ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
August 7th 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 3:00 p.m. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
   Members Absent: Nick Holmes, Jim Wagoner, Kim Harden, Catarina Echols, and David Barr.
   Staff Members Present: John Sledge, Bridget Daniel, Paige Largue, and Flo Kessler.
2. Mr. Brown moved to approve the minutes of the July 17, 2019 meeting. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.
3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the Mid-Months as written. Ms. Largue clarified a few agenda items for the Board at the request of Mr. Brown. Mr. Brown seconded the motion. The Mid-months were approved unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. Applicant: David Miller
   a. Property Address: 1204 Old Shell Road
   b. Date of Approval: 6/25/2019
   c. Project: Restore rear elevation on main house including dormers. Install appropriate siding to match existing in dimension, profile, and material. Repaint as needed to match. Continue installing 8' privacy fence (lot is next to multi-family) with lattice and picketed fence in front yard. On ancillary building: paint exterior to match; repair and reroof with asphalt shingles to match; repair garage door and steps.

2. Applicant: Chris Teague Chris
   a. Property Address: 400 Charles Street
   b. Date of Approval: 6/28/2019
   c. Project: Repair work.

3. Applicant: Ben Cummings of Cummings Architecture Corp.
   a. Property Address: 1413 Old Shell Road
   b. Date of Approval: 6/28/2019
   c. Project: Construct two ADA ramps necessary for code. Ramps will be constructed of painted wood with framed lattice screening base. Applicant will return with more plans for permanent ramps.

4. Applicant: Chad Wynne
   a. Property Address: 124 Houston Street
   b. Date of Approval: 6/25/2019
   c. Project: Install outlets out of public view. Install gutter over back door.

5. Applicant: Horst Grimm
   a. Property Address: 366 Tuttle Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 7/2/2019
   c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in charcoal or black.

6. Applicant: Sean Coley
   a. Property Address: 159 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 7/3/2019
   c. Project: Restucco and repaint.
7. Applicant: Chris Marshall  
a. Property Address: 1365 Government Street  
b. Date of Approval: 7/3/2019  
c. Project: Attach metal sign to awning face.

8. Applicant: Chris Sayre  
a. Property Address: 1059 Caroline Avenue  
b. Date of Approval: 7/8/2019  
c. Project: Reroof charcoal gray shingles.

9. Applicant: Stimrad Investments  
a. Property Address: 963 Elmira Street  
b. Date of Approval: 7/8/2019  
c. Project: Replace rotten siding; reroof as existing.

10. Applicant: Kimberly Knowles  
a. Property Address: 16 S. Lafayette Street  
b. Date of Approval: 7/8/2019  
c. Project: Reroof asphalt shingles, repair/replace trim and repair front porch decking where necessary to match original in material, profile and dimension. Repaint to match.

11. Applicant: William and Susan Case  
a. Property Address: 1214 Selma Street  
b. Date of Approval: 7/9/2019  
c. Project: Repair/replace rotten siding or other wood to match original in material, profile, and dimension. Repaint to match.

12. Applicant: Casey Downing  
a. Property Address: 1133 Montauk Avenue  
b. Date of Approval: 7/9/2019  
c. Project: Repair and replace to match existing: porch, spindles, bottom rails and any other rotten wood as needed. Also repaint to match existing paint color.

13. Applicant: Jerry Arnold  
a. Property Address: 154 S. Cedar Street  
b. Date of Approval: 07/10/2019  
c. Project: Repaint house to match existing.

14. Applicant: Lou Evans of Delta Construction  
a. Property Address: 1320 Dauphin Street  
b. Date of Approval: 7/10/2019  
c. Project: Replace sill across back of house

15. Applicant: Hind Ahmed  
a. Property Address: 413 Michigan Street  
b. Date of Approval: 7/11/2019  
c. Project: Put trash dumpster on property for 30 days. Erect six foot wood fence with gate.

16. Applicant: DBL-P Properties  
a. Property Address: 102 Dauphin Street  
b. Date of Approval: 7/11/2019  
c. Project: Install hanging blade business sign at recessed entrance extending past pole.

17. Applicant: Cynthia Tyon  
a. Property Address: 1357 Old Shell Road  
b. Date of Approval: 7/12/2019  
c. Project: Reroof.

18. Applicant: Magee Restoration  
a. Property Address: 1360 Dauphin Street  
b. Date of Approval: 7/12/2019  
c. Project: Paint brick off white, with light brown/tan trim.
19. **Applicant:** Richard Caine of Gulf Construction and Roofing  
   a. Property Address: 1252 Dauphin Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 7/12/2019  
   c. Project: Replace support beam under porch and deteriorated decking to match. Repaint to match.

20. **Applicant:** Rich Heidal  
    a. Property Address: 62 Fearnway  
    b. Date of Approval: 7/12/2019  
    c. Project: Box front iron porch columns per drawing; change out two non-historic bathroom windows per drawings with wood; repaint house white.

