A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The acting Chair, Kim Harden called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
   
   **Members Present:** Kim Harden, Joseph Rodrigues, Nick Holmes, Catarina Echols, and Craig Roberts.
   
   **Members Absent:** Steve Stone, Robert Brown, Abby Davis, Andre Rathle, Jim Wagoner, and David Barr.
   
   **Staff Members Present:** John Sledge, Bridget Daniel, Paige Largue, Marion McElroy and Flo Kessler.

2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes of the August 21st, 2019 meeting. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

3. Mr. Holmes moved to approve the Mid-Months as written. The motion was seconded and the Mid-Months were approved unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant:** Catholic Housing of Mobile
   a. **Property Address:** 351 Conti Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 08/13/2019
   c. **Project:** Upgrade existing cell tower.

2. **Applicant:** Arthur Tonsmire
   a. **Property Address:** 3 Dauphin Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 08/14/2019
   c. **Project:** Reroof flat roof.

3. **Applicant:** Dennis Melton
   a. **Property Address:** 167 Roberts Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 08/14/2019
   c. **Project:** Remove old shingles, reroof charcoal gray.

4. **Applicant:** 1659 Government Street
   a. **Property Address:** 1655 Government Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 08/15/2019
   c. **Project:** Upgrade existing tower, no height change.

5. **Applicant:** Matt Zarzour
   a. **Property Address:** 63 N Monterey Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 08/19/2019
   c. **Project:** Repair/replace rotten wood as needed to match existing in material, dimension and profile, repaint to match.

6. **Applicant:** Rhone Samuel
   a. **Property Address:** 1459 Eslava Street
   b. **Date of Approval:** 08/19/2019
   c. **Project:** Rework underneath house, repair/replace rotted joists, nothing visible from street.

7. **Applicant:** Tindle Construction, LLC
   a. **Property Address:** 104 Beverly Court
   b. **Date of Approval:** 08/19/2019
   c. **Project:** Repaint to match in dimension, profile, and material. Shutters and Wrought Iron to be painted black. Trim to be painted Cream.
8. Applicant: 9 Saint Emanuel LLC
   a. Property Address: 127 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 08/19/2019
   c. Project: Repaint Dauphin Street doors red.

9. Applicant: Lori Blankenship
   a. Property Address: 1120 Selma Street
   b. Date of Approval: 08/20/2019
   c. Project: Erect three foot picket fence in front, six foot privacy fence in back.

10. Applicant: Dean Mayfield
    a. Property Address: 54 Hannon Avenue
    b. Date of Approval: 08/21/2019
    c. Project: Drop rear non-historic chimney, put architectural shingles in place, add ridge vent; rear non-historic addition, level, reside hardiplank, remove non-historic jalousie windows and replace with solid glass, add fiberglass back door, none of this work visible to street; repaint house (including front porch brick) in historically appropriate colors, redeck front porch tongue and groove, replace broken front steps with solid wood; erect six foot privacy fence with gate back yard.

11. Applicant: Saint John's Church
    a. Property Address: 1707 Government Street
    b. Date of Approval: 08/22/2019
    c. Project: Reroof flat additions to rear of church. Repair/replace rotten fascia and soffit to match existing.

12. Applicant: Timothy Maness
    a. Property Address: 203 Michigan Avenue
    b. Date of Approval: 08/22/2019
    c. Project: Remove stucco to expose original openings. Repair or replace wood to match. Repaint to match.

13. Applicant: Chris Holmes Construction, LLC
    a. Property Address: 254 Park Terrace
    b. Date of Approval: 08/23/2019
    c. Project: Repair and feather in wood siding around new wooden windows located at the rear corner of the house to match. Repaint to match.

14. Applicant: Gerald Gabriel
    a. Property Address: 1006 Elmira Street
    b. Date of Approval: 08/24/2019
    c. Project: Replace missing windows on house, matching original openings, install wood 2/2 double hung sash windows; replace missing front door with wooden historically appropriate style; replace roof with charcoal gray asphalt shingles.

15. Applicant: Ms. Collins
    a. Property Address: 115 Houston Street
    b. Date of Approval: 08/23/2019
    c. Project: Reroof architectural shingles black.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2019-36-CA: 158 Roberts Street
   a. Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Ms. Margaret Boazman.
   APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
   a. Applicant: Taggart Creative, LLC

   *APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.*

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

2019-36-CA: 158 Roberts Street
Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Ms. Margaret Boazman
Received: 8/15/2019
Meeting: 9/4/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1

BUILDING HISTORY

This bungalow was constructed in 1932.

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 an existing ancillary and new construction of an ancillary building.
B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
1. When reviewing applications calling for the demolition of ancillary structures, the following criteria are taken into account “architectural significance of the building, physical condition of the structure, impact on the street & the district, and nature of any proposed development.”
2. “Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from the new.”
3. “A new accessory or ancillary structure should be compatible with those in the district.”
4. “Design an accessory or ancillary structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.”
5. “Locate a new accessory or ancillary structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district. These are traditionally located at the rear of the lot.”
6. “Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture and finish to the original are acceptable. These often include: wood panel; wood panel with glass lights; leaded glass with lead cames; and metal with a painted finish.”
7. “Design a garage door to be simple and compatible with the primary building.”

B. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Demolish an existing ancillary building.
   a. Clear debris from site.
2. Construct a new ancillary building (a garage)
   a. The ancillary building will be setback 27’0” from the rear façade, 3’8” from the northern lot line, and 10’0” from the rear lot line.
   b. The garage will be 30’0” x 20’0” in size with a 6’0” x 8’0” porch and will be one-story in height.
   c. The garage will be at grade level.
   d. The walls will be clad with hardi-plank lap-siding so as to match the wood siding profile and dimension found on the body of the main residence.
   e. Exterior will be painted to match the main dwelling.
   f. Wooden fascia and rafter tails will match found on the on body of the principle residence.
   g. Gable roofs will surmount both the garage and the porch. The garage will feature a jerkinhead roof.
   h. The roof will be sheathed in asphalt shingles matching those found on the body of the house.
3. East (façade) Elevation
   a. The northern portion of the elevation will feature a two vehicle carport supported by wood columns on plinths.
   b. The porch will be recessed off the South (side) elevation. The porch will be screened in.
4. North (side) Elevation
   a. The elevation will feature two screened in bays on the eastern portion.
5. West (rear) Elevation
   a. The rear elevation will be sheathed in lapsiding with a louvered vent punctuating the gable.
   b. The screened-in porch will be recessed on the southern portion of the elevation.
6. South (side) Elevation
   a. The elevation will feature two open bays on the eastern portion.
   b. The screened-in portion will be in advance of the open bays and feature a screened-in door.
7. Conduct site improvements.
   a. Install pavers in rear yard.
   b. Construct brick bench and fire pit.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a later non-contributing ancillary structure and the construction of a new ancillary (garage).

With regard to the removal of the existing ancillary building, the same criteria by which Board reviews the demolition of principle buildings are taken into account. According to the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, the considerations taken into account are as follows: architectural significance of the building, condition of the structure, impact on the street & the district, and nature of any proposed development (See B-1.). With regard to significance, the ancillary building is not of the same architectural importance and construction quality. In addition to the age, the detailing and materials caused it to not contribute to the architectural significance of the property and district. As to condition, the building is in bad state of repair. With regard to the impact on the streetscape and district, the building is located behind the main dwelling at the very rear of the lot. While building is visible, its impact on the streetscape is minimal. If authorized demolition approval, a new ancillary building would be constructed.
The Design Review Guidelines state that new ancillary construction should be compatible with those in the district (See B-3.). New ancillary construction involves review of considerations: placement, scale, massing, façade elements, and materials so as to obtain compatibility between the new and the existing.

As to placement, the proposed new construction, a carport, would occupy a rear portion of the lot and would be located directly behind the main house. Garages were constructed behind the front plane of residential buildings in general and for the subject property (See B-5.). The side setback of 3’8” feet is permissible by reason of the Historic District Overlay, a planning regulation authorizing (in certain cases) the employment of traditional setbacks within Midtown’s four locally designated National Register Districts (Old Dauphin Way being one). The aforementioned taken into account, the proposed building’s placement is compatible with traditional ancillary construction.

With regard to scale and massing, the Design Review Guidelines state that new ancillary construction should be subordinate to the main building (See B 3- 4.). The proposed building’s placement behind the main residence serve to make the building not only subordinate to, but also respectful of the historic body of the house (See B-2.). On grade construction is authorized for garages and carports. The height of the proposed carport is no higher than the single-tory main residence.

Façade elements are crucial to compatibility of compatible ancillary construction. Box-like/rectilinear massing, gable roof forms, and matching eave treatments serve engender compatibility between the main house and the carport. The aforementioned elements reference the existing fabric. With regard to materials to be employed on ancillary construction, the Design Review Guidelines allow for composite materials if said materials appear similar in texture and finish of the original (See B-6.). Hardi-plank siding will be employed on the walls. Said siding will match the dimension and profile of wood siding found on main residence. Roofing shingles will similarly match those surmounting the body of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

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

No further discussion from the Board ensued at that time.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as written.
The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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

2019-37-CA: 755 Monroe Street
Applicant: Taggart Creative, LLC
Received: 8/23/19
Meeting: 9/15/19

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: T5.1
Project: Fenestration Related: Install windows on front façade. Install ADA ramp and railings.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one brick veneer building was constructed circa 1980 as part of the Crystal Ice complex.

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 altering fenestration and installing ramps and railings.

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

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):
   1. Install two new aluminum storefront doors.
   2. In central portion of elevation (southern portion of existing advanced façade) install a triparte aluminum storefront window with new metal awning. Metal will match existing metal roof.
   3. Install ADA ramp and railings.
      a. Install ADA ramp on central portion of elevation.
b. Base of ramp will be sheathed with wood siding and painted to match other foundations found on the building.

c. A metal railing will be installed on the existing galleries and dock.
The aforementioned railing will be constructed of painted metal pipe with stainless steel wires.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the alteration of a front façade on non-contributing building.

With regard to the work proposed to the storefront, the subject storefront dates circa 1980. Replacing two existing doors with aluminum storefront doors does not impact any historic fabric (See B-1). The installation of the ADA ramp will be constructed as to blend in with the existing building foundation by painting the wood the same color as the existing block foundation. The newly installed window will match the existing one pane configuration. The metal canopy above the new window will match the existing metal used on the roof of the gallery/porch. The proposed metal pipe and wire guardrail will be painted to meet the Design Review Guidelines. Its design compliments the existing industrial fabric of the building (See B-5).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Taylor Atchison, applicant, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

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

Mr. Atchison replied to Mr. Roberts by stating the building will be adapted into a café or neighborhood restaurant. Mr. Rodrigues responded positively to the use which is proposed to repurpose a vacant building.

The Board, staff and applicant discussed the view of the building from Church Street Cemetery.

No further discussion from the Board ensued at that time.

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

FINDING OF FACT

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

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

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

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