ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
March 16, 2016 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER
1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
   Staff Members Present: Cartledge W. Blackwell, Melissa Mutert, and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Allen moved to approve the minutes for the February 17, 2016 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.
3. Mr. Stone moved to approve the minutes for the March 6, 2016 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.
4. Mr. Stone asked for clarification regarding the first Certificate of Appropriateness. Upon receiving clarifications from Mr. Blackwell, Mr. Stone moved to approve the midmonths as outlined in the agenda. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. Applicant: Rogers and Willard for Clif Inge
   a. Property Address: 251 St. Francis Street
   b. Date of Approval: 2/24/2016
   c. Project: Construct a fire escape off the rear elevation (within a service alley). Access to the building will be afforded by a single metal door.
2. Applicant: Leinkauf Historic District Neighborhood Association
   a. Property Address: Flo Claire entrance at Government St and McDonald Ave
   b. Date of Approval: 2/25/2016
   c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace stuccowork of the signature gate houses and coping wall to match the existing in composition and texture. Repaint the stuccowork to match the existing color scheme. Reinstate urns atop pedestals.
3. Applicant: Charles B. Hunter
   a. Property Address: 210 Lanier Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 2/26/2016
   c. Project: Reinstall four sets of operable louver shutters on ancillary and move an an of electrical box from front to rear of an ancillary building.
4. Applicant: Restoration Society
   a. Property Address: 918 Conti Street
   b. Date of Approval: 2/25/2016
   c. Project: Install an eight interior lot privacy fence with in the rear of the lot. The fence will not extend beyond the front plane of the house.
5. Applicant: Restoration Society
   a. Property Address: 920 Conti Street
   b. Date of Approval: 2/25/2016
   c. Project: Install an eight interior lot privacy fence with in the rear of the lot. The fence will not extend beyond the front plane of the house.
6. **Applicant:** Michael Windom  
   a. Property Address: 208 Levert Avenue  
   b. Date of Approval: 2/26/2016  
   c. Project: Screen a rear porch.

7. **Applicant:** Ruth Rye  
   a. Property Address: 13 Julia Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 2/26/2016  
   c. Project: Reinstall a wooden picketed railing within the porch bays.

8. **Applicant:** David Schmohl  
   a. Property Address: 1453 Old Shell Road  
   b. Date of Approval: 2/26/2016  
   c. Project: Remove concrete paving, install new pavers, and construct a platform in the forecourt per submitted plan.

9. **Applicant:** Fred South on behalf Gene and Liz Petro  
   a. Property Address: 1752 Government Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 2/29/2016  
   c. Project: Install a new window to match existing one over one window. Install a new door with glass panel above and raised panel below, and a½ and 6 siding within an existing and previously enclosed rear porch.

10. **Applicant:** Rob Emmorey  
    a. Property Address: 960 Old Shell Road  
    b. Date of Approval: 3/1/2016  
    c. Project: Repaint exterior of home in the following approved colors: Body, Flo Claire Crocus Yellow; Accent, Claiborne Street Red; Decking: Salisbury Hall; and Trim: White. Enclose back porch with matching size clapboard siding and relocate existing door. Possibly build deck off rear of house to meet setback requirements.

11. **Applicant:** Tony Stewart  
    a. Property Address: 205 Michigan Avenue  
    b. Date of Approval: 3/1/2016  
    c. Project: Replace woodwork to match existing and repaint to match the existing color scheme.

12. **Applicant:** John Halbrooks  
    a. Property Address: 158 Davitt Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 3/2/2016  
    c. Project: Install a six foot interior lot privacy fence within the rear portion of lot.

13. **Applicant:** Mary Berg  
    a. Property Address: 150 S. Monterey  
    b. Date of Approval: 3/3/2016  
    c. Project: Remove existing cement and wooden fences and replace the same with a six foot wood privacy fence, five foot gate on south side.

