

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

April 16, 2008 – 3:00 P.M.

Pre-Council Chambers

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:** Mrs. Heubach  
**Property Address:** 354 Chatham Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 31, 2008  
Repair/replace rotten wood throughout the exterior with wood to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint in the existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant's Name:** Chris King  
**Property Address:** 1254 Elmira Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 31, 2008  
Paint building to match color scheme on main house at 208 South Georgia Avenue.
3. **Applicant's Name:** Wanda Vergos  
**Property Address:** 104 South Ann Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 31, 2008  
Repair fire damage to the building with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
4. **Applicant's Name:** Kimberly Tew  
**Property Address:** 9 Semmes Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** March 31, 2008  
Repair/replace rotten wood on the existing fence with new boards to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repair/replace rotten wood on the front porch and steps. Repair/replace wood siding on the rear of the residence with new siding to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint the porch and steps in Charcoal. Rebuild the rotten porch rail to match what existed (see photos on file with MHDC). Rebuild the damaged back wall of the rear shed and reinstall the soffit. Paint in the existing color scheme.
5. **Applicant's Name:** Mike LaSarge  
**Property Address:** 68 South Georgia Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** March 31, 2008  
Repair/replace rotten wood siding on the north side with siding to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint in the existing color scheme.
6. **Applicant's Name:** Jane Siegel  
**Property Address:** 256 West Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 31, 2008  
Paint in the existing color scheme.
7. **Applicant's Name:** Adline Clarke  
**Property Address:** 155 South Broad Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 31, 2008  
Paint building white with grey trim. Repair rotten wood as necessary with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Repair roof as necessary with materials to match existing.
8. **Applicant's Name:** Marcia and Stanley Lewis  
**Property Address:** 62 North Monterey Street  
**Date of Approval:** April 1, 2008  
Reroof with sandstone metal shingles to match the current asbestos shingles in profile and dimension.

9. **Applicant's Name:** Ken Baggette  
**Property Address:** 1051-1053 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** April 1, 2008  
Repair fire-damaged roof with materials to match existing.
10. **Applicant's Name:** Marie Dismukes/Catholic Housing of Mobile  
**Property Address:** 351 Conti Street  
**Date of Approval:** April 3, 2008  
Caulk windows and doors as needed.
11. **Applicant's Name:** Dave Johnson  
**Property Address:** 1112 Selma Street  
**Date of Approval:** April 3, 2008  
Replace rotten wood on porch to include columns with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint to match existing color scheme.
12. **Applicant's Name:** Ed and Susan Crowson  
**Property Address:** 1219 Elmira Street  
**Date of Approval:** April 3, 2008  
Replace wood on front porch with materials to match existing. Paint to match existing color scheme.
13. **Applicant's Name:** Slate and Tile Roofing  
**Property Address:** 1401 Blacklawn  
**Date of Approval:** April 3, 2008  
Remove, repair and replace existing tile roof. Missing tiles to match original in color, profile and dimension.
14. **Applicant's Name:** Kevin Cross  
**Property Address:** 1001 Augusta Street  
**Date of Approval:** April 3, 2008  
Reroof with architectural shingles in a dark blend. Prep and paint in the following color scheme:
- Body – ICI Paints Winter's Silence, D0532
  - Trim – ICI Paints White on White, D0437
  - Shutters – Benjamin Moore Night Horizon, 2134-10
15. **Applicant's Name:** Coulson Construction Company LLC  
**Property Address:** 1254 Elmira Street  
**Date of Approval:** April 3, 2008  
Reroof building with black architectural shingles.
16. **Applicant's Name:** Faith Community Missionary Baptist Church  
**Property Address:** 1110 Texas Road  
**Date of Approval:** April 4, 2008  
Replace window on the rear west side with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
17. **Applicant's Name:** Veets  
**Property Address:** 66 South Royal Street  
**Date of Approval:** April 4, 2008  
Install a 28SF aluminum sign using the existing lighting. It will look similar to the Royal Scam sign.
18. **Applicant's Name:** Brett Faircloth  
**Property Address:** 257 Stocking Street (rear of 1419 Monroe)  
**Date of Approval:** April 4, 2008  
Repair wood with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint in the existing colors.
19. **Applicant's Name:** Thad Phillips  
**Property Address:** 12 South Catherine Street  
**Date of Approval:** April 7, 2008  
Repair wood with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint in the existing colors.

