ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
January 16th 2019 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Steve Stone, called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:

   **Members Present:** Steve Stone, John Ruzic, Bob Allen, Kim Harden, and Carolyn Hasser.
   **Members Absent:** Jim Wagoner, Robert Brown, Catarina Echols, David Barr, and Craig Roberts.
   **Staff Members Present:** Bridget Daniel and Paige Largue.

2. Mr. Allen moved to approve the minutes of the January 2nd 2019 meeting.
   The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

3. Mr. Ruzic moved to approve the Mid-Months as written. Mrs. Hasser seconded the motion. The motion was approved with one in opposition, Mr. Allen. A discussion regarding a staff approved one story ancillary structures and the difference in pre-fabricated structures ensued.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant:** Michael J. Fasano
   a. Property Address: 1159 Selma Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/28/2018
   c. Project: Install pre-fabricated one story 20'0" x 14'0" shed in rear yard. Setbacks will meet zoning requirements. Shed will be wood frame with architectural shingles and painted to match main house.

2. **Applicant:** Shiria Lunsford
   a. Property Address: 56 N. Georgia Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 12/31/2018
   c. Project: Repair windows to match. Repair roof to match. Repair deteriorated wood to match existing in dimension, profile and material.

3. **Applicant:** David Rasp
   a. Property Address: 273 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 1/2/2019
   c. Project: Install roll up shades. Shades will be installed where hardware is not seen under covered area and used during variable weather.

4. **Applicant:** Harold Deese of Deese Lawn Care
   a. Property Address: 1106 Texas Street
   b. Date of Approval: 1/3/2019

5. **Applicant:** Harold Deese of Deese Lawn Care
   a. Property Address: 1159 Texas Street
   b. Date of Approval: 1/3/2019

6. **Applicant:** Law Offices of J. Mack
   a. Property Address: 905 Government Street
   b. Date of Approval: 1/8/2019
   c. Project: Install one double-sided blade sign attached wooden post. Sign will be composed of wood composite and painted letters.
7. **Applicant:** Pitsios Family  
   a. **Property Address:** 300 N. Joachim Street  
   b. **Date of Approval:** 1/9/2019  
   c. **Project:** Repair termite damage, repair stucco over damage, and replace two exterior windows per existing.

C. **APPLICATIONS**

1. **2019-03-CA: 1157 Spring Hill Avenue**  
   a. **Applicant:** Mr. Carleton Dortch of Dortch, Figures and Sons Mr. and Mrs. David and Brenda Harrub  
   b. **Project:** Demolition Related: Demolish a contributing residence.  
   **WITHDRAWN.**

2. **2019-02-CA: 453 Marine Street (HELDOVER)**  
   a. **Applicant:** Mr. Brandon Jackson  
   b. **Project:** Demolition Related: Demolish a contributing residence.  
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

   a. **Applicant:** Twin Hotels, LLC  
   b. **Project:** Remove existing port cochere. Construct new canopy.  
   **WITHDRAWN.**

D. **OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Mr. Stone thanked Mr. Ruzic for his time served on the Board.  
2. Ms. Largue stated a couple of Board members have concerns about the current midmonth resolution. She stated the midmonths would be discussed at the February 6th meeting of the ARB. She explained she will attach a copy of the resolution to the meeting reminder.  
3. The topic of amending a section of the ordinance pertaining to demolitions was raised by Mr. Stone. He noted “redevelopment plans” was loosely defined. Mr. Allen noted a couple of recent application planned to replant sod. Ms. Kessler, City of Mobile Legal Department, stated the definition of redevelopment plans could be defined in the Rules and Regulations of the ARB. She stated to address in the ordinance it would need to appear before Council who is generally concerned with the life safety of the constituents.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
WITHDRAWN

