ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA
February 20, 2013 – 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: Steve Stone with dakinstreet Architects
   a. Property Address: 124 North Ann Street
   b. Date of Approval: 1/30/13
   c. Project: Replace windows to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Make repairs to brick fence piers. Repave an existing parking lot.

2. Applicant: Bruce Knodel
   a. Property Address: 257 State Street
   b. Date of Approval: 1/30/13
   c. Project: Repaint the building per the existing color scheme. Repair any deteriorated stuccowork to match the existing.

3. Applicant: Dharam Pannu
   a. Property Address: 505 Eslava Street
   b. Date of Approval: 1/29/13
   c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing and repaint to match the existing.

4. Applicant: Gina Finnegan
   a. Property Address: 1306 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 1/29/13
   c. Project: Construct an ancillary structure (per submitted plans) atop an existing concrete slab. The building will be setback 4’ from the east property line and 3’ from the North property line. Measuring 40’ x 23’ in plan, the building will be faced with hardiboard siding and employ windows salvaged from a demolished ancillary building. The building’s bracketed eaves will match those found on the principle dwelling. A hipped roof will surmount the whole. The roofing shingles and color scheme will match that of the principle dwelling. French doors will allow for ingress and egress.

5. Applicant: Richard Brown Building and Maintenance
   a. Property Address: 256 South Broad Street
   b. Date of Approval: 1/30/13
   c. Project: Repair and replace (when and where necessary) deteriorated woodwork and details to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.

6. Applicant: Rennie Brabner
   a. Property Address: 303 North Conception Street
   b. Date of Approval: 1/30/13
   c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated windows and components to match the exiting. Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.

7. Applicant: Satori Sound for Charles H. Cox
   a. Property Address: 1737 Hunter Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 2/4/13
c. Project: Install storm windows. The storm windows will fit within the window reveals. Replace and when necessary replace side and rear windows to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.

8. Applicant: Annunciation Greek Orthodox Church
   a. Property Address: 50 South Ann Street
   b. Date of Approval: 2/4/13
   c. Project: Remove deteriorated doors accessing the main sanctuary. Replace the deteriorated wooden doors with stylistically and temporally appropriate wooden doors (per the submitted design).

9. Applicant: Vernon Moore
   a. Property Address: 210 Dexter Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 2/4/13
   c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.

10. Applicant: Coastal Exposures Landscape for McGill Toolen Catholic High School
    a. Property Address: 1413 Old Shell Road
    b. Date of Approval: 2/4/13
    c. Project: Remove sections of sidewalk in front of the building. Reinstall the green space located between the curb and the outer edge of the sidewalk. Reinstall the concrete sidewalk and reconfigure the entrance walks. Install 3’ high steel bollards featuring ball-finial caps with suspended metal links alongside the sidewalk.

11. Applicant: James Woodall
    a. Property Address: 508 George Street
    b. Date of Approval: 2/5/13
    c. Project: Repair and when necessarily replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

12. Applicant: Carla Sharrow
    a. Property Address: 1005 Augusta Street
    b. Date of Approval: 2/6/13
    c. Project: Construct wood deck at rear of house per plan, remove existing chain link fence along northeast side and erect four foot privacy fence, except for eight foot section at the side rear.

13. Applicant: Deborah Mason
    a. Property Address: 27 South Lafayette Street
    b. Date of Approval: 2/6/13
    c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.

14. Applicant: Azalea Health Care
    a. Property Address: 805 Church Street
    b. Date of Approval: 2/6/13
    c. Project: Install a 12” x 10” metal sign on the modern doorway. The sign will advertise the name, hours, and numbers of the occupying tenant.

15. Applicant: Take Five Oil Change
    a. Property Address: 1307 Government Street
    b. Date of Approval: 2/13/13
    c. Project: Renewal of a signage package issued on 15 February 2012.

16. Applicant: Jarrod White
    a. Property Address: 1200 Dauphin Street
    b. Date of Approval: 2/13/13
    c. Project: Install metal garage doors per the submitted design.