20. **Applicant's Name:** The Jason's Company  
**Property Address:** 12 South Catherine Street  
**Date of Approval:** April 7, 2008  
Install new roof using 3tab shingles, 30 year, Onyx in color.

21. **Applicant's Name:** John Hayes  
**Property Address:** 29 South Reed Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** April 7, 2008  
Repair rotten wood as necessary with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint in the existing color scheme from 1995.

### C. NEW BUSINESS

1. **034-08-CA:** 1760 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** William Graham  
**Request:** Construct a 2-car carport.
2. **035-08-CA:** 1110-1112 Government Street/Montauk Avenue  
**Applicant:** Michael Lee/Central Park Condominiums  
**Request:** Install a fence.
3. **036-08-CA:** 1706 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Aimee McCormick  
**Request:** Remove inappropriate alterations to renovate building exterior.
4. **037-08-CA:** 103 South Ann Street  
**Applicant:** E. Crosby Latham  
**Request:** Add a rear porch.
5. **038-08-CA:** 2250 DeLeon Avenue  
**Applicant:** Lucy Barr Designs  
**Request:** Construct an addition.
6. **039-08-CA:** 27 South Reed Avenue  
**Applicant:** Lawrence and Melissa Specker  
**Request:** Remove inappropriate alterations to renovate building exterior.
7. **040-08-CA:** 351 Conti Street  
**Applicant:** Marie Dismukes/Catholic Housing of Mobile  
**Request:** Paint the brick.
8. **041-08-CA:** 302 McDonald Avenue  
**Applicant:** Ronald Hinton  
**Request:** Construct a greenhouse.

### D. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Discussion

### E. ADJOURNMENT

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

**034-08-CA:** 1760 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** William Graham  
**Received:** 03/21/08 (+45 Days: 05/04/08)  
**Meeting:** 04/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Construct a 2-car carport.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story frame residence with Classical detailing was built circa 1906.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve applications proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds 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 district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. There is currently a small wooden pergola under which cars park.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[a]n accessory structure...includes, but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like...[t]he structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Mr. Graham is proposing to construct a 10'-0" by 10'-0" carport per the submitted plans.
  - 1. It will be located behind the house, which sits on a corner lot, and be 16'-0" from the street.
  - 2. It will sit on a concrete slab and have smooth-faced Hardiplank siding.
  - 3. There will be a double 6-panel front door and single 6-panel back door.
  - 4. There will be recessed lights and a ceiling fan in the parking area.
  - 5. All detailing, including the roof shingles, columns, corner boards, soffit, fascia and paint colors, will match the main residence.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or district. The design of the proposed carport will complement the existing residence and staff recommends approving the application. Mr. Graham will need to clear any setback issues with Urban Development before construction.

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

**035-08-CA:** 1110-1112 Government Street/Montauk Avenue  
**Applicant:** Michael Lee/Central Park Condominiums  
**Received:** 03/25/08 (+45 Days: 05/08/08)  
**Meeting:** 04/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-3  
**Project:** Install a fence.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This townhouse complex was constructed in 2006.

**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. The Central Park Condominiums face Government Street with rear access facing Montauk Avenue. Urban Development requires that access to Montauk be blocked.
- B. The Guidelines state that fences “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.” Also, “the height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.”
- C. Mr. Lee is proposing to install an 8’-0” wood privacy fence per the submitted site plan.
  - 1. The finished side will face the exterior.
  - 2. The area between the fence and sidewalk will be landscaped.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The proposed fence falls within the standards of the Guidelines. However, Mr. Lee is proposing a setback of 12’-0” from Montauk. Code requires a setback of 25’-0” from the street for a solid fence over 3’-0” tall.

