

**AGENDA**  
**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**  
January 27, 2003 – 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
4. Approval of Agenda

**B. MID MONTH APPROVALS**

1. 315 North Joachim Street: Willie Martin  
Replace rotten siding as necessary to match the original in profile and dimension.

**APPROVED** 1/3/03 jss

2. 253 Dexter Street: Michael Duff  
Replace rotten wood as necessary with new to match existing in profile and dimension on siding and trim. Repaint to match existing color scheme.

**APPROVED** 1/6/03 weh

3. 1400-1404 Church Street: Banks Properties, LLC.  
Paint building the following colors:  
Painted brick first floor – SW Bunglehouse Gray 2845  
Shingled second floor – SW Roycroft Bronze Green 2646  
Trim – SW Roycroft Vellum 2833  
Concrete foundation and step caps – SW Roycroft Bronze Green 2846

**APPROVED** 1/6/03 weh

4. 400 Government Street: Kiker Roofing Company  
Re-roof building to match existing roofing material in color, profile and dimension.

**APPROVED** 1/6/03 weh

5. Holiday Inn Express/ Ben Meisler for MWH Investments  
Replace existing rotten wood privacy fence around dumpster with new 8' high solid wood fence painted to match building. Replace rusted metal doors with new metal doors matching existing in profile and dimension, and painted to match building body. Replace rotten wood privacy fence around power transformer with new 6' high solid wood fencing painted to match building.

**APPROVED** 1/06/03 weh

6. 109 Gilbert Street: Blackard Roofing Company  
Re-roof building with new materials to match existing in color and profile.

**APPROVED** 1/8/03 weh

7. 12 Semmes Avenue: Cynthia L. Nelms  
Replace front walkway to match existing in profile and dimension. Replace back siding as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension and repaint to match existing color scheme.

**APPROVED** 1/9/03 asc

8. 301 Government Street: AT&T Wireless  
Replace existing tower mounted amplifier with new equipment not to exceed existing equipment size.

**APPROVED** 1/13/03 weh

9. 700 St. Michael Street: Singleton Construction Company  
Re-roof with 3-tab fiberglass shingles.

**APPROVED** 1/14/03 weh

10. 313 George Street: Diversified Roofing  
Re-roof house with 5 v-crimp metal roofing.

**APPROVED** 1/14/03 weh

11. 551 Church Street: Robert Eddington/Nodar Construction  
Repair rotten wood as necessary with new matching dimension and profile to include: front steps, porch railing, and stair rail.

**APPROVED** 1/15/03 asc

**C. OLD BUSINESS:**

**030-02/03-CA** 960 Church Street  
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund  
Nature of Project: Request change in setback from previously-approved 10' to new 5' front setback.

**D. NEW BUSINESS:**

**026-02/03 – CA** 118 Ryan Avenue  
Applicant: Dr. Dan McCall, Owner/Bill Baff Landscape, Contractor  
Nature of Project: Construct 18" high brick retaining wall, installed on a reinforced concrete footing inside front property line, as per submitted plans.

**028-02/03 – CA** 121 Macy Place  
Applicant: J. W. Raybon  
Nature of Project: Construct bedroom addition, measuring 12' x 13', as per submitted plans.

**029-02/03-CA** 511 Eslava Street  
Applicant: Albert Hartley  
Nature of Project: Construct covered patio off south side of garage as per submitted plan.  
Construct pergola as per submitted plan.

**031-02/03-CA** 1750 Dauphin Street  
Applicant: Felix and Carolyn Vereen  
Nature of Project: Replace chain link fence gate with iron gates as per submitted photograph  
Replace chain link fence with wooden privacy fence to match existing as per submitted design

**027-02/03-CA** 56 St. Francis Place  
Applicant: TAG/The Architects' Group, architects/Ron Blount, RSA, Owner  
Nature of Project: Demolish existing structure. Incorporate reassembled cast iron façade as a false front on new 8 story parking garage.

