ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA
August 17, 2016 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Approval of Mid Month COAs Granted by Staff

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant: Brittany Smith
   a. Property Address: 12 S. Hallett
   b. Date of Approval: 7/25/16
   c. Project: Install 3’ picket fence from main body of house to sidewalk and wrap to side of house, allow gate at front sidewalk. Construct 6’ privacy fence at side of house and around rear.

2. Applicant: Pinkie Henderson
   a. Property Address: 1058 Elmira Street
   b. Date of Approval: 7/25/2016
   c. Project: Remove and replace wooden lap-siding with materials in exact type, dimension, and profile. Remove and replace porch decking with same materials in exact type, size and dimension. Replace columns on porch as needed to match in dimension, profile, and thickness. Remove other wooden components, such as molding around windows, fascia, soffitt, and eaves and replace with materials of exact type, dimension, and profile as needed.

3. Applicant: Apex Roofing
   a. Property Address: 915 Church Street
   b. Date of Approval: 7/26/2016
   c. Project: Re-roof with dark architectural shingles.

4. Applicant: Patricia Felis
   a. Property Address: 954 Palmetto Street
   b. Date of Approval: 7/28/16
   c. Project: Install steel handrails per the submitted design.

5. Applicant: Earl Harris Construction LLC on behalf of Pentacostal Church of God
   a. Property Address: 308 N. Joachim Street
   b. Date of Approval: 7/29/2016 (Revised date for 4/25/2016 per Permitting Office)
   c. Project: Rework and replace front door to match existing door in materials and profile. Replace front handrails to match existing, replace back door to match existing, and replace back porch decking.

6. Applicant: Jennifer Reese
   a. Property Address: 265 Park Terrace
   b. Date of Approval: 7/29/16
   c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted color scheme.

7. Applicant: P.M. Gardener
   a. Property Address: 200 Dexter Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 8/1/16
   c. Project: Reroof front porch.

8. Applicant: William Singleton
a. Property Address: 160 Houston Street  
b. Date of Approval: 8/1/16  
c. Project: Install pre-fabricated accessory building (shed) per MHDC Design Guidelines. Building will be located in rear of lot minimally visible of public view and adhere to setback guidelines. Body of structure to match main house, roof to be charcoal metal.

9. **Applicant:** Linda Guy  
   a. Property Address: 1220 Selma Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 8/3/16  
   c. Project: Reroof using architectural shingles in dark brown color.

10. **Applicant:** Mike Dunn  
    a. Property Address: 301 Government Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 8/5/16  
    c. Project: Install new roof, TPO.

11. **Applicant:** Gaines Zarzour  
    a. Property Address: 54 N. Monterey Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 8/8/16  
    c. Project: Repaint the house. The body will be painted white. The foundation will be painted black. The front door will be repainted red. Repair/replace any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.

12. **Applicant:** Gulf Coast Foundation and Remodeling  
    a. Property Address: 2254 DeLeon Avenue  
    b. Date of Approval: 8/8/16  
    c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint as per the existing color scheme.

13. **Applicant:** David Miller  
    a. Property Address: 1204 Old Shell Road  
    b. Date of Approval: 8/8/16  
    c. Project: On ancillary building, Paint exterior to match, repair and reroof with asphalt shingles to match, repair garage doors, repair steps.

14. **Applicant:** Gus Albanese  
    a. Property Address: 312 Chatham  
    b. Date of Approval: 8/8/16  
    c. Project: Construct an ancillary building based on the MHDC stock design. The building will be so placed as to meet municipal setback requirements for the HDO landscape.

15. **Applicant:** David and Christine Knowles  
    a. Property Address: 253 West Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 8/8/16  
    c. Project: Repaint house in the approved color scheme. Replace two wooden sashes on windows per MHDC Guidelines to match in dimension, materials.
C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2016-19-CA: 211 Lanier Avenue
   a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley of Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect on behalf of
      Mr. & Mrs. Mike Stashak
   b. Project: Demolish existing garage and construct new garage.