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

**036-08-CA:** 1706 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Aimee McCormick  
**Received:** 03/26/08 (+45 Days: 05/09/08)  
**Meeting:** 04/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Remove inappropriate alterations to renovate building exterior.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story frame residence was built circa 1915. However, subsequent inappropriate renovations and additions have altered the building to a point that it is currently not contributing.

**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. As mentioned above, this building has undergone such inappropriate renovations and additions that its status as contributing to the district was compromised.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “the exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. Original [material] should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
- C. The work proposed includes the following per the submitted plans:
  - 1. Replace/repair stucco with stucco to match existing.
  - 2. Replace/repair rotten wood throughout the exterior with wood to match existing.
  - 3. Reroof with architectural shingles.
  - 4. Replace the board and batten throughout the exterior with stucco to match existing.
  - 5. Cover the rear concrete block section of the building with stucco to match existing.
  - 6. Move the wall on the enclosed front porch to install a new wood column to match existing.
  - 7. Create new window openings and install windows in the additions to match the original residence.
  - 8. Paint in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
    - a. Body – Camelback, SW6122
    - b. Trim – Navajo White, SW6126
    - c. Accents – Van Dyke Brown, SW7041

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff feels that the changes will not impair the historic integrity of the district. The proposed work falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines and staff recommends approving the application.

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

**037-08-CA:** 103 South Ann Street  
**Applicant:** E. Crosby Latham  
**Received:** 03/28/08 (+45 Days: 05/11/08)  
**Meeting:** 04/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Add a rear porch.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This two-story frame residence with Italianate detailing was constructed circa 1876. It was moved to its current address in 1934 from the NE corner of Government and Ann when the Catholic Diocese sold the land to Shell. It has been used as a five-unit apartment for a number of years.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states, "the Board shall not approve an application proposing 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 district..."

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This residence is currently in good condition. As mentioned above, it has been used as a five-unit apartment for a number of years and the new owners wish to turn it back to a single-family dwelling. Formerly on the Endangered Properties List, it was renovated with the help of a façade grant in 1993.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that new additions should respect the age and style of the building.
- C. Mr. Latham is proposing to construct a 19'-0" by 19'-0" one-story rear porch per the submitted plans.
  - 1. It will sit on stucco piers with wood lattice.
  - 2. There will be full-width stucco steps with cheeks.
  - 3. Operable wood shutters will be installed on the side elevations.
  - 4. There will be 16" square recessed-panel columns with pilasters to match.
  - 5. It will have brackets to match those of the existing residence.
  - 6. It will have a modified bitumen roof with ARB approved stock railing and posts to match the columns.
  - 7. There will be two new windows installed on the second floor to match the existing units on the rest of the residence in material, profile and dimension.
  - 8. There will be two sets of double French doors installed on the first floor.
  - 9. There will be new siding on the rear elevation to match the rest of the residence.
  - 10. All new materials will be painted in the existing color scheme.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and recommends approving the application.

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

**038-08-CA:** 2250 DeLeon Avenue  
**Applicant:** Lucy Barr Designs  
**Received:** 03/31/08 (+45 Days: 05/14/08)  
**Meeting:** 04/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Ashland Place  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Construct an addition.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story frame residence was built circa 1921.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states, "the Board shall not approve an application proposing 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 district..."

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This residence sits on a large corner lot.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that new additions should respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The work proposed is to construct a 42'-10" by 40'-8" addition per the submitted plans.
  - 1. It will sit on a continuous brick foundation with metal vents.
  - 2. It will have wood lap siding, trim, shutters and 6/6 or 3/3 sash windows.
  - 3. It will feature a screened-in porch with exterior brick chimney, steps and iron railing on the left side.
  - 4. It will have a timberline roof over the main section and a bitumen roof over the screened-in porch.
  - 5. The design and materials of the addition will match and/or complement the existing residence.
  - 6. It will be painted in the existing color scheme.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The design and materials of the new addition will match and/or complement the existing residence. However, staff is concerned about the size of the proposed work, primarily because this residence is prominently located on a corner lot. Overlarge additions are acceptable if they cannot be or are minimally seen from the street – thus not overwhelming the lines of the original residence.