14. **Applicant:** Sherrilyn and Robert Allen  
    a. Property Address: 959 Augusta Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 3/3/2016  
    c. Project: 1. Install fence with gate on west elevation of property to match existing at 6’ high, 1” x 6” solid wood with 2” x 8” beveled cap and 1” x 6” horizontal trim board below cap. Fence to be unpainted and cap to be painted to match existing. This will be 12’ in
length. 2. Build fence with gate on East side on property to match existing at 10’ in length. 3. Install brick pavers in driveway per plans submitted.

15. **Applicant:** William Hanes for Southern Light Fibers  
   a. Property Address: 202 Government Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 3/4/2016  
   c. Project: Retain fiber optic devices atop a gallery for a six month period.

16. **Applicant:** Joy Eden  
   a. Property Address: 64 Houston Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 3/4/2016  
   c. Project: Re-roof dwelling with asphalt shingles.

17. **Applicant:** Carlos Serrano  
   a. Property Address: 153 Houston Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 3/4/2016  
   c. Project: Re-roof a dwelling with asphalt shingles.

18. **Applicant:** Ernest Philon  
   a. Property Address: 204 South Dearborn Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 3/4/2016  
   c. Project: Remove applied lights from side elevation windows and correct sill changes to the same.

19. **Applicant:** Finn Cox  
   a. Property Address: 1015 Savannah Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 3/7/2016  
   c. Project: Re-roof with asphalt shingles in the existing color.

20. **Applicant:** Tony Stewart  
   a. Property Address: 205 Michigan Avenue  
   b. Date of Approval: 3/1/2016  
   c. Project: Replace wood to match existing and repaint to match existing colors.

21. **Applicant:** Tony Stewart  
   a. Property Address: 205 Michigan Avenue  
   b. Date of Approval: 3/1/2016  
   c. Project: Replace woodwork to match existing and repaint to match existing colors.

22. **Applicant:** Liberty Roofing on behalf of Doug Otto  
   a. Property Address: 53 S. Julia  
   b. Date of Approval: 3/8/2016  
   c. Project: Re-roof with asphalt shingles (slate in color).

23. **Applicant:** Mike Spina  
   a. Property Address: 1252 Government Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 3/8/2016  
   c. Project: Change the color scheme as follows: brick walls, Summerville (red), wooden walls, DeTonti Square Off White (cream); metalwork, black; & trim, red and Albemarle Blue.
C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2016-12-CA: 911 Dauphin Street**
   a. Applicant: Kim Kearley on behalf of David Cooper
   b. Project: Addition of terrace, extension of gallery, removal and addition of fire stairwell, and landscape of rear yard.

   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

2. **2016-12-CA: 609 Dauphin Street**
   a. Applicant: Robert Maurin on behalf of Charles Morgan III
   b. Project: Non-Contributing Commercial Renovation - Replace an existing non-contributing metal storefront with reclaimed wood windows and door.

   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

D. **OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Discussion.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2016-11-CA:  911 Dauphin Street
Applicant:  K.I.M. Kearley on behalf of Historic Restoration Society, Inc
Received:  2/29/16
Meeting:  3/16/16

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Construction of Rear Additions – Add a terrace, construct an entry surround, cantilever galleries, add a fire stairwell, and construct walkways.

BUILDING HISTORY

Commenced in 1845 and completed in 1846, the Protestant Orphan Asylum building stands as a testament to both the architectural and philanthropic pursuits of excellence that typified Mobile during Antebellum Era. Established in 1839 in the wake of yellow fever epidemic, the Protestant Orphanage Society was created to care for orphaned children. The Society fulfilled that mission until 1971. The three-story Orphanage building, which is composed of double pile main block and a massive rear wing, was designed and constructed by Henry Moffat of Philadelphia. It is one of less than a dozen of Antebellum orphanages to survive in the Lower South. The Greek Revival structure received a cast iron gallery sometime during the mid to late 19th Century. Improvements were made in 1920s. Following the closure of orphanage in 1971, the building survived educational, housing, and other ends. After a disastrous period of vacancy, the building and expanded complex are being thoroughly restored and redeveloped in a community conscious manner by Mobile institution of longstanding.