17. Applicant: Glynis Madision
    a. Property Address: 1111 Dauphin Street
b. Date of Approval: 2/8/13

c. Project: Install a temporary sign for a thirty day period. A permanent sign is under construction.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2013-12-CA: 1355 Old Shell Road
   a. Applicant: Lydia Craft with Remax Realty for Phillip and Michael Shade
   b. Project: Reroofing – Install a metal roof.

2. 2013-13-CA: 16 South Royal Street (101 Dauphin Street)
   a. Applicant: Goodwyn, Mills and Cawood for the Retirement Systems of Alabama
   b. Project: Demolition - Demolish a storefront facade along with related inner lot buildings.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
STAFF REPORT

2013-12-CA: 1355 Old Shell Road  
Applicant: Lydia Craft with Remax Realty for Phillip and Michael Shade  
Received: 2/4/13  
Meeting: 2/20/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Reroofing – Install a metal roof.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house dates circa 1900. The contributing dwelling features substantial rear additions.

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 never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. In this application, the applicants propose the installation of a metal roof.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts et state, in pertinent part:
   1. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and the pitch and the color.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted materials):
   1. Reroof the dwelling with metal roofing panels.
      a. The roofing panels will be Tuff-Rib in type.
      b. The roofing color/finish will be Galvalume.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of a metal roof. Metal roofing is among the approved roofing materials listed in the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts. Applications for metal roofs are reviewed on a case by case basis.

Metal roofing is a traditional roofing material. As the 19th-century progressed, metal roofs were employed more frequently. Both frame & brick and residential & commercial buildings featured metal roofs. Standing seam panels and individual shingles were the most common metal roofing types. 5-V crimp metal roofing was another alternative.
The Design Review Guidelines state that roofing materials should be appropriate to the form, pitch, and color of the roof. (See B-1 of the Staff Report.)

This house does not feature a complicated roof structure. Neither dormers, turrets, nor multiple projecting bays need to be addressed. The roof over the main house is hipped in form. A staggered hip roof configuration extends over a rear wing. Two extremely low pitched shed roofs surmount later rear additions. A hipped roof side wing and rear service wing extend from the hipped roof body of the center hall house.

The roof pitches are not pronounced.

The proposed roof is galvalume in color. This silvered color is the traditional color of metal roofing.

In reviewing previous applications the Board has discussed the number and spacing of ridges. Standing Seam and S-V crimp have been approved on account of the fewer number and lower height of dividing seams. The proposed roofing features more pronounced and closely placed ridges.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on (B-1) and previous Board rulings, Staff believes this application would impair the architectural and the historical character of the building and the district. Staff recommends that the applicant consider either standing seam or S-V crimp metal roofing panels.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF REPORT

2013-13-CA: 16 South Royal Street (101 Dauphin Street)
Applicant: Goodwyn, Mills and Cawood for the Retirement Systems of Alabama
Received: 2/4/13
Meeting: 2/20/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Demolition – Demolish a storefront along with related inner lot buildings.

BUILDING HISTORY

This complex of buildings comprises the rear portion of the Van Antwerp complex. The façade of building fronting South Royal Street dates from the latter half of the 19th Century. The building was remodeled several times over the course of 20th Century. The inner lot buildings and their appendages date from 1901 or later.

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 never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review calls for the demolition of a storefront façade and related inner lot buildings.

B. The 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. In making this determination, the board shall consider:

   i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure(s);

      1. The buildings proposed for demolition consist of a late 19th-Century commercial building as well as inner lot buildings that serviced the whole store drug and enterprises (among others) that comprised the larger Van Antwerp complex. The building facing the street dates from the late 19th Century. It is a contributing building located within the Lower Dauphin Commercial District. As historical photographs indicate, the façade has been remodeled on numerous occasions. Originally a stepped
and ornament pediment crowned the façade and hood molds surmounted the upper-story fenestration. A 1950s ground floor storefront has been removed. Jalousie windows have been inserted in the upper story’s fenestrated bays. With the exception of 1950s filler buildings, the multistory inner lot building date circa 1901. Constructed in anticipation of the adjacent Van Antwerp Skyscraper, these buildings allowed for the continued operation of the Van Antwerp commercial operations throughout the construction of the high rise building (1904-1909).