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

**039-08-CA:** 27 South Reed Avenue  
**Applicant:** Lawrence and Melissa Specker  
**Received:** 03/31/08 (+45 Days: 05/14/08)  
**Meeting:** 04/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Remove inappropriate alterations to renovate building exterior.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story frame Craftsman was built circa 1915.

**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. The work for this residence was approved in 2002, but was never completed. The work is slated to begin again; however, because it has been 6 years, staff felt it should go before the Board.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “the exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. Original [material] should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
- C. The work proposed includes the following per the submitted plans:
  - 1. Replace the board and batten siding with lap siding to match existing.
  - 2. Enclose the windows on the south side with lap siding to match existing, leaving one opening.
  - 3. Enclose the rear door.
  - 4. Replace the horizontal window with double French doors that will lead to a new wood rear deck.
  - 5. Recess part of the second floor addition to create a dormer with casement windows.
  - 6. Partially extend the first floor rood over the new deck.
  - 7. Paint in the existing color scheme.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff feels that the changes will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The proposed work falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines and staff recommends approving the application.

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

**040-07-CA:** 351 Conti Street

**Applicant:** Marie Dismukes/Catholic Housing of Mobile

**Received:** 03/31/08 (+45 Days: 05/14/08)

**Meeting:** 04/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Church Street East

**Classification:** Non-Contributing

**Zoning:** B-4

**Project:** Paint.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This twelve-story reinforced concrete building was constructed circa 1975 as a retirement home.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve applications proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds 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 district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. The brick veneer on this residence has never been painted. Staff has received a number of complaints from the residents about the proposed work.
- B. The Guidelines state, “[t]he painting of unpainted brick is...inappropriate in most cases.”
- C. The proposed plans include painting the building in one of the following Sherwin Williams paint schemes:
  - 1. Option 1
    - a. Body – Sawdust, SW6158
    - b. Platform – Roycroft Copper Red, SW2839
    - c. Rails – Rockwood Shutter Green, SW2809
  - 2. Option 2
    - a. Body – Chatroom, SW6171
    - b. Platform – Hardware, SW6172
    - c. Rails – Black of Night, SW6993
  - 3. Option 3
    - a. Body – Perfect Greig, SW6073
    - b. Platform – Portabello, SW6102
    - c. Rails – Tricorn Black, SW6258
  - 4. Option 4
    - a. Body – Quartersawn Oak, SW2836
    - b. Platform – New Colonial Yellow, SW2853
    - c. Rails – Terra Brun, SW6048
  - 5. Option 5
    - a. Body – Aurora Brown, SW2837
    - b. Platform – Roycroft Suede, SW2842
    - c. Rails – Roycroft Bronze Green, SW2846

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Board generally does not approve the painting of unpainted brick.

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

**041-07-CA:** 302 McDonald Avenue  
**Applicant:** Ronald Hinton  
**Received:** 04/01/08 (+45 Days: 05/16/08)  
**Meeting:** 04/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Leinkauf  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Construct a greenhouse.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this residence was built circa 1960.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve applications proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds 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 district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. There is currently a shed in the back yard. The greenhouse has been partially constructed.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[a]n accessory structure...includes, but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like...[t]he structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Mr Hinton is proposing to construct an 8’-0” by 9’-0” frame greenhouse in the back yard.
  - 1. It will have wood lap siding to the ground (the floor will be dirt).
  - 2. The windows will match those of the main building.
  - 3. There will be a French door on the front.
  - 4. The roof will consist of clear plastic panels.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff feels the greenhouse will not impair the integrity of the district. The building is located in the rear of the property and will match the detailing of the main house. While clear plastic roof panels is generally not appropriate in the districts for typical outbuildings, the purpose of this building precludes this guideline. Mr. Hinton will need to clear any setback or lot coverage issues with Urban Development.