

AGENDA
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
March 13, 2006 – 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: K.V. Fordham
Property Address: 654 Marine Street
Date of Approval: 1/21/06 weh
Work Approved: Repair or replace damaged wood with materials matching existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint in existing color scheme.
2. Applicant’s Name: Jo Ann Yarborough/ Caroline Street Contracting
Property Address: 1150 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 1/21/06 asc
Work Approved: Install new weathered wood architectural shingle roof; replace areas of fascia and soffit with new wood to match existing.
3. Applicant’s Name: The Lathan Company
Property Address: 1464 Church Street
Date of Approval: 1/31/06 jss
Work Approved: Repair shingle roof with materials matching existing in material, profile and dimension.
4. Applicant’s Name: The Lathan Company
Property Address: 359 Church Street
Date of Approval: 1/31/06 weh
Work Approved: Repair shingle roof with materials matching existing in material, profile and dimension.
5. Applicant’s Name: Robert E. Gibney
Property Address: 1006 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 2/1/06 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary on fascia and front porch with new materials to match existing in profile, materials and dimension. Repaint building in the existing color scheme.
6. Applicant’s Name: Ralph Reynolds Roofing
Property Address: 1316 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 2/1/06 asc
Work Approved: Install new roof using 3 tab charcoal shingles to match existing.

7. Applicant's Name: Roger Muller
Property Address: 1556 Bruister
Date of Approval: 2/2/06 weh
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials matching existing in profile, dimension and materials. Repaint in the following color scheme:
Body – Ruskin Room Green SW0042
Trim – Classic Light Buff SW 0050
Door and window accent – deep eggplant/black
Porch floor – light gray
Porch ceiling – robin's egg blue
Lattice on infill – black or buff
Remove paint on brick columns & return to original brick.
8. Applicant's Name: AmSouth Bank
Property Address: 31 North Royal Street
Date of Approval: 2/2/06 jss
Work Approved: Re-roof with materials matching existing in profile, dimension and material.
9. Applicant's Name: Dorothy Taldon
Property Address: 1252 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 2/2/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof with gray 3 tab fiberglass shingles. Replace rotten wood as necessary with materials to match existing in materials, profile and dimension. Repaint building: body – sage green, trim – white (or in existing color scheme.)
10. Applicant's Name: Hot Diggity Dog
Property Address: 153 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 2/2/06 jdb
Work Approved: Prepare for painting and repaint building trim currently painted in the existing color scheme.
11. Applicant's Name: Paul Diaz
Property Address: 358 Michigan Avenue
Date of Approval: 2/3/06 weh
Work Approved: Repaint building in existing color scheme (body to match existing and trim to be Classical white.) replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile, dimension and material.
12. Applicant's Name: Harold Gerhardt
Property Address: 1208 New St. Francis Street
Date of Approval: 2/6/06 weh
Work Approved: Repaint house in the following color scheme:
Body – Wet Concrete
Trim – Cloud White

13. Applicant's Name: Mr. and Mrs. Marvin Fairley
Property Address: 1010 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 2/6/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof entire house with materials to match existing in color, profile and dimension.
14. Applicant's Name: Caroline Presley/Rose McPhillips
Property Address: 60 South Conception Street
Date of Approval: 2/7/06 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building with architectural shingles, dark brown in color to match existing.
15. Applicant's Name: Warren Butler
Property Address: 114 Lainer Avenue
Date of Approval: 2/7/06 weh
Work Approved: Replace storm damaged fence.
16. Applicant's Name: ACO Employment/Wrico Signs
Property Address: 9 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 2/8/06 weh
Work Approved: Install double faced sign measuring 3' x 4', or 24 square feet, as per submitted design.
17. Applicant's Name: Weather Guard Metal Roofing
Property Address: 1219 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: 2/8/06 jss
Work Approved: Re-roof building with galvalume, 26 gauge standing seam metal roof. Color to match existing.
18. Applicant's Name: Reynolds Roofing Co/ Mrs. Alva H. Whiddon
Property Address: 557 Church Street
Date of Approval: 2/8/06 jss
Work Approved: Repair roof with materials to match existing in profile, dimension, materials & color.
19. Applicant's Name: Coulson Roofing Co.
Property Address: 71 North Reed Avenue
Date of Approval: 2/9/06 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building with architectural shingles, pewter in color.
20. Applicant's Name: Hot Diggity Dogs
Property Address: 153 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 2/10/06 asc
Work Approved: Install MDO double face projecting sign 36" x 27", totaling 13.5 sq. ft. Colors to be red, blue, and yellow as per submitted drawing.
21. Applicant's Name: Willie Lucky
Property Address: 262 Marine Street
Date Approved: 2/13/06 jdb
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab shingles, black in color.