21. **Applicant:** Lee Wilson of Turner-Wilson Fence Company  
    a. Property Address: 966 Texas Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 7/16/2019  
    c. Project: Construct 3’6” wooden picket fence around perimeter of property with vehicular access on western perimeter of lot.

22. **Applicant:** Thomas Moore of Thomas Moore Construction, Inc.  
    a. Property Address: 2256 DeLeon Avenue  
    b. Date of Approval: 7/16/2019  
    c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood to match existing in dimension, profile, and material. Repaint to match.

23. **Applicant:** Chris Schwall  
    a. Property Address: 12 S. Conception Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 7/16/2019  
    c. Project: Install one hanging blade sign no more than 4'0" x 2'2" per side constructed of painted wood.

24. **Applicant:** Paul Steshak  
    a. Property Address: 12 N. Dearborn Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 7/17/2019  
    c. Project: Reroof to match existing metal roof in dimension, profile and material.

25. **Applicant:** Shane Hadley of Hadley Construction Specialties  
    a. Property Address: 350 Church Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 7/19/2019  
    c. Project: Repair stucco and repaint.

26. **Applicant:** Steve Stone of Dakin Street Architects  
    a. Property Address: 60 St. Francis Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 7/22/2019  
    c. Project: Install back door to access building. Install new openings and windows on west (side) elevation. There will be six openings on the second floor and possibly five on first. Windows will be aluminum clad and have new masonry and header lintels. Windows will be six-over-six configuration. Repair window on front facade window on second floor.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2019-30-CA: 455 S. Broad Street**  
   a. Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. Mike Rogers  
   b. Project: Storefront Related – Alter a previously remodeled ground floor storefront with the option of installing an awning.
   
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
2. **2019-31-CA: 250 Chatham Street**
   a. Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. Bill Cutts
   b. Project: Ancillary Related: Construct hyphen to connect garage to residence.
   
   **APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

3. **2019-32-CA: 50 Common Street**
   a. Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. Stephen May
   b. Project: Addition: Construct rear addition on residence previously relocated to lot.
   
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

D. **OTHER BUSINESS**
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-30-CA: 455 S. Broad Street
Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. Mike Rogers
Received: 7/15/2019
Meeting: 8/7/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Storefront Related – Alter a previously remodeled ground floor storefront with the option of installing an awning.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to materials provided by the applicant, the building was altered shortly after 1965.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Historic Preservation Ordinance (Article IV, Chapter IV) 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. The application up for review calls for the alteration of a later ground-floor storefront and fenestration.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Preserve the key character-defining features of a historic commercial façade.”
   2. “Retain an original bulkhead as a decorative panel.”
   3. “Locate a new storefront in the same plane as it was historically.”
   4. “Design a wall to be compatible with the architectural style of the house/building and existing walls in the district.”
   5. “When building a solid wall, use a finish and material that is similar in texture, mass, and durability to historic walls in the neighborhood.”
   6. “Visually connect the street and building.”
   7. “Where evidence does not exist, use a contemporary interpretation of a traditional storefront.”

C. Scope of Work:
   1. Remove later brick and glass infill.
   2. Install a new storefront.
      a. Install aluminum storefront window system in northernmost and southernmost masonry openings.
      b. An existing masonry lintel will remain.
      c. A brick sill will be installed.
      d. Windows will have multi-paned transom above.
      e. Install a storefront system with door in the central bay.
3. Remove glass block infill at North (side), South (side) and install multi-pane storefront window in original openings.
4. Install awning with 5V Crimp or standing seam metal roof. Awning will be 5’0” in depth.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the alteration of a previously remodeled ground floor storefront with the option of installing a metal awning.

The ground floor has been altered as is a typical practice in the commercial design realm. With regard to the work proposed to the storefront, the subject storefront dates from after 1965. Photos provided by the applicant show a more traditional storefront window system with large display windows and transoms above. The photo also shows a larger window opening on the side elevation (See B-2.). Infill brick and glass block on the west (façade), north (side), and south (side) elevations if the proposed storefront and windows were installed. Historic fabric would not be lost. Removed later fabric would allow for original openings to be in place (See B-1). The new storefront would be located in a same plane as historic examples (See B-3). Infill removal and replacement would be complementary to historic patterns, not remove historic fabric, and respond to the historic transom zone, and while still be differentiated from the historic fabric (See B-7). The applicant would like to have the option of installing a metal canopy. Materials of the canopy meets the Design Review Guidelines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-7), Staff does not believe this application will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas Kearley, applicant, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed the applicant and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. Kearley stated staff had addressed the application in full.

Ms. Davis asked if the transom would be kept if the awning was constructed. Mr. Kearley replied yes.

No further discussion from the Board ensued at that time.