2019-03-CA: 1157 Springhill Avenue
Applicant: Mr. Carleton Dortch of Dortch, Figures and Sons Mr. and Mrs. David and Brenda Harrub
Received: 12/31/2018
Meeting: 1/16/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-3
Project: Demolition Related: Demolish a contributing residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Victorian cottage with complex massing was constructed circa 1900.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. This property has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board according to the MHDC vertical files. The proposed scope of work includes the demolition of a contributing residence.
B. This property has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board according to the MHDC vertical files. The applicant proposes the demolition of the derelict contributing building.
   A. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
   1. **Required findings; demolition/relocation.** The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district.
   2. The Design Review Guidelines state in pertinent part:
      a. This section provides general guidelines for consideration of demolition of a historic structure. The demolition of historic structures is generally not allowed unless there are extraordinary circumstances. When demolition is proposed, consider the following general guidelines.
      b. As an initial step, determine the significance of the historic structure. An analysis should be undertaken to determine if the historic structure retains its integrity. In some cases, a property previously identified as a contributing historic structure may no longer
retain its integrity due to changes to the structure since the time it was originally
determined to be historic.
c. Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.
d. In some cases, the original designation of a structure as contributing or noncontributing
to the historic district in which it is located may no longer be valid either because the
structure has lost its historic integrity or because the passage of time or change in
appreciation of the structure has resulted in the structure contributing to the character of
the district.
d. The physical condition of the historic structure should be considered when determining
whether or not a structure may be demolished.
e. Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more
appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.
f. Consider the impact of removing the historic structure relative to its
context. Demolition may be more appropriate where the removal of the
historic structure does not significantly impact the perception of the block
as viewed from the street.
f. Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind
in the neighborhood, county, or region.
g. Also consider the potential impact of demolition of the structure on the overall context
of the structure.
h. Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures,
including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street or
properties throughout the individual historic district.
i. Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that
create a neighborhood.
j. When applicable, the project proposed to replace the structure proposed for demolition
should be considered.
k. Consider the future utilization of the site.
j. If a development is proposed to replace a demolished historic structure, determine that
the proposed replacement structure is consistent with the guidelines for new construction
in historic districts in Chapters 6 and 7 of this document.

3. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
   i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure:
      1. This property was built circa 1900. This building is listed as a contributing
         structure in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. It holds architectural
         merit and historical significance.
   ii. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the
       immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures:
      1. The dwelling adds to the built density of the Old Dauphin Way Historic
         District.
   iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its
       design, texture, material, detail or unique location:
      1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced or acquired.
   iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the
       neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is
       part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood:
      1. The wood farmed structure is a Victorian cottage which once made up a
         largely residential avenue.
v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
   1. If granted demolition approval, the house would be demolished, debris would be removed, and the lot would be leveled and sodded.

vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition:
   1. The property was inherited by the current owner in November of 2016.

vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner:
   1. The property was vacant at the time it changed hands.

viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any:
   1. To staff’s knowledge, the property has not been put up for sale in the past year.

ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option:
   1. N.A.

x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures:
   1. No plans have been submitted.

xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
   1. N.A.

xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
    1. N.A.
    2. See other submitted materials.

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

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):
1. Demolish a residence.
2. Remove the debris from the site.
3. Stabilize the site.
4. Plant seed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

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

1157 Spring Hill Avenue is listed as a contributing building located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. It is an example of a Victorian cottage built circa 1900 and exemplifies the suburban trend spurred by the streetcar lines in the neighborhood during that period.
This wood frame building is in an advanced state of disrepair. Based on the application submitted, there are structural concerns with damage to the rafters, floors, walls and joists. Staff conducted an on-site inspection of the exterior on ground and noted termite damage and deteriorated wood and broken window panes. The original wood siding is underneath aluminum siding and appears to be in good condition overall.

The house contributes to the built density, rhythmic sequencing of the landscape, and to historic character and physical experience of Spring Hill Avenue. As an inner block dwelling, the building is only viewed from head on or an oblique angle. The house is adjacent to a sidehall residence which is being used as a commercial space to the east, and a mid-century commercial building to the west.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be removed, site would be leveled, and sod would be laid.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2) Staff does believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends denial.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-02-CA: 453 Marine Street
Applicant: Mr. Brandon Jackson
Received: 12/12/2018
Meeting: 1/16/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

This bungalow was constructed circa 1920.

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 January 2nd, 2019. At that time a demolition request was held over to answer legal questions and for redevelopment plans. The proposed scope of work includes the demolition of a contributing residence.

B. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicant proposes the demolition of the derelict non-contributing building.

B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:

4. 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.