iii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures:
1. With the exception of the storefront at 16 South Royal Street, the buildings proposed for demolition do not engage the streetscape. The upper stories of the building labeled B-5 in the site plan are partially visible from Dauphin Street.

iv. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location:
1. Some of the building materials are capable of being reproduced. The heavy timbers that once framed the buildings would have to be obtained from a salvage facility.

v. 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. As a complex, these buildings are historically significant in that they constitute the remains of what was once one of the regions more successful commercial enterprises. A broad concern, wholesale to real estate, the Van Antwerp concern was one of Mobile’s premier business entities at the turn of the 19th Century. The completed complex represented the high point of the family business. Other similar complexes of this date are no longer extant. Other comparable commercial complexes of later date include the former Kress Complex (Hargrove Engineering) and the old Gayfer’s conglomerate.

vi. 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. The applicant’s representatives are in the process of developing plans that would allow for the revitalization of the Van Antwerp highrise, the property’s primary building of significance. The site would be reused for access and service related activities.

vii. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition:
1. The Retirement Systems of Alabama acquired the larger property on October 30, 2012.

viii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner:
1. After investigating the condition of the buildings proposed for demolition and taking into consideration the restoration, renovation, and servicing of the Van Antwerp building, the applicants have continued to develop plans on how to successfully redevelop the inner lot area.

ix. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any:
1. No.
x. 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. NA.

xi Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amount expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
   1. Not submitted.

xii 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; and
   2. Not Necessary.

xiii Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
   1. See submitted Materials.
   2. Post demolition or relocation plans required. In no event shall the board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

C. Scope of Work (Per Submitted Materials).
   1. Demolish a street front façade and related inner lot buildings.
   2. Remove debris.
   3. Continue developing plans for the redevelopment of the site.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of the shell of a commercial storefront along with related inner lot buildings. When reviewing demolition requests, the following criteria are taken into account: the architectural significance of the building(s); the condition of the buildings(s); the impact on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

The street-facing building proposed for demolition is listed as contributing structure located within the Lower Dauphin Commercial Historic District. It dates from the latter half of 19th Century. Remodeled several times over the course of the 20th Century, the building’s façade is much altered. Two of the inner lot buildings date from circa 1901. Small single-story infill buildings located in areas that once served as light wells and connecting passages were constructed at a latter date. A third multi-story building dating from 1901 is also proposed for demolition.

The building fronting Royal Street is a gutted shell. The second floor and roof structures are in danger of collapse. The ground floor’s mid 20th-Century storefront has been removed. Aluminum window units are located within the upper story’s fenestration. The buildings located to the west (behind) and northwest of the building are in varying states of deterioration. Party walls of the surrounding properties comprise the only remains of the two buildings located immediately behind the aforementioned storefront. Roofs covering two small filler buildings whose spaces originally functioned as lot light wells and connecting passages have collapsed. A multi-store grains structure suffered from demolition by neglect.

With the exception of the facing block, this block constitutes the only continuous streetscape remaining on Royal Street. To the north at the corner of Royal and Dauphin Streets stands the Van Antwerp Building and to the south are the Kress, Neiser’s, and Olensky Buildings. With the exception of the last building all are contributing buildings. The demolition of the storefront would cause a cavity in otherwise intact urban vista.
In order to facilitate the exterior restoration and interior renovation of the adjacent Van Antwerp Building, the buildings in question are proposed for demolition. Service related functions and access requirements would be accommodated in the space. The finalized post demolition plan for the site is still being developed. Plans submitted for review illustrate the buildings to be removed. The treatment of exposed walls and new construction will appear before the Board at a later date. The applicant and the representatives are aware that any new design should take into the built density that characterizes the area both in times present and past. All debris would be removed from the site. Salvaged materials would be reused.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and the historical character of the property and the district. Taking into the account the condition of the buildings, Staff recommends approval of the demolition. Redevelopment plans would require Board approval. Staff recommends the owners and their design professionals engage the Board as soon as possible on the design for the Royal Street façade.