22. Applicant's Name: J. Maintenance and Contracting
Property Address: 1508 Eslava Street
Date Approved: 2/13/06 jss
Work Approved: Replace rotten fascia on main house with materials to match existing materials in profile and dimension. Re-roof back building with 3 tab shingles to match existing in profile, dimension and color.
23. Applicant's Name: Bobby Gipson
Property Address: 504 Eslava Street
Date Approved: 2/14/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with dimensional shingles, black in color.
24. Applicant's Name: Universal Glass
Property Address: 157 Dauphin Street
Date Approved: 2/14/06 weh
Work Approved: Replace damaged glass front door with glass door matching existing in materials, profile and dimension.
25. Applicant's Name: O. C. Wiggins
Property Address: 112 South Georgia Avenue
Date Approved: 2/14/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof with 3 tab asphalt shingles, black in color.
26. Applicant's Name: Richard Dorman
Property Address: 6 North Jackson Street
Date Approved: 2/14/06 asc
Work Approved: Re-glaze existing windows. Replace rotten window sills with new wood to match existing in profile, dimension, and material. Paint doors and windows to match existing color scheme.
27. Applicant's Name: Bill Finch
Property Address: 1106 Savannah Street
Date Approved: 2/17/06 weh
Work Approved: Replace front porch flooring with materials matching existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint porch to match existing color scheme. Touch-up painting as necessary on exterior elevations.
28. Applicant's Name: Oakland and Kelly McCulloch
Property Address: 58 North Monterey Street
Date Approved: 2/17/06 km
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Reglaze windows. Repaint house: colors to be submitted later. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
29. Applicant's Name: Len Stemman
Property Address: 160 Dexter Avenue
Date Approved: 2/20/06 weh
Work Approved: Add additional gravel to existing gravel drive as necessary.

30. Applicant's Name: Mobile Public Library/ Holmes & Holmes, Architects
Property Address: 701 Government Street
Date Approved: 2/21/06 weh
Work Approved: Repaint existing steel casement windows dark green in color. Paint existing wood doors bronze. Paint building to match color of new pre-cast concrete panels.
31. Applicant's Name: Christ Church Cathedral/Holmes & Holmes, Architects
Property Address: 115 St. Emanuel Street
Date Approved: 2/21/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof sanctuary with new built-up roof with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Re-roof Rectory & Chapter House with new asphalt shingles to match existing in color, profile and dimension.
32. Applicant's Name: Christ Church Cathedral/ Holmes & Holmes Arch.
Property Address: 115 St. Emanuel Street
Date Approved: 2/21/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof sanctuary with new built-up roof with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Re-roof Rectory and Chapter House with new asphalt shingles to match existing in color, profile and dimension.
33. Applicant's Name: Kendow Roofing
Property Address: 1701 Springhill Avenue
Date Approved: 2/21/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with materials to match existing. (3-tab shingles, brown wood in color)
34. Applicant's Name: S. Adam Davis
Property Address: 1119 Church Street
Date Approved: 2/21/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof with architectural shingles, charcoal in color.
35. Applicant's Name: A&A Roofing
Property Address: 1130 Montauk Avenue
Date Approved: 2/21/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and color.
36. Applicant's Name: Sillings Construction Co.
Property Address: 1660 Old Shell Road
Date Approved: 2/21/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with dimensional shingles, gray in color.
37. Applicant's Name: Thelma Collins
Property Address: 607 St. Francis Street
Date Approved: 2/22/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab onyx black shingles.