5. The Design Review Guidelines state in pertinent part:
   a. This section provides general guidelines for consideration of demolition of a historic structure. The demolition of historic structures is generally not allowed unless there are extraordinary circumstances. When demolition is proposed, consider the following general guidelines.
   b. As an initial step, determine the significance of the historic structure. An analysis should be undertaken to determine if the historic structure retains its integrity. In some
cases, a property previously identified as a contributing historic structure may no longer retain its integrity due to changes to the structure since the time it was originally determined to be historic.

c. Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.
d. In some cases, the original designation of a structure as contributing or noncontributing to the historic district in which it is located may no longer be valid either because the structure has lost its historic integrity or because the passage of time or change in appreciation of the structure has resulted in the structure contributing to the character of the district.
d. The physical condition of the historic structure should be considered when determining whether or not a structure may be demolished.
e. Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.
f. Consider the impact of removing the historic structure relative to its context. Demolition may be more appropriate where the removal of the historic structure does not significantly impact the perception of the block as viewed from the street.
f. Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.
g. Also consider the potential impact of demolition of the structure on the overall context of the structure.
h. Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street or properties throughout the individual historic district.
i. Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.
j. When applicable, the project proposed to replace the structure proposed for demolition should be considered.
k. Consider the future utilization of the site.
j. If a development is proposed to replace a demolished historic structure, determine that the proposed replacement structure is consistent with the guidelines for new construction in historic districts in Chapters 6 and 7 of this document.

6. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:

v. The historic or architectural significance of the structure:
   1. This property was built circa 1950. This building is listed as a contributing structure in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. It holds little architectural merit nor historical significance.

vi. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures:
   1. The dwelling adds to the built density of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District and Marine Street.

vii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location:
   1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced or acquired.

viii. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood:
   1. The wood farmed structure has a bungalow influence, but the building is not a stellar example of a particular style and does not contribute much to the historic aesthetic of the neighborhood or street.
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. If granted demolition approval, the house would be demolished, debris would be removed, the lot would be leveled, seed would be planted, and a single family residence will be constructed at a later date.

vii. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition:

1. The date the current owner acquired the property is February 15, 2017 for $6,500.00.

viii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner:

1. The property has stood vacant for a number of years. The current owner purchased the property with the intention of rehabilitating it. However, the building was extremely deteriorated and the roof has caved in.

ix. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any:

1. To staff’s knowledge, the property has not been put up for sale in the past year.

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. N.A.

xi. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures:

1. A single family residence would be constructed to fit the neighborhood and street at a later date. No amount has been spent on plans that staff is aware of.

xiii. 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.

2. N.A.

xiv. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.

1. N.A.

2. See other submitted materials.

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

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

5. Demolish a residence.
6. Remove the debris from the site.
7. Stabilize the site.
8. Plant seed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

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

453 Marine Street is listed as a contributing building located within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The three-over-one window pattern is indicative of an Arts and Crafts influence.

This wood frame building is in an extremely advanced state of disrepair. Conditions extend far beyond cosmetic concerns. The house is a liability due to life safety issues. The roof has caved in causing the walls to bow out.

While house contributes to the built density and rhythmic sequencing of the landscape, it does not lend to historic character or physical experience of Marine Street. As an inner block dwelling, the building is only viewed from head on or an oblique angle.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be removed, site would be leveled, and seed would be planted. The owner would like to build a single family residence. The new construction would be consistent with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts. Redevelopment plans have not been submitted as of January 9, 2019.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2) Staff does not believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval due to the life safety issues.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Carlos Gant, applicant’s representative, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed the applicant’s representative and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. Gant stated the owner intended on demolishing the house and selling the vacant lot. He explained the house is a life safety issue.

Mr. Stone stated the plans presented by Mr. Jackson at the last meeting and in the application differed from Mr. Gant’s explanation of the proposal. Ms. Largue stated no new information had been given before the meeting.

Mr. Stone questioned if the city deemed the property an emergency or if the city would be demolishing the house since it was a life safety concern. Ms. Harden explained properties deemed emergency demolitions by the city are demolished with city funds. Ms. Kessler stated the city has reviewed if the property needed to be demolished by the city, but this is an application made by the owner. Mr. Ruzic noted the information provided by the applicant where the city sent notice of nuisance abatement and issues. A discussion ensued about when the city could demolish the property. Ms. Kessler stated the owner can apply to repair or demolish the property. If they do not act, the city can demolish the property if approved by Council as a emergency demolition. She explained a lien would then be placed on the property and the owner would have to reclaim.
MR. Gant stated the property is a life safety issue and collapsing already. He expressed concern of delaying the application, stating it may collapse at any moment. Mr. Ruzic commented that the house will need to be demolished by the owner or city. He then questioned if the Board could approve demolition with a requirement of marketing property to sell within 6 months of demolition. Mr. Stone commented that with a collapsed roof it would be easier to sell the property without the building. Mr. Ruzic stated the a year and a half ago the property was in salvageable condition and that it was unfortunate it deteriorated to this level.

