

**AGENDA**  
**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

January 8, 2007 – 3:00 P.M.  
Mayor's Pre-Council Chamber – Mobile Government Plaza  
205 Government Street

**A. CALL TO ORDER – Chair**

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Approval of Mid-Month Requests Approved by Staff

**B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS**

1. **Applicant's Name:** ASR LLC  
**Property Address:** 254 Dexter Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** November 2, 2006  
Replace rotted siding to match existing. Repaint house in the following Sherwin Williams colors:
  - Body: Colonial Revival Green Stone (SW2826)
  - Trim: Bright White
2. **Applicant's Name:** Caldwell Montdrakgo  
**Property Address:** 951 Selma Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 13, 2006  
Replace rotten sills to stabilize house. Repair/replace rotten siding, window casings, column bases. Install new 6/6 wood windows with true divided lights. Install new roof using architectural charcoal gray shingles. Install porch railing per MHDC design. Paint exterior the following colors:
  - Body: Cream
  - Trim: White
3. **Applicant's Name:** Mattie Nichols  
**Property Address:** 114 North Hallett Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 14, 2006  
Remove existing asbestos roof, re-roof with 30-year architectural shingles, Moree Black in color.
4. **Applicant's Name:** Edward Pederson/ASR LLC  
**Property Address:** 106 Hannon Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** November 14, 2006  
Minor wood repair with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile. Paint exterior in the following Sherwin Williams colors:
  - Body: Kilim Beige
  - Trim: White
5. **Applicant's Name:** H.A.Becker/Daoust Contracting Services, Inc.  
**Property Address:** 257 South Georgia Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** November 16, 2006  
Replace rotted siding with materials to match existing. Reclad balcony roof with materials to match existing. Reset balcony rail to match current. Replace rotted windows/door with elements to match existing. Windows will be true divided light. Door will have the same light pattern/panels.
6. **Applicant's Name:** Strategy Inc.  
**Property Address:** 112 South Dearborn Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 20, 2006  
Replace old storage shed with a new 12'x18' unit to follow stock MHDC plans. It will have Grade B board and batten siding, brick posts and a front gable roof. It will have wood carriage-style front doors and a small wood door to the side. The roof pitch will match the pitch of the main house.
7. **Applicant's Name:** John C. Bell  
**Property Address:** 122 Ryan Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** November 20, 2006  
Paint trim/accents with Benjamin Moore "Rockies Brown," 2107-30. Bricks will remain unpainted.

8. **Applicant's Name:** Mobile Brewing LLC/Henry Arrington  
**Property Address:** 225 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 22, 2006  
Install a 28 SF double-sided sign made of high-density urethane sandblasted foam. It will be mounted with eyebolts with sway chains.
9. **Applicant's Name:** George A. Neese  
**Property Address:** 7 Oakland Terrace  
**Date of Approval:** November 27, 2006  
Reroof with black 50-year Timberline shingles. Place ridge vent. Replace rotten fascia boards.
10. **Applicant's Name:** McNeal Trust/Murray Thames Contracting  
**Property Address:** 7 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 28, 2006  
Repair termite damage on rear elevation. All materials to match existing in dimension and profile.
11. **Applicant's Name:** Ormandos M. Jackson  
**Property Address:** 1107 Elmira Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 29, 2006  
Level foundation underneath house. Reclad roof with materials to match existing.
12. **Applicant's Name:** John and Penny Coleman  
**Property Address:** 251 Charles Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 29, 2006  
Repaint north and front elevations of house with existing color scheme. Replace rotten wood as necessary with materials to match existing in profile and dimension.
13. **Applicant's Name:** Nathaniel Walton  
**Property Address:** 162 South Warren Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 29, 2006  
Replace rotted and damaged wood, including guardrail on side porch, with new wood to match existing. Add torchdown on roof deck. Paint to match existing color scheme.
14. **Applicant's Name:** Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund  
**Property Address:** 515-521 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 29, 2006  
Paint exterior of residence in the following color scheme:
  - Doors, windows, dormers, trim, shutter hardware – White
  - Blinds, balcony floors, shutter “L” brackets – BLP “Bellingrath Green”
  - Balconies – SW6473 “Surf Green” or SW6740 “Kilkenny Green”
  - Balcony/recessed porch ceilings, balcony floor undersides – SW6491 “Open Air”
15. **Applicant's Name:** Stevi Gaston  
**Property Address:** 261 Marine Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 30, 2006  
Repair/replace damaged and rotted siding with siding that matches existing.
16. **Applicant's Name:** Marty Druhan  
**Property Address:** 1055 Augusta Street  
**Date of Approval:** December 4, 2006  
Install 20-yr Estate Grey Owens-Corning shingles. Redeck roof with materials to match existing.
17. **Applicant's Name:** Haston Construction Company  
**Property Address:** 1217 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** December 5, 2006  
Reclad roof with materials to match existing in color, profile and dimension.
18. **Applicant's Name:** Matt McDonald  
**Property Address:** 1260 Selma Street  
**Date of Approval:** December 6, 2006  
Re-roof with 3tab shingles, grey in color, materials and color to match existing roof.