38. Applicant's Name: Juanita Owens/ Caldwell & Osborn
 Property Address: 112 Garnet
 Date Approved: 2/23/06 asc
 Work Approved: Install new timberline black shingle roof.
39. Applicant's Name: Pete's Home Improvements
 Property Address: 60 Houston Street
 Date Approved: 2/24/06 weh
 Work Approved: Repair foundation with existing materials to match existing where necessary.
40. Applicant's Name: Graham Roofing
 Property Address: 1756 New St. Francis Street
 Date Approved: 3/1/06 weh
 Work Approved: Re-roof with 3 tab shingles, black to match existing.
41. Applicant's Name: Presley Roofing
 Property Address: 50 St. Emanuel Street
 Date Approved: 3/1/06 weh
 Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, weathered wood in color.

C. OLD BUSINESS:

1. **033-05/06-CA** 50 St. Emanuel Street
 Applicant: Tilmon Brown, Contractor
 Nature of Request: Construct balcony as per submitted plans.

D. NEW BUSINESS:

1. **034-05/06-CA** 7 North Royal Street
 Applicant: Lyons, Pipes & Cook/TAG Architects
 Nature of Request: Modifications to existing buildings as per submitted plans.
2. **035-05/06-CA** 211 Michigan Avenue
 Applicant: Ora & Teri Raines
 Nature of Request: After the fact approval of a roofing system over an existing rear deck, as per submitted photographs.
3. **036-05/06-CA** 1104 Old Shell Road
 Applicant: Mobile Revolving Fund
 Nature of Request: Rehabilitate historic structure as per submitted plans. Construct rear addition.
4. **037-05/06-CA** 6 North Jackson Street
 Applicant: Richard Dorman
 Nature of Request: Replace main entry door with new wood & glass mahogany door to match existing in size. Replace four existing fixed doors with new raised panel mahogany doors to fit existing openings. Paint existing door surround & replace hardware.

5. **038-05/06-CA** 1601 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Cunningham Bounds Crowder Brown & Breedlove
Nature of Request: Remove existing cedar shutters and replace with aluminum hurricane-rated shutters as per submitted information.
6. **039-05/06-CA** Flo-Claire Gatehouse, McDonald Avenue at Government Street
Applicant: Flo-Claire Neighborhood Association
Nature of Request: Install neighborhood signage to match original signage as per submitted photograph.
7. **040-05/06-CA** 1070 Government Street
Applicant: Vaughan and Linda Drinkard
Nature of Request: Erection of a metal fence around the front and side of residence as per submitted site plan and design.
8. **041-05/06-CA** 211 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. Sumner Adams/Lucy Barr Designs
Nature of Request: One story addition to right side, two story addition to rear as per submitted design.
9. **042-05/06-CA** 1510 Government Street
Applicant: Starbucks/ Clark Geer Latham & Associates
Nature of Request: Construct new free-standing restaurant as per submitted plans.
10. **043-05/06-CA** 72 South Royal Street
Applicant: David Rasp
Nature of Request: Renovate building for use as a bar/restaurant as per submitted plans.
11. **044-05/06-CA** 200 South Ann Street
Applicant: Bob and Carol Carmack
Nature of Request: Install metal roofing on residence as per submitted sample.
12. **045-05/06-CA** 203 South Warren Street
Applicant: David McDonald
Nature of Request: Enclose existing rear porch as per submitted plans;
Construct new rear porch as per submitted plans.

E. OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. **National Alliance of Preservation Commissions Trip to Baltimore
July 27-30, 2006**
2. **306 Marine Street Update**

F. ADJOURNMENT

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

033-05/06-CA 50 St. Emanuel Street
Applicant: Peter F. Burns, Owner/Tilmon Brown, Contractor
Received: 3/2/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/15/06 1) 2/13/06 2) 3/13/06 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (de-certified)
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Nature of Project: Construct balcony as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

1. The ca. 1850 two story masonry building was considered non-contributing due to unsympathetic alterations over time.
2. There are actually two historic buildings with different second floor window heights, different cornice lines, and roof.
3. The 1904 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows that originally the corner building had a balcony, but there was no balcony on the Conti Street elevation of the back building.
4. The original balcony had a shorter run down Conti Street than the one proposed.
5. The proposed balcony is designed in two sections, respecting the fact that there are two separate buildings.
6. The balcony on the front building, at the corner of St. Emanuel and Conti Streets, is more classical in design.
7. The balcony on the front building features 4” cast pipe columns approximately 15’-6” in height with Lawler #6008 and #6009 decorative column wrap and capital.
8. The balustrade is constructed using square pickets spaced at 4” on center, with Lawler decorative element # 9604 spaced between six pickets, or 28” on center.
9. Due to the location on the sidewalk of existing utilities, column spacing along Conti Street cannot be uniform.
10. In order to alleviate the long span between the third and forth columns from the corner, decorative corner brackets and a center scroll have been proposed (King Metals # 13-61-2).
11. The balcony on the rear building, along Conti Street, is proposed to be constructed of new design elements, and is similar in design to the balcony approved and constructed on the Port City Brewery Building on Dauphin at Joachim Street.

