A. CALL TO ORDER
1. The Chair, Steve Stone, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
   Members Present: Catarina Echols, Carolyn Hasser, Craig Roberts, David Barr and Bob Allen
   Staff Members Present: Cartledge W. Blackwell and Melissa Mutert.
2. Ms. Hasser moved to approve the minutes for the May 18, 2016 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve midmonth COA’s granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS:  APPROVED.
1. Applicant:  Miloyd Murphy
   a. Property Address:  8 LeMoyne Place
   b. Date of Approval:  10 May 2016
   c. Project: Re-roof with asphalt shingles, charcoal gray. Repair rotten wood as necessary to match original in profile and dimension.
2. Applicant:  Douglas B. Kearley on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Zieman
   a. Property Address:  209 S. Cedar Street
   b. Date of Approval:  12 May 2016
   c. Project: Construct ancillary building at rear of property per submitted plans in keeping with approved setbacks.
3. Applicant:  Charles Weems for Robert Holberg
   a. Property Address:  1653 Government Street
   b. Date of Approval:  12 May 2016
   c. Project: Replace roof with asphalt shingles.
4. Applicant:  Mike Henderson on behalf of William R. Evatt
   a. Property Address:  1554 Bruister Street
   b. Date of Approval:  13 May 2016
   c. Project:  Remove and replace ¾” decking with same. Re-roof with GAF timberline architectural roofing in charcoal color. Replace and repaint fascia and overhang boards.
5. Applicant:  Mary Beth Harris
   a. Property Address:  1315 Brown Street
   b. Date of Approval:  13 May 2016
   c. Project: Replace wood railing on porch to match existing. Extend porch railing around side of house to tie into front porch. Replace concrete steps on front porch with wooden steps and replace metal hand railing. Remove plywood infill to expose and repair original doors. Repair wood siding as needed to match in dimension, profile and size. Repaint exterior of house as follows: trim and railings-white; body- church Street East Gray; Doors- Chatham Street Blue, and decking to be darker than Chatham Street Blue.
6. Applicant:  Kiel Home Renovation Inc.
a. Property Address: 1154 Old Shell Road
b. Date of Approval: 16 May 2016
c. Project: Repair/reconstruct front gable and roof damage to match original in appearance.

5. Applicant: Don Bowden for Evan Maisel
   a. Property Address: 18 N. Monterey Street
   b. Date of Approval: 16 May 2016
   c. Project: Replace deteriorated later fenestration on the rear elevation to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Construct a rear porch (site of an existing deck), construct two pergolas over walkways, and construct a carport (all in the backyard per submitted plans). Install a five foot metal fence behind existing shrubbery extending the along the North (a side) lot line. Relocate later pavers.

6. Applicant: Edward and Julie Flotte
   a. Property Address: 1209 Government Street
   b. Date of Approval: 19 May 2016
   c. Project: Remove a later metal vehicular gate accessing the property from the rear alley. Install new metal gate that will match one on the adjacent property.

7. Applicant: Integrity Remodeling
   a. Property Address: 1707 Conti Street
   b. Date of Approval: 19 May 2016
   c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color.

B. APPLICATIONS

   2016-17-CA: 208 LeVert Avenue
   a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley on behalf of Mike and Marion Windom
   b. Project: Renovation – Renovate an existing ancillary garage by adding a second-story.

   APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion:
   a. The district expansion of Church Street East has been changed to the district expansion of Lower Dauphin Commercial District.
   b. In upcoming ARB meetings, members can expect to see applications for more ancillary buildings in Ashland Place and applications for residential infill in Oakleigh Garden District.
   c. New requirements for vacant lot screening in the Downtown Development District which encompasses the Hank Aaron Loop will not be enforced until 2017 at this time.
   d. The Alabama State Historic Tax Credits did not pass during this last legislative session.
   e. If you are an ARB member, please email Cart Blackwell about a discounted price for the NAPC by June 15th.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2016-18-CA: 208 LeVert Avenue
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley on behalf of Mike and Marion Windom
Received: 5/20/16
Meeting: 6/1/16

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing Main Building with Non-Contributing (work to be impacted)
Ancillary
Zoning: R-1
Project: Renovation – Renovate an existing ancillary garage by adding a second-story.