19. **Applicant's Name:** Greg Vaughan  
**Property Address:** 212 South Dearborn Street  
**Date of Approval:** December 6, 2006  
Repaint exterior in the following Valspar American Tradition color scheme:
  - Body: Hubbell House Clayo, 2006-98
  - Trim: Churchill Hotel Navajo White, 7003-12
  - Shutters: Mark Twain Gray Brick, 4005-2C
  
20. **Applicant's Name:** Laurie Benjamin  
**Property Address:** 115 Providence Street  
**Date of Approval:** December 7, 2006  
Remove damaged chimney at west slope. Cap and reclad section with materials to match existing. Repair chimneys at north/south slopes and center ridge with materials to match existing.
  
21. **Applicant's Name:** Freddie and Virginia Sigler  
**Property Address:** 500 Canal Street  
**Date of Approval:** December 8, 2006  
Construct a 6' high wood shadowbox fence along the N boundary and a 6' high stucco-covered masonry with brick pier wall along the E boundary, both with 5' setbacks. The masonry wall will have a sloped cap and the piers will have pyramidal caps. This renews the COA issued 04-19-04.
  
22. **Applicant's Name:** Samuel Hamilton  
**Property Address:** 307 North Jackson Street  
**Date of Approval:** December 11, 2006  
Repaint exterior to match existing.
  
23. **Applicant's Name:** Affordable Roofing  
**Property Address:** 905 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** December 11, 2006  
Repair roof with materials to match existing in profile, material, dimension and color.
  
24. **Applicant's Name:** Volunteer Mobile  
**Property Address:** 1010 Selma Street  
**Date of Approval:** December 12, 2006  
Repair as necessary the roof of the residence. Replace existing corrugated metal roof with either materials to match or 30-yr architectural shingles in charcoal gray or black.
  
25. **Applicant's Name:** Clark and Deen Attorneys  
**Property Address:** 207 Church Street  
**Date of Approval:** December 13, 2006  
Replace rotten wood with materials to match existing. Paint building to match existing scheme.
  
26. **Applicant's Name:** Madeline Nelson  
**Property Address:** 259 Michigan Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** December 13, 2006  
Repaint residence in the following Valspar American Traditions color scheme:
  - Trim – Golden Butter
  - Accents – Tile Green
  
27. **Applicant's Name:** Kimberly Hargrove  
**Property Address:** 109 Parker Street  
**Date of Approval:** December 14, 2006  
Repaint exterior in existing colors. Repair/replace rotted wood with materials to match existing.
  