12. Design elements for the rear balcony include 4" square tube columns with Lawler #8398 bases; horizontal stainless steel cables spaced at 4" on center stretched between 2" x 2" square tube vertical pickets; and 2" x 2" tube steel quarter moon brackets.
13. Plans call for three new doors where there are currently existing original historic windows, all located on the Conti Street elevation.
14. While plans call for doors opening onto the proposed balcony, no information was provided regarding these doors, which will be made from existing original historic window openings.
15. The Board should request more information on how the alteration of existing original historic windows will effect the character of the building.

Staff recommends approval of the application with the condition that additional information be provided regarding the alteration of windows to doors to allow egress onto the balcony.

14. The applicants are proposing to apply a stucco finish coat to the north elevation to protect the soft brick.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

035-05/06-CA 211 Michigan Avenue
Applicant: Ora and Teri Raines
Received: 2/16/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/3/06 1) 3/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: After-the-fact approval of a roofing system over an existing rear deck, as per submitted photographs.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

1. The ca. 1899 Gass House is a contributing structure within the Leinkauf Historic District.
2. The applicants are requesting permission to continue work on a roof system over an existing rear deck.
3. The deck in question was approved by the ARB in 1994.
4. The deck in question is located on the northeast corner of the residence, and is barely visible from either Michigan Avenue or Elmira Street.
5. A Stop Work Order was placed on the property due to the fact that the owners began construction of the roof system without a Certificate of Appropriateness or a building permit.
6. A number of later additions with various roof types are constructed at the rear of the subject structure.
7. The roof of the porch cover is a hipped roof.
8. The addition of a roof on an existing deck will transform an open deck essentially into a porch.
9. In the past, the Board has denied such actions unless the addition of extra detailing incorporates all aspects of a true porch – i.e. columns, balustrade, finished ceiling, etc.
10. 4x4 wood posts have been affixed to the top of existing porch newels to support the new roof system.
11. Typically, a continuous column that is integral with the porch railing system is used to support a porch roof system.

Staff recommends approval of the application with the following conditions:
That the design incorporate true columns similar to those on the front porch.
That the ceiling be of a finished material, (beadboard or similar)
That the porch cornice, soffit & fascia match that of the main house.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

036-05/06-CA 1104 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Mobile Revolving Fund
Received: 2/3/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 3/20/06 1) 2/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Additions to rear of structure as per submitted plan. Addition to measure 12' x 21'-4".

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

1. The subject structure is a one story frame L-shaped structure with a recessed front porch under the main roof.
2. The subject structure was declared unsafe by Mobile City Council in 2002 after it was determined that the owners had died, leaving no heirs.
3. The property was acquired by the Mobile Revolving Fund in 2004.
4. The subject lot measures approximately 42' x 74'.
5. The proposed rear addition measures 12' x 21'-4".
6. There are no issues concerning setbacks or lot coverage.
7. An existing deteriorated enclosed rear porch is to be removed,
8. This area will be reconstructed to resemble a porch enclosed with tempered glass panels, and will serve as a connector to the proposed addition.
9. A covered stoop is proposed for the west elevation.
10. Proposed foundation materials are brick piers to match those existing on the historic structure.
11. Both the existing foundation and the addition foundation to have new framed lattice panels between piers.
12. Proposed siding is wood lap siding to match that existing on the historic structure.
13. Proposed windows are two-over-two wood double hung, putty glazed with true divided lites to match existing on the historic structure.
14. The applicants are proposing to re-roof the entire structure in GAF Timberline architectural grade shingles, slate gray in color.
15. A 6' high wood privacy fence with cap is proposed to enclose the rear yard as shown on the site plan.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

