10” in width at the rear elevation.
   d. The walls would be clad in brick.
   e. The windows would be black or dark bronze aluminum clad.
   f. A parapet wall would rise above the south (façade) and north (rear) elevations and at the intermediate break between living space and the garage.
   g. The roof forms employed would be gabled and shed.
   h. Roofs would be covered with Atlas Pinnacle “Weathered Wood.”
2. South (façade along Church Street) Elevation
   a. The façade would be two bays wide with a single casement type window at the west end and a recessed porch at the center and east end.
   b. The porch would be 10’-0” deep and approximately 20’ wide.
   c. The casement windows on this elevation would consist of two fixed lights above two three-light vertical casements.
   d. The fenestration pattern across the porch would be window, door, window.
   e. The door would be a timber pivot hinge door surmounted by a two-light transom.
f. A railing would enclose the porch.
g. The porch would be accessed via brick steps.
h. The parapet would be stepped at the outside corners and arched at the center.
i. The highest point of the parapet would be 24'-6”.

3. East (Warren Street side) Elevation
   a. The East elevation roofline would feature a change in height.
   b. The southern portion of the elevation would have fenestration as follows in a
      south to north direction: fixed six-light window; set of three (3) fixed, six-light
      windows; set of three (3) fixed, six-light windows; set of three (3) fixed, six-light
      windows; vertical plank door; single fixed six-light window; two-car garage
      door; single garage door. All windows would be placed high in the wall,
      mimicking those historically found on neighborhood stores.
   c. An iron work panel is proposed at the far south end of the elevation, and clay tile
      accents are proposed for the south end, between the six-light window at the south
      end and the southernmost set of three windows, and between the northernmost
      set of three windows and the northernmost six-light window (above the door).
   d. The door would be accessed by brick steps.
   e. A vertical steel beam would break the lengthy brick wall between the
      southernmost and central sets of three windows.
   f. A stepped parapet wall measuring 24'-6” at its highest would separate the higher
      roof of the living area and the lower roof of the garage portion of the elevation.
   g. The garage portion of the elevation would be stepped back from the plane of the
      living area wall by 7'-4”.
   h. The two-car garage door would be plank wood surmounted by an eight-light
      transom.
   i. The one-car garage door would be a 15-light glass door surmounted by a three-
      light transom.

4. North (rear) Elevation
   a. The North elevation would be blank.

5. West (interior side) Elevation
   a. The West elevation would feature portions of the building that advance and
      recede.
   b. The northern portion of the elevation would shelter the garage and master bath,
      and this portion would be separated from the living areas of the elevation by a
      parapet wall. The fenestration from north to south would be garage door; fixed
      eight-light window; fixed six-light window. The fixed six-light window would be
      located in a “bump-out” housing the master bath water closet.
   c. The central portion would continue along the same plane as the garage portion
      of the elevation, then recess to accommodate a patio or deck area. The recessed area
      would be stepped back approximately 15'-8” from the plane of the garage portion
      of the elevation.
   d. The fenestration of the central portion of the elevation would be as follows, from
      north to south: set of three fixed four-light windows; set of three fixed four-light
      windows; sliding glass doors surmounted by four-light transom. The northernmost set of
      three fixed four-light windows would be located in the area
      north of the recessed portion of the elevation and sheltered by a shed roof.
   e. The southernmost portion of the west elevation would advance 15'-5” from the
      central portion. The fenestration would consist only of sliding glass doors
      sheltered by a shed-roofed porch. The porch roof would be supported by a single
      square timber column at the north and south ends. The porch would be
      punctuated by an exterior fireplace.
STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a new single-family residence designed as an interpretation of a commercial building on a corner lot in the Church Street East Historic District. The application is being reviewed under the guidelines for new commercial structures, as that is its design intent. When reviewing applications for new commercial construction, the following principal criteria are taken into consideration: context; placement and orientation; massing; scale; façade elements; and materials. Of these criteria, the first three items should be considered strongly (see B.2).