28. **Applicant's Name:** Joia Juzang  
**Property Address:** 909 Elmira Street  
**Date of Approval:** December 15, 2006  
Repaint house in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
  - Body – White
  - Trim – Tricorn Black, SW6258
  - Accents – Anonymous, SW7046

29. **Applicant's Name:** Fred South  
**Property Address:** 156 Lawrence Street  
**Date of Approval:** December 15, 2006  
Repair/replace as necessary all rotted wood throughout exterior. Reclad roof with materials that match existing in color, profile and dimension.
30. **Applicant's Name:** DRB Properties  
**Property Address:** 1014 Old Shell Road  
**Date of Approval:** December 18, 2006  
Repair/replace rotted wood. Repaint house in the following BLP color scheme:
  - Body – Desert Sand
  - Trim – White
  - Handrail Accent – Black
31. **Applicant's Name:** Kiker Roofing  
**Property Address:** 219 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** December 18, 2006  
Re-roof flat roof with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and color.
32. **Applicant's Name:** Do Right Construction Company  
**Property Address:** 1214 Selma Street  
**Date of Approval:** December 18, 2006  
Repair roof and rotten wood on front porch with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
33. **Applicant's Name:** Mobile Housing Board  
**Property Address:** 809 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** December 19, 2006  
Re-roof modified flat roof using TAMPCO product (roof not visible at street level).
34. **Applicant's Name:** Charles Harrison  
**Property Address:** 7 North Reed Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** December 21, 2006  
Repair to rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile. Install wood lattice panels between piers. Paint in the following Devoe colors:
  - Body – Peppered Moss
  - Trim – White
  - Porch Ceiling – Light Blue
  - Porch Deck, Steps and Lattice – Black

#### **C. NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS**

1. No NoVs or MoTs were written during this time period.

#### **D. NEW BUSINESS**

1. **131-06-CA:** 1255 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Alabama School of Mathematics and Science/TAG Architects  
**Request:** Install two new signs.
2. **132-06-CA:** 1105 Elmira Street  
**Applicant:** Ethel Harris  
**Request:** Demolish residence.
3. **133-06-CA:** 751 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Henry A. Davis/Eddie Cornell  
**Request:** Install new overhead trellis and arbor in courtyard.
4. **134-06-CA:** 756 Government Street  
**Applicant:** John L. Switzer  
**Request:** Add garage between 63 South Bayou and 756 Government. Renovate building.

5. **135-06-CA:** 1507 Springhill Avenue  
**Applicant:** Charter South Inc  
**Request:** Demolish existing building. Construct a convenience store with six gas pumps under a canopy.

**E. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. New procedure for granting Certificates of Occupancy.
2. Latest draft of the Design Guidelines.

**F. ADJOURNMENT**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**131-06-CA:** 1255 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Alabama School of Mathematics and Science/Ben M. Radcliff Contractor, Inc  
**Received:** 12/18/06 (+45 Days: 02/01/07)  
**Meeting:** 01/08/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-1  
**Project:** New signage for school.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This complex of masonry buildings once belonged to the Dauphin Way Baptist Church. The main cruciform building, built in 1942, fronts Dauphin Street and is a modern, streamlined representation of Romanesque architecture. Two flanking 1949 structures use matching brick and architectural features to blend with the original building. A contemporary-styled Christian Life Center was constructed in 1970 at the rear of the property, and several other secondary structures are located throughout.

The church closed in the 1980s amid local concern over the fate of the complex. In 1987, Mobile College considered acquiring and utilizing the buildings; however, nothing became of that plan. In the 1990s, the property was developed into the Alabama School of Mathematics and Science, which is still its function today. Since then, some of the secondary structures have been replaced with new construction.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. Currently, the Alabama School of Mathematics and Science is undergoing a major renovation and construction project. Included in this project is new signage for the property.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile state that signs shall “not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building...shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property...shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs...should match the historic materials of the building...[and] shall use focused, low intensity illumination.”
- C. The Alabama School of Mathematics and Science is proposing two items.
  1. Install a 64 SF monument sign at the corner of Ann and Dauphin Streets consisting of
    - a. A 20’ wide crenellated cream-colored brick wall with a cast stone top (3’-0” at low points and 3’-8” at high points with a 34” diameter round center section) within the existing brick fence posts;
    - b. Dimensional bronze letters and a round medallion with the school’s symbol anchored to the brick and lit by a Hydrel accent lighting fixture.
  2. Install a 15 SF wall sign at the pedestrian entry gate on Dauphin Street consisting of
    - c. A single-face solid bronze plaque anchored to the cast-iron rails;
    - d. Bronze-colored lettering in relief on a black background.
- D. The Architectural Review Board has authority to approve signs totaling a maximum of 64 SF.
  1. The ARB’s main responsibility is to determine the appropriateness of signage in historic districts.
  2. Law allows a maximum of one monument sign per property.
  3. Authority to grant exceptions to the signage requirements of the historic preservation ordinance is vested in the Board of Zoning Adjustment. However, state law exempts the Alabama School of Mathematics and Science from Board of Zoning Adjustment oversight, effectively negating the appeal process designed to give relief from the strictures of the historic district sign restrictions.
- E. The Alabama School of Mathematics and Science is a large complex comprising well over two city blocks.
  1. The ARB has supported applications before the Board of Zoning Adjustment in the past for extra signage in similar situations.