BUILDING HISTORY

This ancillary building is located behind a Mediterranean Revival residence built in 1927. The ancillary building, a garage, is a single story building which postdates the construction of the main residence. Said building is not visible from the public view.

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 in 2001. At that time, the Board approved extensive rear additions. The application up for review calls for the addition of a second story atop an existing ancillary building.
B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. Historic accessory structures should be preserved.
   2. Ancillary construction should be compatible with those in the district.
   3. Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.
      a. If a proposed accessory structure is larger than the size of typical historic accessory structures in the district, break up the mass of the larger structure into smaller modules that reflect traditional accessory structures.
   4. Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district.
      a. These are traditionally located at the rear of a lot.
   5. Materials that are compatible with the historic district in scale and character are acceptable. These often include:
      a. Wood frame
      b. Masonry
      c. Cement-based fiber siding
C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans and other materials):
1. The footprint of the ancillary structure will remain the same.
2. Repaint existing and new portions of the building
3. Remove the existing roof.
4. Construct a second-story atop the existing CMU first-story.
5. The second-story will be clad in painted cementitious lap siding (color to TBD).
6. The addition’s two-gable roofs will be covered in dimensional shingles.
7. An 8” Frieze board will extend below cornice line.
8. Exposed rafter tails will be employed.
9. Aluminum-clad wooden windows will be employed.
10. Board-and-batten operable shutters will be employed.
11. West Elevation
   a. An existing door and a six-light window on first-story will remain.
   b. A portico will be constructed a portico over the existing and aforementioned entrance.
      i. The gable roof of the porch will be supported by two 8” x 8” wood columns.
      ii. The columns will be detailed to match those located off the rear of the main house.
      iii. The flashing for porch will be concealed behind lap siding on second-story.
   c. Two two-over-two aluminum clad wooden windows will be set equidistantly the new second-story.
   d. Shutters will flank the aforementioned windows.
   e. An arched louvered vent taking the form of a fanlight will be centered within the West Elevation’s gable roof.
12. South Elevation
   a. The first-story of the existing South Elevation will remain the same.
   b. The westernmost portion of the South Elevation (of the addition) will not feature fenestration.
   c. The easternmost portion of the South Elevation will feature three equidistantly spaced two-over-two windows with shutters.
13. East Elevation
   a. The first-story of the exiting East Elevation will remain the same (minus the presence of electrical boxes).
   b. One two-over-two window with shutters will be centered on the addition’s West Elevation.
14. North Elevation
   a. The first-story of the existing North Elevation will remain the same.
   b. This inner lot-facing second-story addition will not feature fenestration.
   c. An arched louvered vent taking the form of a fanlight will be centered below the with the South Elevation’s gable roof.
STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the renovation of a non-contributing ancillary structure. The ancillary building - a structure which is utilized as a garage - is located behind a contributing residence. The ancillary structure in question is at best minimally visible from the public view. The renovation of the building focuses on the construction of a second-story addition. The Design Review Guidelines state that historic accessory structures should be preserved (See B-1). The subject building, a cinder-block construction, represents non-contributing (non-historic) ancillary infill. The Design Review Guidelines go on to state that ancillary construction/renovations should be compatible with those found elsewhere in a given district (See B-2.). Two-story ancillary structures are located throughout the surrounding Ashland Place Historic District. Second-story additions atop existing one-story ancillary buildings have been proposed, approved, and constructed elsewhere in Ashland Place (example being that behind 108 Lanier Avenue). While the principle residence is a one-story building, the building is designed so that the setbacks and massing are not only respectful of the main building, but also responsive to traditional (& nearby) ancillary construction (See B-3.). Additionally, the building is located to be responsive to the varied setbacks of other visible accessory structures in the district and the materials are compatible with the character of property and surrounding ancillary buildings (See B 4-5).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-5), Staff does not believe this application will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley, architect and representative of the owners 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. He asked Mr. Kearley if he had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address. Mr. Kearley responded that Ms. Largue had addressed the application in full.

After the receipt of several compliments, no comments ensued from the assembled Board members.

Mr. Stone asked the audience if there was anyone who wanted to speak for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, 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.

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 district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.
Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: June 2, 2017