New commercial design will likely fall into one of the following contexts in Mobile’s historic districts: main street, commercial corridor, or interior neighborhood. The property is located on a corner lot on a mixed-use street one block distant from a prominent artery of the Church Street East Historic District (see B.5). Buildings located in the interior neighborhood corridor context are in close proximity to historic residences. The Church Street East boundary is defined by Conti Street, Broad Street, Canal Street and Water Street. The period of significance is listed from 1834 to 1957. Uses found in this district are governmental, educational, religious, commercial, and residential buildings. Commercial buildings take the form of hotels (e.g., LaClede Hotel, 150 Government), mixed use buildings (e.g., 126 Government Street), and industrial facilities (e.g., Crystal Ice House, 800 Monroe Street).

Placement of commercial buildings in an interior neighborhood context involves consideration of setbacks and orientation (see B.3 and B.4). The proposed building would face Church Street, matching the residence adjacent to the west (see B.3 and B.6). As the property is a corner lot, responsiveness to the setbacks of two street streets, Warren and Church Street, is required. With regard to the front setback, the building would be set back approximately 13’ from the Church Street ROW, and the building would be set back approximately 2’ from the Warren Street ROW. The setback is close in line with the neighboring property to the west, 602 Church Street. When reviewing setbacks, front setback and landscaping are of primary consideration. The site plan shows there would be no parking or vehicular drives on either frontage. Curb cuts will remain on the Warren Street side and provide access to a vehicular garage. Several residential structures in Church Street East, such as the shotguns, are set closely to the side lot lines. The setbacks of the building respond to historic setbacks seen on Church Street and in the district.

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 an interior neighborhood context should appear to be similar to that of historic buildings in the districts (see B.7). Scale is related to massing. Traditionally, most historic commercial buildings were situated close to the ROW. The proposed building was inspired by a commercial building located at 451 St. Louis Street (Buick Building) in the Automobile Alley historic district, a commercial corridor context. This particular example is also responsive to other historic commercial buildings found in interior neighborhood or on small commercial corridors, such as 2066 Old Shell Road. Both of these commercial buildings are rectangular in massing and feature flat roof forms with parapet. The east (right side, Warren Street) elevation’s massing is broken by a change in roof height and the use of a vertical steel beam (see B.16). In terms of height, the single story responds to historic buildings in the district (see B.14). The adjacent residence at 600 Church Street is two stories in height. The massing and scale of the proposed design is compatible with the district.

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.18). Historic storefront facades were often composed of bulkhead, window, and transom or clerestory window above. The windows would be aluminum clad, an approvable material for new construction project in historic districts. The roof would be sheathed in neutral-colored shingles.
CLARIFICATIONS

1. What is the intended material of the front porch railing?
2. The drawings provided appear to show the roof of the main part of the structure (between the two taller parapets) would be a shed form, rising from east to west. Was that the intention?
3. In what material would the glass garage door be framed?

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-18) above, Staff does not believe new residence proposed by this application would impair the architectural or historical character of the surrounding district. Due to the massing, scale, orientation, and compatibility of materials to the neighborhood, Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Barr and Mr. Crowder were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Ms. Barr stated that the property owner preferred that the porch railing be of wood. Mr. Stone advised Ms. Barr to submit the design for the wood railing to Staff for approval.

Ms. Davis inquired whether the roof indicated by Staff was, in fact, a shed form. Ms. Barr replied that it was in order to help keep water out of the courtyard on the west side of the building, which would be hard to drain.

Mr. Brown noted that the design did not much resemble a house. Mr. Roberts stated that was the point of the design that it appears to be an industrial structure, but the floorplan was very appealing to him. Mr. Roberts further stated that an iron railing on the front porch, rather than wood, would continue the industrial look of the building.

There was no further discussion at that time.

No members of the public were present to speak for or against the application. Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application and during public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff Report as written.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Wagoner and was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed new construction residence would not impair the integrity of the property or the district and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

Mr. Wagoner seconded the motion, and the application was unanimously approved.
D. Other Business

1. In accordance with Section 5 of the *Rules and Regulations Governing Proceedings of Before the Architectural Review Board*, the Chair and Vice-Chair positions are elected at the first regularly scheduled meeting in January.

2. Mr. Roberts nominated Mr. Stone to continue serving as Chair. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

3. Mr. Roberts nominated Mr. Wagoner to serve as Vice-Chair. Ms. Harden seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.