2. The Alabama School of Mathematics and Science complex could be considered to have 10 street frontages when considering the ball fields, the parking lot and the block east of South Georgia Ave.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The question of jurisdiction is one that should not be taken lightly. It appears that the intent of the law is to allow a mechanism for relief from the sign restrictions normally reviewed by the Architectural Review Board. It is the duty of the ARB to determine appropriateness for structures, including signs, within the historic districts. Since the ARB holds a public hearing after giving public notice, a fair hearing can be had. There is also an appeal process through the City Council should any person be aggrieved by a decision of the Board. Therefore, since the amount of signage should be considered as part of its appropriateness, the best solution would be to have the ARB review the complete sign package, including the amount of signage, for appropriateness. Then if anyone (applicant, neighbor or citizen) should consider the decision of the Board incorrect, the remedy of an appeal to City Council is still available.

The design and materials of both signs are compatible with the Guidelines, and staff feels this aspect of the improvements will not negatively impact the integrity of the building or district. The campus size and multiple street frontages should be reason for an exception to the amount of signage allowed in accordance with previous recommendations made by the ARB to the Board of Zoning Adjustment. Staff also believes the small bronze sign will not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that its size is negligible when considered in context with the campus. However, staff does recommend that the Board reduce the size of the monument sign to fit within its guideline on approval of the application. Sign Guidelines do not allow monument signs larger than 50 SF in historic districts and the ARB has maintained this rule in its decisions.

The authority of the ARB in granting an exception to the amount of signage is not clear. Should the City Attorney determine that the Board is required to deny the application, then staff would recommend that the Board vote to support the appeal of the sign application to City Council with the recommendation for reduction of the size of the monument sign.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**132-06-CA:** 1105 Elmira Street  
**Applicant:** Ethel Harris  
**Received:** 12/18/06 (+45 Days: 02/01/07)  
**Meeting:** 01/08/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Demolish residence.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This one-story frame Shotgun was built circa 1889.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

**Section 44-79 of the Mobile City Code – Demolition/Relocation of structures within the Historic Districts:**

- (a) *Required findings.* The board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition/relocation of any property within a historic district unless the board finds the removal/relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the character of the district. In making this determination, the board shall consider:
- (1) The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
  - (2) The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
  - (3) The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
  - (4) Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county or region, is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of buildings creating a neighborhood;
  - (5) 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.
- (b) *Content of applications.* All applications shall contain the following minimum information:
- (1) The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
  - (2) The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
  - (3) Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
  - (4) 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;
  - (5) Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
  - (6) Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and
  - (7) Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
- (c) *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the board entertain any application for the demolition/relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. Currently, 1105 Elmira Street is in a decrepit state, primarily due to a tree that fell on the roof during Katrina. Ms. Harris inherited the property in October 2006. The City recently declared the building a public nuisance, and it has directed that Ms. Harris either repair or demolish it.
- B. In considering demolitions, the Design Review Guidelines refer to **Section 44-79 of the Mobile City Code**, discussed above. There are a number of points which have not been satisfied:
  1. Ms. Harris has not considered any adaptive uses for the building.
  2. Ms. Harris has not attempted to sell the building.
  3. Ms. Harris has not made any replacement construction plans.