2. 2016-20-CA: 1017 Old Shell Road
   a. Applicant: Mr. Daniel Henderson
   b. Project: After the Fact Approval - Replace six-over-six wooden windows with
      four-over-four wooden windows on an antebellum side hall dwelling remodeled an
      enlarged in the 1920s.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF REPORT

2016-19-CA: 211 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley of Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect on behalf of Mr. & Mrs. Mike Stashak
Received: 7/29/16
Meeting: 8/17/16

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing (main residence)
Zoning: R-1
Project: Ancillary Related – Demolish a garage and construct a new garage.

BUILDING HISTORY

Dating from 1909, this highly significant Spanish Colonial Revival residence ranks among the finest of its genre in whole of Mobile. With its thick stuccoed walls, arched opening, overhanging eaves, tiled roof, and overall monumental form, the house adopts the constructions, massings, and detailing of a Colonial Revival variant that was particularly popular in Mobile. The Port City has such a large concentration of Spanish Colonial Revival buildings that a selection of them comprises a thematic National listing. This house, one built for Charles H. Smith, along the Syson Houses on Old Government (first two properties West of Houston Street), Government Street Methodist Church, and the Gulf Mobile & Ohio Passenger Terminal, constitutes particularly fine executions of a stylistic subset that had strong regional evocations and presence in Mobile.

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 April 2, 2008. At that time, the Board approved the construction of side wings to the principle residence. With this application, the new owners propose the demolition of an existing garage and the construction of a new garage in the rear lot.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “A new accessory structure should be compatible with those in the district.”
   2. “Locate the accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures.”
   3. “Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure. If a proposed accessory structure is larger than the size of the typical historic accessory structure in the district, break up the mass of the larger structure into smaller modules that reflect traditional accessory structures.”
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C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan and elevations):**

1. Demolish an existing garage.
2. Construct a new garage atop and beyond the footprint of the existing.
   a. The garage will be two-story in height.
   b. The lower first-story will be faced with sand-finished stucco over CMU block construction.
   c. The second-story will be faced with smooth-faced Hariboard siding.
   d. Six-light aluminum clad casement casement windows will be employed.
   e. Operable wooden shutters will be employed.
   f. Hipped roof forms will surmount the building.
   g. Exposed rafter tails will be employed on the eaves.
   h. Either clay barrel tiles or asphalt shingles will sheath the roof.

   i. **East Elevation (facing the main residence’s rear elevation)**
      a. The first-story will feature one casement window and a three bay arcuated loggia.
      b. The L-shaped second-story will feature two casement windows.

   J. **North Elevation (a side)**
      a. The first-story will feature two casement windows.
      b. The T-shaped second-story will feature one casement window.

   K. **West Elevation (facing the alley)**
      a. The first-story will feature two vehicular metal garage doors.
      b. The L-shaped second-story will feature one casement window.

   L. **South Elevation (a side)**
      a. The first-story will not feature fenestration.
      b. The second-story will feature one one-over-one sash window and two casement windows.

3. Stabilize and repaint existing masonry walls.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This two part application calls for the demolition of a single-story ancillary or accessory building and the construction of a new two-story building atop and beyond the footprint of the aforementioned building. The existing building functioned as a garage/service oriented building. The proposed building would feature vehicular storage on the lower-story and guest space on the upper-story.

When reviewing demolition applications for ancillary constructions, the same considerations informing the review of demolitions of principle buildings prevail. The main review criteria for demolitions are as follows: 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.

With regard to the architectural significance of the building, while the structure was built prior to publication of the 1955 Sanborn, the first Sanborn Map to depict Ashland Place, the building is not contemporaneous with the main dwelling. Early plats depict part, but not the whole of building. Said building could have been removed for construction of the subject building. The building is not of the same design and construction quality as the principle residence, or even other ancillary construction of the same period and stylistic subset of the same. An example of an architecturally significant ancillary building of the same style and period survives next door at 207 Lanier Avenue. Other extant ancillary buildings in the Spanish Colonial Revival mode include the garage of 1806 Old Government Street and the garage and garden pavilions located of 1673 Government Street.
As per the condition of the building, the garage suffers from far more than cosmetic concerns. Structural failure, termite infestation, and rising damp have caused considerable damage to the building. Issues extend from the foundation to the roof.