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 September 16, 2015. At that time, the Board approved the installation of two additions to be constructed off of the East Elevation of the recessed service wing adjoining the main building’s principle block. Work was also approved for a float barn, fencing, and walkways. The application up for review calls for the continuation of restoration and redevelopment on this site.
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. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”

2. “Modern paving materials are accepted in Mobile’s Historic Districts. However, it is important that the design, location, and materials be compatible with the property.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans and other materials):

1. Construct an elevated terrace off of the South (Rear) Elevation of the main block.
   a. The ground floor superstructure and elevated upper portion of the terrace will be defined by stucco-faced (three part over CMU) pilaster-like piers with concrete caps.
   b. The aforementioned piers will be located in advance of flat-arched relieving arches.
   c. A flight of brick and concrete steps will be located on axis with the rear entrance.
   d. The flat arched relieving arches located to either side of staircase will be more constructed of salvaged brick and will be more substantially massed than those adjacent to them.
   e. A picketed cast iron railing will enclose the elevated terrace.
   f. A railing of the same design as the aforementioned terrace will flank stairs.
   g. Two decorative iron lampstands with globe fixture will be positioned atop two of the stucco-faced piers defining the terrace.
   h. The deck surface will be concrete over metal.
   i. The ceilings of the ground floor beneath the terrace will feature 1’ x 6’ painted wood surfaces with can lights.
   j. All metal work will be painted black.
   k. All stuccowork will be painted white.
   l. The shutters and railings will be painted American Heritage.

2. Construct a parapet topped architrave or surround off the main block’s principle rear entrance.
   a. The stepped and raked parapet will be constructed of the same three part stucco over CMU as the terrace’s pilaster-like piers.
   b. A diamond-like lozenge device will punctuate the stepped and raked parapet.
   c. A glazed and paneled wooden door will be placed within the main floor of the upper/terrace accessing entrance (an existing entrance).
   d. A railing of same design as that enclosing the terrace and stairs will define balcony-like accent above the entrance.

3. Cantilever balconied extensions to a previously reconstructed and altered gallery extending the length of the service wing’s West (inner lot facing) Elevation.
   a. The four southern or rearmost bays will be extended.
   b. Wooden porch posts on the second and third floor levels will be replicated in the subject area.
   c. Wood porch decking will be installed.
   d. A picketed railing will enclose the cantilever balconies on the two upper-story levels.
   e. A shed-roofed porch cantilevered and rafter detailed umbrage will extend over the uppermost cantilever’s three northernmost bays.
   f. A dog-leg stair will occupy the southernmost bay.
A brick end wall will serve as the defining feature of the southern termination of the gallery and cantilever’s ground floor. This ground floor stepped bay will feature a double entrance accessing the ground floor gallery.

4. Implement site and landscape plan in the courtyard (see site plan).
   a. Install a series of spiraling concrete walks bordered in bricks.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the following: construction of a terrace and architrave/surround about the rear entrance; construction of cantilevered extensions off of a gallery; construction of an exit stair within the aforementioned cantilevers; and the installation of paving within & in advance of a courtyard. The whole of the proposed scope of work is restricted to the rear portion of the main building and its courtyard area. The plans set forth continue the revitalization of a featured historic structure in Mobile.

In accord with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, the addition of a raised terrace and the construction of a door surround about the entrance to the North elevation of the main building is differentiated from the historic structure, yet in keeping with its mass, scale, size and existing historic architectural features, as well as recently constructed and/or approved constructions (See B-1.). The diamond motif and overall profile of the door surround in particular are already realized in on the mid-century building forming the western boundary of the rear courtyard. Similar motifs and constructions were approved for the additions to be constructed off of the East Elevation. The terrace design infuses both the past and the present by repurposing materials such as bricks and employing new materials and ornamentation that visually are in keeping with historic context.