**E. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Discussion of Policies and Procedures
2. Discussion of Commission Procedures and Guidelines

**F. ADJOURNMENT**

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

026-02/03 – CA

118 Ryan Avenue

**Applicant:**

Dr. Dan McCall, Owner/Bill Baff Landscape, Contractor

**Received:** 1/06/03

**Meeting Date (s):**

Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/21/03

1) 1/27/03 2) 3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**

Ashland Place Historic District

**Classification:**

Contributing

**Zoning:**

R-1, Residential

**Additional Permits Required:**

**Nature of Project:**

Construct 18” high brick retaining wall, installed on a reinforced concrete footing inside front property line, as per submitted plans.

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Design Review Guidelines*

**Sections**

3

**Topic**

Fences, Walls and Gates

**Description of Work**

Construct 18” high brick retaining wall

**STAFF COMMENTS**

Based on information contained in the Application, in Staff’s judgement:

- A. The Guidelines state that “ fences should compliment the building and not detract from it.”
  - 1. The proposed brick retaining wall will match the brick of the foundation of the main residence.
- B. The Guidelines require “...design, scale and placement...be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
  - 1. The lots along Ryan Avenue are elevated from the sidewalk ranging from 6” to 2’.
  - 2. A number of residences adjacent to this location have retaining walls constructed of brick, stone or a combination of the two.
  - 3. A number of residences utilize landscaping elements such as fig ivy, sod and liriop to retain the soil.
  - 4. The following addresses along Ryan Avenue feature retaining walls as part of the front yard landscaping:
    - 108 Ryan Avenue – brick retaining wall
    - 110 Ryan Avenue – stone retaining wall
    - 114 Ryan Avenue – stone retaining wall
    - 116 Ryan Avenue – brick retaining wall

Staff suggests that the Review Board approve the application as submitted.

## APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – STAFF COMMENTS

**0027-02/03 – CA**      56 St. Francis Street  
**Applicant:**      TAG/The Architects’ Group, architect/Ron Blount, Project Director, RSA, Owner  
**Received:**      1/17/03      **Meeting Date (s):**  
Submission Date + 45 Days:      1/27/03      1) 1/27/03      2)      3)

### INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

**Historic District:**      Lower Dauphin Street Historic District  
**Classification:**      Contributing  
**Zoning:**      B-4: General Business  
**Additional Permits Required:** (1) Demolition  
**Nature of Project:**      Request to alter plans previously granted Concept Approval. Alteration involves change from retaining first 13’ of historic structure to demolition of existing structure and incorporation of reassembled cast iron and masonry façade as a false front on new 8 story parking garage.

### **History of the Project:**

- 17 January 2002, Devereaux Bemis, Anne Crutcher, Buffy Donlon, and Ed Hooker (MHDC representative and ARB staff) met with Markham Smith, Dan Koch, Scott Taricco, and Libby Patrick (the architects for the RSA/Battlehouse Project to discuss a list of concerns of the MHDC. In order of importance, the future of the Coley Building was ranked number one.
- 28 June 2002 – In a follow-up letter from Smith Dalia Architects, Dan Koch addressed this concern with the following response: “... Coley Building on St. Francis Street: We are proposing retaining the Coley Building façade by integrating it into the street level retail space along St. Francis Street. The building will serve as a lobby for the parking deck and rooftop hotel fitness center and will help redefine and respectfully inform the new streetscape”
- 8 July 2002 – A meeting was held on site, attended by Devereaux Bemis, Anne Crutcher, Markham Smith, Dan Koch, and Gene Montezinos, at the Coley Building; the following comments were provided by MHDC staff:
- Keep as much of the roof as possible
  - Step back parking lot building above Coley Building
  - Maintain 2<sup>nd</sup> floor historic fabric to the first floor interior column bay, including doors and frames, window frames, 2 historic fireplaces in rooms facing St. Francis Street, and interior walls.
  - Look at keeping 2<sup>nd</sup> floor line as is with steps down to 2<sup>nd</sup> level parking deck (Headroom at elevator lobby landing may be a problem.)
  - Would like to see dormer windows recreated as a mansard roof.
- 8 July 2002 – Architects Markham Smith, Bob Kock and Gene Montezinos appeared before the ARB specifically requesting Concept Approval on plans for the exterior restoration of the Battlehouse. As a courtesy, preliminary plans for the tower and parking garage were discussed at this time. The Board granted Concept Approval for the exterior restoration plans, with the following understood: “... The Coley Building will remain and will be incorporated into the elevator lobby of the parking garage. It’s mansard roof will be restored and the garage will be stepped back to the south ridge line...” The motion was made by Buffy Donlon, and seconded by Douglas Kearley. David Barr with TAG Architects recused himself from voting on the application.
- 23 July 2002 – Correspondence from Markham Smith of Smith Dalia Architects regarding clarification to meeting minutes. This letter stated the following with regard to the Coley Building: “... Only the first structural bay of the Coley Building is proposed to be retained, not the entire building...”
- 24 July 2002 – ARB staff Ed Hooker responded to correspondence requesting clarification of the term “ structural bay.”