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 and was unanimously approved.
DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the property or neighborhood and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

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

2019-31-CA: 250 Chatham Street  
Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. Bill Cutts  
Received: 7/14/2019  
Meeting: 8/7/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Ancillary Related: Construct hyphen to connect garage to residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

Completed in 1868 for John Little and Virginia Smith, this grand Italianate villa was among the first buildings to be constructed on Washington Square after the Civil War. Originally situated in the center of the block upon which it stands, the dwelling stood atop a higher foundation and featured an expansive rear wing. During the 1920s or 1930s, the house was relocated further east (toward the square) and lowered in elevation. The original front gallery was removed. Elements salvaged from other notable Mobile residences were incorporated into the interior and exterior. A garage received the front doors from the Emanuel House (demolished for construction of The Admiral). Interior fittings included mirrors and architectural elements from the Murray Forbes Smith House (demolished for construction of the Greyhound Station, now a portion of the Government Plaza site). The current owner restored the porch in 2004/2005.

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 16, 2017. On the aforementioned date, the Board approved a rear addition. The application up for review proposes a hyphen connector to be constructed between the existing residence and garage.

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

1. “Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site (site topography, character-defining features, tree, and significant district vistas and public views) are retained.”

2. “Design an addition to be compatible with the character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.”

3. “Design the building components (roof foundation, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”

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

5. “Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color, and/or wall plane.”
6. “Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.”
7. “Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.”
8. “Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.”
9. “Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, Mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.”
10. “Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Construct a small rear addition (connector).
   a. The connector will be located on the northwest (rear oriented and engaged Palmetto Street) between the corner of two story house and one story garage.
   b. The connector will be ground level.
   c. Corner boards on the house and garage will remain.
   d. The walls will be faced with hardiplank siding matching that employed on the body of the garage.
   e. A gable roof will surmount the addition.
   f. The roof will be sheathed with asphalt shingles matching those employed on the body of the house.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application entails the construction of a small rear addition (connector) onto a contributing residence and connecting to an ancillary building. Rear additions are the most frequently employed means of expanding an existing building (See B-6.). In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, the design of the addition changes neither the overall characteristics of the site, the property, or the district (See B 1-3). By virtue of being so designed as to retain existing corner boards and the subordinate size, the proposed addition would be differentiated from the historic core of the dwelling (See B 5, 7, & 8.). The siding and roof treatments will match the existing (See B-3.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Rodrigues was present.

Mr. Douglas Kearley, applicant, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed the applicant and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions.
Mr. Kearley stated the proposed addition would be in the same location as what was approved in 2017.

Mr. Kearley explained the elevator system in the addition.
No further discussion from the Board ensued at that time.

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 and was unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the property or neighborhood and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

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

2019-32-CA: 50 Common Street
Applicant: Mr. Stephen May
Received: 7/14/2019
Meeting: 8/7/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Addition: Construct rear addition on residence previously relocated to lot.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Amelia Stewart House at 137 Tuscaloosa Street is comprised of an 1835 rear portion and 1871 front addition. The rear portion was constructed in the Federal style while the front portion is a temple form Greek Revival imitating Oakleigh. After dismantling the house, both portions may date earlier.

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 February 20, 2019. At that time a request for the relocation and repair work of a residence was approved. The proposed scope of work includes constructing a rear addition to the residence.
B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. Construct a rear addition.
      a. The addition will be located off the West (rear) elevation.
      b. The addition will be 16’0” in depth and 24’0” in width.
      c. The addition will rest atop brick faced piers matching those employed on the house with framed lattice between piers.
      d. There will be a change in wall plane to distinguish the old from the new.
      e. The walls will be faced with wooden siding matching that employed on the body of the house.
      f. New wooden windows and doors will be employed.
      g. A gable roof will surmount the addition.
      h. The roof will be sheathed with shingles matching those employed on the body of the house.
      i. South (side) Elevation
      j. A 2’2” wooden diamond window will punctuate the eastern portion of the addition.
k. North (side) Elevation
   i. A 2’2” wooden diamond window will punctuate the eastern portion of the addition.

l. West (rear) Elevation
   i. A covered wooden stoop will be located centrally on the elevation. Said stoop will be accessed by stairs located on the north and south sides.
   ii. A set of wooden doors with transom above will access the stoop.
   iii. Six-over-six windows will flank the rear entrance.
   iv. A louvered vent will punctuate the gable.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application entails the construction of a small rear addition onto a relocated residence. Rear additions are the most frequently employed means of expanding an existing building (See B-6.). The addition is located off the rear elevation. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, the design of the addition changes neither the overall characteristics of the site, the property, or the district (See B 1-3). The proposed addition would be differentiated from the historic core of the dwelling because of the change in wall plane (See B 5, 7, & 8). The brick pier foundation, wooden siding, and fenestration treatments will match the existing (See B-3).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-1), Staff does not believe the relocation of the house will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the properties or district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas Kearley, applicant, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed the applicant and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. Kearley stated staff had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Roberts expressed his excitement for the project.

No further discussion from the Board ensued at that time.

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 and was unanimously approved.
DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the property or neighborhood and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

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