037-05/06-CA 6 North Jackson Street
Applicant: Richard Dorman/ David T. McConnell
Received: 2/21/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/7/06 1) 3/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Nature of Project: Replace main entry door with new wood & glass mahogany door to match existing in size. Replace four existing fixed doors with new raised panel mahogany doors to fit existing openings. Paint existing door surround & replace hardware.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

1. The first floor of the subject structure was constructed ca. 1845; the second and third floors were constructed in 1994. The current structure is a two and one-half story masonry structure with end gable parapet walls.
2. The subject structure is a non-contributing structure within the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District.
3. The existing painted pine entry door in question is not original to the subject structure nor is it historic.
4. The proposed replacement door is to be made out of mahogany, and will match the existing door in profile and dimension.
5. The central storefront consists of four fixed wood doors with four panes above flat panels.
6. The existing storefront in question is not original to the subject structure nor is it historic.
7. The proposed replacement wood doors are to be made out of mahogany, and will have four panes above raised panels.
8. All new doors will be finished with 3 coats of urethane.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

038-05/06-CA 1601 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Cunningham Bounds Crowder, Brown & Breedlove
Received: 2/21/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/7/06 1) 3/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (new construction)
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Remove 58 pair of cedar shutters & replace them with 66 pair of aluminum hurricane-rated shutters as per submitted information.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the proposed work does not comply with the Design Review Guidelines and could impair the historic integrity of the district. The building itself would not be impaired as it is not a historic building.

- A. The Design Review Guidelines state that “Blinds and shutters should be sized to fit the reveal of the window opening precisely.”
1. The subject structure is non-contributing to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District due to its age.
 2. The wings of the subject structure were added around 1985.
 3. The applicant is requesting to remove wood shutters and replace them with aluminum shutters with fixed louvers.
 4. A sample pair of shutters has been installed on the south side of the east wing of the subject structure.
 5. The sample shutters do not fit within the brick window opening, but rather are mounted on the outside of the window opening and close over the opening.
 6. Traditional shutters are designed to fit within the window opening.
 7. Due to the way the replacement shutters are hung, they must be longer and wider than traditional wood shutters.
 8. The detailing of the proposed aluminum shutter is dissimilar to wood shutters in design in that the louvers are fixed and there is no vertical bar simulating the operable louvers.
 9. The louvers are fixed in place, are too large, and the open space between them resembles a vent in design rather than a shutter.

While Staff is not opposed to synthetic shutters, the consensus is that the proposed shutter does not replicate the look and feel of real wood shutters well enough to be used for this application. Staff recommends that these particular type of shutters be denied, but encourages the applicant to continue searching for an appropriate shutter out of an alternative material.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

039-05/06-CA Flo-Claire Entrance Gates, Intersection of McDonald Avenue & Government St.
Applicant: Flo-Claire Neighborhood Association
Received: 2/21/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/7/06 1) 3/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: N/A
Nature of Project: Install neighborhood signage to match original signage as per submitted photograph.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the district.

1. The Flo-Claire entrance gate houses were constructed ca. 1908 to define the entry to the subdivision.
2. When originally constructed, a sign spelling FLO-CLAIRE stretched between the interior columns of the sign. Also, at secondary entrances to the neighborhood at West Street & Government Street, white columns with the letters spelling FLO-CLAIRE were constructed.
3. Over time, this sign and these letters were removed.
4. The applicants have provided a photograph showing the signage as originally constructed.
5. The applicants are requesting to re-install a sign spelling FLO-CLAIRE at the main entrance of the neighborhood.
6. The letters will be cast aluminum 12"-14" wide by the width of the space between the columns.
7. The applicants are requesting to re-install lettering on the columns at secondary streets of marking the entrances to the neighborhood.
8. The letters will be cast aluminum 12"-14" high, installed in a vertical format.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

040-05/06-CA 1070 Government Street
Applicant: Vaughan & Linda Drinkard
Received: 3/01/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/14/06 1) 3/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-2, General Business
Nature of Project: Install metal fence and gates as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Fences, Walls & Gates	Install 5' fence