- 13 August 2002 – Correspondence from Markham Smith of Smith Dalia Architects clarifying “structural bay”: “...Currently we plan on retaining all St. Francis Street frontage of the Coley Building up to the first structural bay (free-standing columns), which is approximately 13’-0” from exterior wall to centerline of column structure. The entire building to the north of the first column line will be demolished. We intend on utilizing the ground floor of the Coley Building for the entrance lobby to the new elevator and stair core of the parking deck.” A site plan was attached.
- 27 August 2002 – Correspondence to Markham Smith of Smith Dalia Architects from Devereaux Bemis requesting an explanation of why the Coley Building cannot be retained intact as indicated on the site plan.
- 3 September 2002 – Correspondence from Markham Smith of Smith Dalia Architects – explanation of why the entire building cannot be retained: “...We are saving the first structural bay primarily to retain the St. Francis Street façade and part of the mansard roof; both require restoration and restructuring...” The letter further states “...We intend to instruct the contractor on how to protect and shore up the structure of the Coley Building during demolition and new construction work for the parking deck.”
- 4 December, 2002 – ARB approved demolition plans for the wing of the Battlehouse, and general restoration of the exterior of the Battlehouse.
- 13 January, 2003 – TAG, The Architects’ Group acting on behalf of Ronald J. Blount and the RSA, made application to demolish the Coley Building and reconstruct the cast iron and masonry façade of the Coley Building on the front of the parking garage. The attachment to the application cites the following reasons for this change in plans:
  - A. Reason for wholesale demolition request:
    - 1. instability of the existing structure
    - 2. construction activities at the new garage producing ground vibrations and/or instability at the existing foundations
  - B. Problems with retaining a portion of the building after removal of cast iron façade:
    - 1. cast iron is a combination of decorative and structural elements
    - 2. safe method of shoring up embedded attachments without damaging the surrounding brick has not been found
    - 3. removal of rear portions of the building will result in structural instability

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES, CITY ORDINANCE and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
***Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Design Guidelines***  
***Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts***  
***Article 4, Section 44 Mobile City Code, “Historic Preservation”***  
***Secretary of the Interior’s Standards***

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
1, LDSCD	Demolition	Demolish existing historic structure
10, Mobile City Code	Demolition	

**STAFF COMMENTS**

Based on information contained in the Application, in Staff’s judgement:

Sub-Section 10 of Article IV, Section 44 of Mobile City Code requires the Board to consider the following:

“The Board shall not grant Certificates of Appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historic or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:”