Ms. Harden stated the information provided by Mr. Jackson in the packet from the city stated the house should be repaired by January 2019 or demolished, but did not specify if it was an emergency or life safety concern. Mr. Stone expressed concern over the lack of safeguards in place for required new development. Mr. Ruzic stated the guidelines for historic districts will help prevent infill that impacts the neighborhood negatively. He further noted the house was not highly significant architecturally, and granting demolition would provide safety for the neighborhood since it is on the verge of collapsing entirely.

Mr. Allen stated the house was another example of demolition by neglect. He noted the Board would only have control over a new development. He noted demolition of the property would result in loss of density in the neighborhood, and loss of rhythm on the street.

Mr. Harden asked if the inspectors listed it as an emergency demolition, to help establish precedent. A discussion ensued on the topic. Ms. Harden noted the Board usually requests the homeowner to list the property on the MLS (multiple listings system) before granting a demolition to see if any other options are available. Ms. Kessler requested the Board look at roman numeral II in the city report which states the property is dangerous and unstable.

Mr. Stone noted a mid-month for repair work was granted for a Texas Street property which had received a similar report from the city. The Board questioned if granting the application would set bad precedent.

Ms. Largue explained she has currently been meeting with staff of Municipal Code Enforcement (MCE) and had questioned their report. She noted staff of MCE stated all the reports outline the code violations and then order the property to be “repaired or demolished.” Ms. Largue further explained “repair or demolish” was boiler plate language, regardless of the condition of the house.

Mr. Ruzic stated the house was not salvageable. Mr. Allen noted the following items to consider. First, property is not of high significance architecturally. Second, consider the impact of the house on the street versus the empty lot. Lastly, consider the safety of the house. MR. Allen explained that he did not have an expertise in structural engineering, but that it was obvious with a collapsed roof and bowed out walls the house was a life safety issue for neighbors.

Mr. Stone stated his belief it needed to be demolished if the Board was not going to require redevelopment plans.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

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

**FINDING OF FACT**

Mrs. Hasser moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public
testimony the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as written.

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

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Ms. Harden noted the applicant did not own the property outright. Mr. Stone stated the applicant currently has the tax deed on the property. Ms. Kessler stated the ordinance did not state where the Board could determine the applicant would have to own the property outright and noted the applicant would be taking on the risk. Mr. Allen inquired if the Board took the risk, if they approved the application. Ms. Kessler responded the ARB’s role was to apply the standards and the applicant would have to go through other channels to get a demolition permit. Mrs. McElroy confirmed for Ms. Harden the permitting office has the information on who owns the property.

Mr. Ruzic moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted because although it will impair the density of the neighborhood and rhythm of the street, the demolition does not impair the historic integrity of the building and it is an obvious life safety concern. He noted the Board strongly encourages the marketing the property for sale in a timely manner, and that the new owners be informed of the ARB’s purview.

The motion received a second by Mrs. Hasser and was approved with two in opposition, Ms. Harden and Mr. Stone.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
WITHDRAWN

2018-38-CA: 301 Government Street
Applicant: Twin Hotels, LLC
Received: 10/10/2018 (Held over from November 7th meeting)
Meeting: 11/7/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: T5.2
Project: Remove existing port cochere. Construct new canopy.

BUILDING HISTORY

This 16 story building was constructed in 1975 as a Sheraton hotel per records.