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

- A. The Guidelines state that “These should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
1. The Piser House is a ca. 1903 two and one-half story brick structure combining the Queen Anne and half-timbering styles of architecture.
 2. The subject structure is located on the northeast corner of Government and South Hallett Streets.
 3. The subject structure is a contributing structure within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
 4. The proposed fence is 4'-9" high with 5' high end and intermediate posts, painted black.
 5. There are 5 gates:
 - 3' wide gate on the west property line
 - Double leaf 3' gate (6' total) along the south property line at front of structure
 - Double leaf 7' gate (14' total) along east property line (at parking area)
 - 12' electric sliding gate at driveway
 - double leaf 8' gate (16' total) at east end of property on south elevation
 6. The proposed fence matches the fence installed around the law offices of Gardner & Middlebrooks, at the corner of Government and Roper Streets.
 7. The proposed fence will not impair the integrity of the structure or the district.

Staff recommends approval of the request as submitted.

11. Exterior walls of the proposed two story rear addition are to be stucco painted to match the existing historic exterior walls.
12. Windows in the proposed two story rear addition are to be wood, double hung nine-over-fifteen lite.
13. A pair of wood French doors with arched transom above allows access from the family room to the porch.
14. Floor height in the proposed two story rear addition will match that of the main house.
15. Ceiling height of the family room in the proposed two story rear addition will be 12’.
16. Ceiling height of the porch in the proposed two story rear addition will be 16’-4”.
17. Five arches, three on the west elevation and one each on the north and south elevation replicate the arches found on the main façade of the subject structure.
18. A hipped roof covered in barrel-style tile is proposed to be tied into the existing historic roof.
19. The ridge line of the addition is not to exceed that of the existing historic roof.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Guidelines for New Commercial and Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Design Standards for New Construction	Construct new restaurant
3,I	Placement and Orientation	
3,II	Massing and Scale	
3,III	Façade Elements	
3,IV	Materials and Ornamentation	
3, IV, A	Appropriate Materials for New Residential Construction	

3,I

- I. Placement and Orientation:** The guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
- A. Setbacks in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings such as the Shoppes of Midtown with a large setback.
 - B. The proposed setback is approximately 100' with one row of parking and drive-thru circulation toward Government Street.
 - C. Other fast food restaurants on Government Street, such as Wendy's, Taco Bell, Arby's and McDonald's all have a minimum setback from the sidewalk and have no front yard parking. All parking is contained within the side and rear of the lots at these locations.

3,II

II. Massing and Scale:

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. There are multiple examples of small scale commercial structures in the Historic Districts.
 - 2. The proposed building is a 1 story frame, stucco and brick veneer structure.
- B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. There are no other historic commercial buildings within this block.
 - 2. Adjacent commercial buildings have a slab-on-grade foundation.
 - 3. The proposed foundation is concrete slab-on-grade.
- C. The guidelines state that new construction should consider roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings.
 - 1. A variety of commercial roof shapes exist in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District, but the most common are flat roofs behind a parapet.

3, III

III. Façade Elements:

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. The use of clear glass in bronze anodized frames is a common design element found in new construction throughout the Historic Districts and will match those of the Shoppes of Midtown.

2. The use of a brick veneer water table and a stone moulding, along with a moulded cornice at the parapet add interest to the building.
3. Pilasters with a 1 ½” projection help break up the building massing.
4. The use of 16” square decorative medallions at the pilasters adds visual interest.

3, IV

IV. **Materials and Ornamentation:**

- A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
 1. There are a number of commercial brick veneer structures in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
- B. The guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found in the design of nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
 1. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

V. **Signage:**

- A. A monument sign is proposed to be placed along the sidewalk fronting Government Street.
- B. No additional information was provided regarding size, materials, lighting etc.
- C. Building signage is depicted on the Government Street elevation.
- D. The signage scales to 40 square feet.
- E. No additional information was provided regarding materials, lighting, etc.
- F. The total allowable signage for the site is 64 square feet.

VI. **Landscaping:**

- A. Two live oak trees are proposed to be placed to the north of the sidewalk as per the City of Mobile’s Landscape Ordinance.
- B. A three foot high solid hedge is proposed to screen front yard parking from Government Street.
- C. A complete landscaping plan should be submitted.