The 5’ extension of three center bays of the gallery located off of the East elevation in the courtyard is in alignment with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (See B-1.). The cantilevered extensions of the gallery match the proportion and scale of the existing porch. The extended horizontal forms serve as subtle differentials between the old and new forms. Original columns will remain in their locations as support. Cantilevers will be used as additional support for the 5’ extension of the three center bays, thus integrating seamlessly into the elevation. The addition of painted steel exit staircase off of the East Elevation will be screened from the North by the use of a brick opening on the ground floor and wooden louvered shutters on the second floor; therefore, mitigating the view of newer components. The stepped brick screen is in keeping with the aforementioned mid-century building situated on the opposite side of the courtyard area, as well as previously approved additions to the east of the building.

The landscaping and hardscaping will serve to better integrate the historic and later buildings at ground level. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, the brick edged walks are responsive to not only architectural, but also the material contexts of the larger property (See B-2.).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the additions, and site improvements.
PUBLIC TESTIMONY

K.I.M. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant’s representative. He asked Ms. Kearley if she had any clarifications to address or questions to ask. Ms. Kearley responded that the staff report and presentation addressed the application in full.

Noting in advance that it was not a part of the application up for review, Mr. Oswalt asked for clarification as to nature of the final fencing along the North portion of the property. Mrs. Kearley replied the fencing would be of a picketed iron construction/nature in front of Cotton Hall proper. She stated that she would prefer to keep the current pipe fence in front of the to-be installed iron fence as well landscape the area between the two fences.

Mr. Oswalt asked if his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant’s representative.

Mr. Allen inquired if the addition of the door surround and terrace would afford the retention of the historic dentil work. Ms. Kearley stated that the dentil work would remain.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Steve Stone 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. Stone 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: 3/16/2017
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2016-12-CA: 609 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Robert Maurin on behalf of Charles Morgan III
Received: 3/1/16
Meeting: 3/16/16

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: T5.1
Project: Non-Contributing Commercial Renovation - Replace an existing non-contributing metal storefront with reclaimed wood windows and doors.

BUILDING HISTORY

This non-contributing building sits between the current day business establishments of Café 615 and Wintzell’s in the Lower Dauphin Historic District. It dates from the latter half of the 20th Century.

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 2007. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a 24’8” x 21’0” rear addition. The application up for review calls for the removal of later aluminum storefront with a new storefront sequence defined by salvaged architectural elements.

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. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize a property.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans and other materials):

1. Remove an existing non-original storefront.
2. Install four (4) salvaged windows and a shutter system. Both units will be natural pine.
3. Two (2) windows and shutters systems will be installed to either side of entrance.
4. Install a (1) salvaged door in natural pine.
5. The masonry will be painted Sherwin Williams HC-166 Kendall Charcoal.
6. Remove sections of masonry so no filler will be employed. The storefront size has been altered previously.
7. Locate two (2) planters in advance of the window bays.
STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the removal of non-original windows and door on a non-contributing building in the Lower Dauphin Historic District and their replacement with salvaged architectural materials. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, the proposed work will not damage historic fabric (See B-1.). The proposed installation of a salvaged door, windows, and shutters would recapture the layered nature of fenestration that once typified the bulk of Dauphin Street’s building stock, most notably the 1850s architecture of the building located to either side of the subject building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-1), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district. Pending final approval from the Consolidated Review Committee, Staff recommends approval of the alterations and site improvements.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Robert Maurin was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant’s representative. He asked Mr. Maurin if he had any clarifications to address or questions to ask. Mr. Warren answered no.

Mr. Oswalt asked for clarification as to the Staff Recommendation, namely the CRC. Ms. Largue and Mr. Blackwell addressed Mr. Oswalt’s query.

Mr. Oswalt asked his fellow Review Board members if they had any questions for the applicant’s representative.

Mr. Allen requested clarification of where the planters were to be located in relation to the storefront. It was clarified that one a planter would be attached under each window, on either side of the main entrance.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that the application for 609 Dauphin Street had been approved by the Certified Review Committee.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.
DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the facts as amended 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: 3/16/2017