- A. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;**
1. The Coley Building is the only antebellum commercial structure remaining along St. Francis Street between Water and Royal Streets.
  2. The Coley Building is only one of a few remaining cast iron storefronts in the LDSCHD.
  3. The Coley Building is the best example of a commercial structure reflecting the Second Empire design from the 1870s, characterized by the mansard roof, cast iron storefront, and decorative cornice.
- B. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the Historic District, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;**
1. The Coley Building is a contributing structure within the LDSCD
  2. The Coley Building was added to the National Register of Historic Places for its “unusual blend of architectural styles...” and is considered noteworthy for how its “...stylistic mix has resulted in a unique commercial building in which the elements blend interestingly but still retain their clearly distinctive origins.”
  3. The plan to combine the Coley Building with the parking garage, as originally proposed, allowed the retention of the first 13’ of the Coley Building. This would allow the profile of the structure, with its mansard roof, to maintain the historic streetscape.
- C. The difficulty or impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;**
1. The solid masonry structure, along with the unique blend of cast iron structural and decorative elements, would make the replication of this structure cost-prohibitive.
  2. The purpose of the demolition of the Coley Building is to construct a multi-story parking structure at this location. The construction of the new parking facility would not allow for the reconstruction of the Coley Building in its current form on the original site.
- D. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;**
1. The Coley Building is the last remaining late-Federal commercial structure in the block between Water and Royal Streets.
  2. The Coley Building, with its current Second Empire mansard roof and cast iron storefront, is the best remaining structure of this style in Mobile.
- E. 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.**
1. There are plans to place a multi-story parking garage on this site, connected by a bridge to the new RSA tower.
  2. The proposed plans call for the reconstructed Coley Building facade to be applied to the lower part of the proposed parking garage.

**Secretary of the Interior’s Standards – Item 3**

**“Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.”**

Staff recommends denial of the application as submitted.



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

029-02/03 – CA            511 Eslava Street  
Applicant:                Albert Hartley, Owner  
Received:                 1/14/03                                Meeting Date (s):  
 Submission Date + 45 Days: 3/04/03                                1) 1/27/03    2)                                3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District:        Church Street East Historic District  
Classification:         Non- Contributing (New Construction)  
Zoning:                    R-1; Single Family Residential  
Additional Permits Required: (2) Building; Electrical  
Nature of Project:       Construct covered patio off south side of garage. Deck to be constructed at grade, measuring 22’ x 16’-7” constructed of 2x6 treated lumber. Columns to match those existing on carport. Gable roof to tie into existing hip of garage roof, with 1x6 lap siding in exposed gable end. Roofing material to match existing.  
 Construct a 20’ x 7’ – 8”x 10’ high pergola as per submitted plan. Pergola to be constructed of 8x8 posts with 2x12 cornice, with notched 2x10s. Ends of 2x10s to be moulded as per drawing.  
History of the Project: The ODWRB approved this infill construction in July 1999. Staff worked with the applicants to ensure the new construction was compatible with adjacent historic residences. The result was a compatible contemporary bungalow with arts and crafts detailing.

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Design Review Guidelines*

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Accessory Structures	Construct covered deck
3	Accessory Structures	Construct wood pergola

**STAFF COMMENTS**

Based on information contained in the Application, in Staff’s judgement:

1. The addition is located at the rear of the residence; the roof structure and a portion of the cornice will be visible from the street.
  - a. the yard is concealed from public view by a high masonry wall.
2. The design will be compatible with the existing garage structure and will compliment the design and scale of the main residence and garage.
  - a. the columns will match those of the carport
  - b. the roof will be a continuation of the carport roof
3. The pergola will be located at the rear of the residence; the top of the pergola will be visible from Cedar Street.
  - a. the materials of the pergola will match the materials used on the rear porch of the main structure and the carport.

Staff suggests that the Review Board approve the application as submitted.



- C. Based on Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, the residences previously located on the north side of Church Street between Marine and South Broad Street were located in close proximity to the sidewalk. Additionally, the structure previously on the northwest corner of Church and Marine Streets faced Marine Street but had a side setback of 0' on Church Street.
- D. The house type, a Carolina Single House, historically had an average setback of 0'-5'. No such house type exists in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District, but those extant in the DeTonti Square Historic District have an average setback of 14'.
- E. From all information provided, it appears that the earlier houses in this area of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District (pre-1930) were closer to the sidewalk than houses constructed after 1930.

Staff recommends approval of the request as submitted.

-