Staff recommends approval of the application with the following conditions:

1. That the parking spaces be removed from in front of the building.
2. Require that all trees be 4” trees to fall under the Tree Ordinance for maintenance purposes.
3. A complete signage package should be submitted.
4. A complete lighting package should be submitted.
5. A complete landscaping package should be submitted.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

043-05/06-CA 72 South Royal Street
Applicant: David Rasp
Received: 3/01/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/14/06 1) 3/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (condition)
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Nature of Project: Renovate building for use as a bar/restaurant as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District Guidelines

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district. The subject building falls under Building Condition 3 – Original Design Significantly Altered due to the fact the that the original design is not discernable; most elements have been removed or changed.

1. The Sentinel Bonding Co. Building is a non-contributing one story masonry structure within the Church Street East Historic District.
2. The subject structure appears on the 1925 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map.
3. The subject lot measures approximately 118’ x approximately 26’.
4. The subject building measures approximately 67.46’ x approximately 26’.
5. The subject structure currently has a painted plywood front façade.
6. The existing storefront includes small plate glass windows on either side of a single recessed entry.
7. The proposed new entry is designed using modern polished chrome storefront with tempered green glass.
8. A canopy created by a series of three pyramid-shaped elements is constructed of tempered frosted wire glass and aluminum, and is to be lit internally.
9. The canopy will extend from the front face of the building out 5’ above the sidewalk.
10. Due to the loss of the building to the south of the subject building, the south wall of the subject building is now visible.
11. The applicants are proposing to apply a stucco finish coat to the south elevation to provide a uniform appearance for the south elevation.
12. A 5’ high stucco-covered wall is proposed for the south property boundary to create an enclosed courtyard for dining.
13. An 8’ high stucco-covered wall is proposed for the west property line.
14. There is no transition between the 5’ and 8’ wall.
15. This courtyard dining area will be highly visible from both Government and Royal Streets.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

Staff further recommends, from a design standpoint, that the applicant may wish to install a vertical divider in the proposed transom over the double entry doors to maintain the verticality of the proposed façade.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

044-05/06-CA 200 South Ann Street
Applicant: Bob and Carol Carmack
Received: 3/01/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/14/06 1) 3/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Install metal roof on residence as per submitted sample.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Roofs	Re-roof with metal roofing

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work does not comply with the Design Review Guidelines and will impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

- A. The Guidelines state that “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch, should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
1. The subject structure is a one and one-half story wood frame with a predominant end gable facing Ann Street and cross gable facing Selma Street.
 2. The house, constructed between 1910 and 1925, features Tudor Revival-style detailing.
 3. The subject structure is located on the southwest corner of South Ann and Selma Streets.
 4. The existing roof is a diamond asbestos shingle.
 5. The proposed roof is a steel sheet, charcoal gray in color.
 6. Historically, houses of this type in Mobile were constructed with either wood shakes or asbestos tile roofs.
 7. Historically, houses of this type in Mobile were not constructed with metal roofs.
 8. Due to the configuration of the roof, and the location of the subject structure on the corner, the roofing material will be highly visible from public view.
 9. The use of a steel panel roof would greatly change the architectural character of the residence.

Staff recommends denial of the application as submitted. Staff further recommends that the Board consider approving a metal shingle or an architectural-grade asphalt shingle.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

045-05/06-CA 203 South Warren Street
Applicant: David McDonald
Received: 3/6/06 Meeting Date (s):
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/19/06 1) 3/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: ontributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Enclose rear porch as per submitted plans. Construct new rear porch as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Porches	Enclose existing rear porch Construct new rear porch

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district.

- A. The Guidelines state that "The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period... When rear and side porches are to be enclosed, one recommended method is to preserve the original configuration of columns, handrails and other important architectural features."
- 1. The ca. 1866 Taber House is a one and a half story wood frame residence with Greek Revival styling.
- 2. A one story service wing is located at the rear of the main residence.
- 3. This wing is smaller in scale and closer to the ground than the main residence.
- 4. There is a 3 bay inset porch on the south elevation of the rear wing.
- 5. The applicants are requesting to enclose this porch, utilizing the existing columns and railing system to retain the appearance of a porch.
- 6. The applicants are proposing to install louvered wood blinds as sheathing between the columns.
- 7. A new porch is proposed for the east and south elevations of the main residence.
- 8. The new porch elements (columns, railing, roof) will match that of the existing porch.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.