The building is not visible from the public view. The location of the main residence, proximity to the southern lot line, and presence of landscape features cause the building to not be seen from Lanier Avenue.

When addressing the nature of any redevelopment, the design of new ancillary or accessory construction comes into play. Location, massing, and scale come into play. Here follows an assessment of the proposed ancillary construction:

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that accessory structures should be placed in line with other visible accessory structures (See B-2.). In accord with The Design Guidelines the building would be placed atop and expand upon the existing West and South setbacks as the existing building. Those two setbacks define the interactions with adjacent buildings (ancillary building at 207 Lanier Avenue) and the alleyway more than the other two lot lines. Said setbacks complement the picturesque nature of said alleyway.

The Design Review Guidelines go on to state that an accessory structure should be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure (See B-3.). The placement, footprint, elevation, and height of the building all serve to make the building subordinate to the principle dwelling that defines the property.

Though the proposed two-story building is larger than the present one-story ancillary building, the massing of the building is so handled as to break it up into smaller modules as in the manner of traditional ancillary construction (See B-3.). Multiple examples of such picturesque groupings survive in Ashland Place. The garage located behind 103 Lanier Avenue is just one instance. Accessory structures of the period located within and without Ashland Place often featured multi-story service structures. The Board has approved similar instances in which an ancillary structure was reconstructed and heightened. The garage at 108 Lanier Avenue is a case in point.

The materials (stucco walls) and details (eave construction, window type, etc…) and other design aspects are drawn directly from the main house so as to fulfill an intent of infill construction in being complementary or compatible to the existing in the district. (See B-1.).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

With regard to the demolition of the current ancillary building, Staff recommends approval on account the combination of the building’s architectural merits, physical condition, location on the lot, and the proposed redevelopment of the pertinent portion of the site. The aforementioned work would not impair the architectural or historical character of the contributing building that establishes the historical and architectural character of the property.

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe the construction of the proposed ancillary building will impair the architectural or the historical character of the property or the surrounding district.

Staff recommends approval of the application in full.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF REPORT

2016-20-CA: 1017 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Mr. Daniel Henderson
Received: 8/9/16
Meeting: 8/17/16

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: After the Fact Approval - Replace six-over-six wooden windows with four-over-four wooden windows on an antebellum side hall dwelling remodeled an enlarged in the 1920s.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to materials located in the property’s file, the core of this residence dates circa 1859. An overlay in the 1901 City of Mobile Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps depicts rear additions and alterations that expanded the dwellings footprint. The house was remodeled in the 1920s. Other changes ensued. In 2015 a later side/ rear addition was demolished and the exterior was restored.

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 March 4, 2015. At that time, the Board approved a restoration package for Restore Mobile that centered on the construction of prominently located, but historically attuned and design sensitive roof cricket, as well as the demolition of small southeast corner addition that obscured a significant historic fabric. It is with this application the new owner, Daniel Henderson, would like to retain two four-over-four wooden windows on West Elevation. The work was executed without the issuance of a building permit or a Certificate of Appropriateness, The applicant also proposes the replacement of all of the dwellings remaining six-over-six wooden windows on the West, East with four-over-four wooden windows.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.”
C. Scope of Work:
   1. Retain two installed four-over-four wooden windows.
   2. Replace all remaining wooden windows on located on the West, East and South Elevations with custom-made four-over-four wooden windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This two part application involves a proposal to retain the unauthorized installation of two four-over-four wooden windows in the place of intact six-over-six wooden windows located on the northernmost end of the West elevation (facing Pine Street) of a contributing residence. The application also calls for the additional removal of all remaining six-over-six windows on the building’s West, East, and South Elevations and their replacement with four-over-four wooden windows. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material (See B-1.). While the composition of the four-over-four windows replacing the six-over-six windows remains the same, the light configuration does not match the lost windows. Both of the windows were in good states of repair. The loss of historic fabric with its architectural and historical implications on the property’s principle contributing building, one situated on a prominent corner lot, alters the building’s character and integrity. The loss of the remaining six over six windows, even with custom-made replacements, would only exacerbate the impact on the architectural, historical, and design fabric.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff believes that both retention of the two unauthorized windows and the removal of the remaining windows application would impair the architectural and historical character of the building. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.