- C. During a meeting with staff, Ms. Harris expressed a desire to repair the residence. Staff felt that this residence is a very good candidate for the Hurricanes Katrina and Rita Recovery Grant and provided her with the application. We also let Ms. Harris know that we would assist her in any way we could.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

As a contributing building to the Oakleigh Garden Historic District, the demolition or removal of this building would result not only in an impairment of the historic structure, but also the street and the district. Elmira Street has been cited in the Press-Register for its number of decrepit and neglected residences. However, there are still many homes being cared for and several residences being restored, including the building at 1107 Elmira, which could revive this once vibrant neighborhood. Renovating 1105 Elmira would not only help spark this revival, it also avoids yet another empty lot – a problem the MHDC is working hard to prevent.

Staff recommends denial of this application.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**133-06-CA:** 751 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Henry A. Davis  
**Received:** 12/21/06 (+45 Days: 02/04/07)  
**Meeting:** 01/08/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-4  
**Project:** Install new trellis and arbor in courtyard.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This early twentieth century one-story masonry building built housed a number of separate commercial ventures. In time, it was consolidated into one address and, in the 1990s, turned into a restaurant. A rear courtyard was later added extending to Conti Street and enclosed by a masonry wall with two large modern outbuildings at the southeast and southwest corners. A gate opens up to Conti. The building currently sits vacant.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. Currently, masonry walls enclose the rear (south side) courtyard, but the top is open to the sky.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that walls “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.” Furthermore, new additions “shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be...compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
- C. The proposed plan for the rear courtyard includes the following:
  - 1. Extend existing 8’ stucco pilasters at garden walls up 5’ to match the height of the roof (total 13’);
  - 2. Install a decorative diamond-patterned ironwork trellis between each pilaster;
  - 3. Install an overhead pressure treated wood arbor that will cover the entire courtyard between the main building and its outbuildings. A 16’ x 27’ area at the rear entry will remain uncovered.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff feels that the proposed improvement to the property will not negatively impact the building or the district. Indeed, the proposed arbor is an attractive addition that will create visual interest as well as a pleasant outdoor environment. Staff suggests, however, that the owner stain the arbor a complementary color in order to better preserve the wood as well as blend in with the buildings. Furthermore, staff believes that the open ironwork trellis of the extension will detract from the arbor.