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 January 2nd 2019 for approval of the demolition of a port cochere and construction of a canopy, according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time, the application was held-over due to an incomplete application. The Board requested clarification on the polycarbonate material. The proposed scope of work includes demolishing an existing port cochere and constructing a new canopy to replace it.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Alterations to non-historic commercial buildings must be compatible with the historic district.”
   2. “7.29 Design changes to a non-historic commercial building to be compatible with the district.”
   3. “Design an alteration to retain a placement and orientation that is compatible with the district.”
   4. “Design an alteration to appear similar in massing and scale with historic commercial buildings in the district.”
   5. “Use building elements that are of a similar profile and durability to those seen on historic buildings in the district.”
   6. Maintain a solid-to-void ratio on building walls that is similar to those seen on historic buildings in the district.”
   7. “…see the next section on New Commercial Construction when considering alterations to non-historic commercial buildings in locally designated historic districts.”
For the corridor and interior neighborhood contexts, building elements used in new commercial construction can potentially impact the historic district, but these elements are less critical than overall building placement, massing and scale described above.

7.45 Use building materials that are compatible with the surrounding context.

7.46 When using masonry, ensure that it appears similar in character to that seen historically.

Consider using cast concrete details that are designed to be similar to stone trim elements.

When considering demolitions: “Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.”

When considering demolitions: “Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.”

When considering demolitions: “Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.”

When considering demolitions: “Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street or properties throughout the individual historic district.”

When considering demolitions: “Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.”

When considering demolitions: “Consider the future utilization of the site.”

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

1. Remove existing port cochere on East elevation and construct new port cochere.
   a. The canopy will be overall 39’10” in width and 38’8” in depth.
   b. Canopy will be constructed in the same footprint as the previous port cochere.
   c. The canopy will be constructed of metal (steel), and modular polycarbonate.
   d. The canopy will be supported by columns constructed of steel covered by EIFS to look like stucco.
   e. The plinth base of the columns will be clad in brick veneer.
   f. The columns will be 11’10” in height and 3’0” in width.
   g. The roof system will be constructed of polycarbonate resting on metal supports.
   h. The roof system will be 4’0” on height.
   i. The columns will be painted to match a previously approved color scheme.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application involves demolition of a port cochere and the construction of a new canopy on a non-contributing building. The application was reviewed at the November 7th 2018 meeting of the Architectural Review Board. The application was held over at that meeting for further clarification on the canopy roof material. The application was then heard again on December 5th, 2018 and held over due to an incomplete application. The application was then at the December 19th and January 2nd meetings. Both times the application was held over for clarification of the polycarbonate. Staff was able to contact the architect on January 4th and requested notice of withdrawal or clarification by January 7th. There is no more to report at this time.

When reviewing applications for partial demolition, the following principle criteria are taken into account: significance, condition, impact on the street and district, and nature of proposed redevelopment. The structure dates circa 1975 when the hotel was constructed (See B-12). The removal of the structure,
while in good condition, does not adversely affect the 16 story hotel or the streetscape along the primary street frontage (Government Street) (See B-15). The structure would be demolished and a new canopy would be constructed.

The structure would be in close proximity to a non-contributing building. Adjacent to the East of the structure is a masonry and brick parking garage for Mobile County and the Admiral Hotel (See B-4). Adjacent to the west of the Holiday Inn is a parking lot for the Mobile Carnival Museum. The structure would face Government Street Presbyterian Church, a national landmark.

Placement, massing and scale, façade elements and materials must be compatible with the district. The structure would be located on a secondary frontage (Joachim Street) and setback from Government Street. As to orientation, the structure engages Joachim Street as its principle vehicular artery (See B-3). The one story 15’10” structure will be constructed in the same footprint as the previous port cochere. The structure will not be attached to the 16 story hotel. As to materials, the drawings of the proposed building depict a brick veneer plinth and EIFS (stimulated stucco) column treatment supporting a metal structure with polycarbonate sheathing. Materials that simulate historic materials may be considered on new structures in historic districts (See B-5).

Polycarbonate is not a material typically approved for additions on historic structures. The proposed use of the polycarbonate is a canopy installed above ground, and on a non-contributing property (See B-5). The Board has been provided with four images of Holiday Inn canopies using the proposed ribbed polycarbonate. A fifth image of a canopy using glass and aluminum from the same manufacturer of the Holiday Inn canopies has been provided as well. Staff has confirmed that a sample of the ribbed polycarbonate sent in by the applicant is proposed for the roof of the canopy. Staff notes that on September 13, 2018 the Consolidated Review Committee reviewed an application for the polycarbonate canopy and it was denied.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-5) and B (1-8) Staff believes this application as proposed would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends denial as proposed.