Staff recommends approval of Items C1 and C3 and denial of Item C2 on the application.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**134-06-CA:** 756 Government Street  
**Applicant:** John L. Switzer  
**Received:** 12/27/06 (+45 Days: 02/10/07)  
**Meeting:** 01/08/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Church Street East  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-4  
**Project:** Renovate building at 756 Government. Add garage to connect 756 Government with 63 S Bayou.  
**Departmental**  
**Comments:** The property may need to be rezoned.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This twentieth century one-story masonry building has housed a number of businesses, including Mid-South Construction and Decorating Center and Action Labor of Mobile. It is currently part of the single-family residential compound at 63 S Bayou Street.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. Renovate Building at 756 Government
  - 1. Currently, this brick building is being renovated into a residence. The windows and doors have been boarded up.
  - 2. The proposed improvements include the following:
    - a. Raise roof with glass-block window per submitted plans;
    - b. Install hipped roof with teal-colored metal tiles to match existing Spanish tiles at 63 S Bayou;
    - c. Cover brick in cream-colored true stucco with architectural features to match 63 S Bayou;
    - d. Install metal industrial windows 9’ off ground with metal awnings that match the roof color;
    - e. Install Western Cypress doors to match existing doors at 63 S Bayou.
- B. Add Garage and New Entry to Connect 756 Government with 63 S Bayou
  - 1. Currently, there is a wood privacy fence enclosing an open space between the two buildings at the west elevation.
  - 2. The proposed improvements include the following:
    - a. Construct three-bay garage – one bay will have a two-car garage opening, one bay will have a one-car garage opening and one bay will have a small foyer entryway for pedestrians;
    - b. Match materials and features to existing building at 63 S Bayou, which includes true stucco walls, Western Cypress doors and teal-colored metal tiles.
  - 3. Construct recessed entry to match arched openings along the street. Cover with an iron gate.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information contained in the application, as well as the building being non-contributing to the historic district, the proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the district. The addition of new architectural features to an otherwise non-descript building (756 Government) will create visual interest, which does not currently exist along this part of the street. Furthermore, the new garage will match the existing buildings and enclose the open gap in order to establish a single-family residential unit. Staff recommends approval of the application.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**135-06-CA:** 1507 Springhill Avenue  
**Applicant:** Charter South Inc  
**Received:** 12/27/06 (+45 Days: 02/10/07)  
**Meeting:** 01/08/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-2  
**Project:** Demolish existing building and build a convenience store with six gas pumps under a canopy.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This is currently the Heritage Pharmacy. A part of the rear of the property is within Old Dauphin Way. Recently, Volunteers of America considered the site for a long-term shelter for Veterans, but later withdrew the application.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. Demolish Existing Building
  - 1. Currently, the Heritage Pharmacy building is vacant.
  - 2. The building is outside of the district, so **Section 44-79 of the Mobile City Code** does not apply.
- B. Build a Convenience Store with Six Gas Pumps Under a Canopy
  - 1. The building will be standard and typical gas/convenience store architecture, which consists of
    - a. A hipped-roof with front-gable dormer, prefinished standing seam metal roofing and metal gutter and downspout, vermilion in color;
    - b. EIFS Fascia;
    - c. Brick veneer with quoin details at the corners of the front elevation;
    - d. An aluminum storefront window system with tempered impact resistant glazing, Flower Pot in color.
  - 2. No details were submitted on the canopy.
- C. Site Details
  - 1. The asphalt lot will have 23 spaces, including handicapped. The minimum for this space is 15.
  - 2. There will be a dumpster pad with can wash at the rear of the property.
  - 3. There will be a 10' landscaped buffer zone in between this lot and the residential historic district.
  - 4. No fence is called out on the plans.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Though the building is on the edge of the district, staff feels the proposed improvements will have a significant impact on Springhill Avenue, a major thoroughfare for the City of Mobile, and thus affect the integrity of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. Staff believes the current design is a standard design that does not consider the unique architecture of the district or the City. Though the building to be demolished would be considered non-contributing due to age, it does address the street and maintains a more urban feel in the way it uses the site. Staff recommends denial of the application and suggests the applicants address the following areas of concern:

- Site plan – the building creates a large expanse of concrete on Springhill Avenue that is not in keeping with neither the former residential character nor the current commercial character of the area. Most notably, the placement of the dumpster so close to the residences will have an adverse impact on the residential character of the historic district. The plans for the dumpster also call for it to be constructed of unfinished CMU. The Board generally does not allow raw concrete block in the districts. Though a 10' buffer will help with visual impact, a wider buffer zone adjacent to the residential areas with denser

landscaping and an 8' shadow box fence should be required. Additional landscaping around the perimeter and within the site is also recommended.

- Building – the large expanse of vermillion roof with the downspout accents treats the building as signage and does not consider its impact on the historic district. The building actually becomes secondary to the roof. Furthermore, the three blank sides of the building create a fortress mentality, which detracts from the nearby residential buildings of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District and does not consider its context within the larger neighborhood. The standard storefront design is typical of a convenience store in any location and is not appropriate in context with the historic district or Springhill Avenue (which has suffered from similar inappropriate designs in the past, although still retains its essential character in some areas). The one concession to design is the use of quoins on the front corners, but those do not offset the overall impact of the building.
- Signage – the monument sign is proposed at 64 SF. The maximum allowed is 50 SF for this type of sign. Additionally, this only allows 14 SF for the remainder of the property. The sign is also proposed to be 6'-2" high and the Board generally restricts monument signs to 5'. Its placement is not shown on the plans and there is no design submitted.
- Canopy – there is no design for the canopy and it should not be considered.