

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

February 9, 2004 – 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: Grover Durrant  
Property Address: 259 S. Georgia Avenue  
Date of Approval: January 13, 2004 asc  
Work Approved: Repair rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
2. Applicant's Name: Charles Martin  
Property Address: 1011 Selma Street  
Date of Approval: January 13, 2004 asc  
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new wood matching existing in profile and dimension. Remove front metal awning. Paint house. (Paint colors to be submitted later.)
3. Applicant's Name: Thomas Roofing  
Property Address: 206 Government Street  
Date of Approval: January 13, 2004 asc  
Work Approved: Repair flat roof as necessary.
4. Applicant's Name: Steve Miller  
Property Address: 209 S. Georgia Avenue  
Date of Approval: January 13, 2004 asc  
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint house in the existing color scheme.
5. Applicant's Name: Fauver House Movers for Elizabeth Smith  
Property Address: 202 Roper Street  
Date of Approval: January 13, 2004 weh  
Work Approved: Level foundation from under the house. No work will be visible from exterior view.

6. Applicant's Name: Hicks Stewart LLC  
Property Address: 1206 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: January 21, 2004 asc January 30, 2004  
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with new to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint house in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:  
Body: Veranda SW2057  
Trim: Casa Blanca SW 2060  
Shutters and porch: Rookwood Shutter Green SW2809
7. Applicant's Name: Delta Builders, Inc.  
Property Address: 120 Espejo  
Date of Approval: January 30, 2004 asc  
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with new wood to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
8. Applicant's Name: Loretta Sanders  
Property Address: 1000 Selma Street  
Date of Approval: January 22, 2004 weh  
Work Approved: Repair or replace damaged wood siding with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing. Re-roof brick shed at rear of property.
9. Applicant's Name: Bettye Jackson  
Property Address: 50 LeMoyne Place  
Date of Approval: January 22, 2004 asc  
Work Approved: Repair to rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in profile and dimension; paint in the following Behr colors: 370E-1, Country Dairy; trim-white; deck and steps-color to match existing color.
10. Applicant's Name: Margaret Donald/Contractors of Today  
Property Address: 1560 Luling Street  
Date of Approval: January 23, 2004 weh  
Work Approved: Repair or replace rotten wood with new materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
11. Applicant's Name: Marion Hartley/Contractors of Today  
Property Address: 206 Roper Street  
Date of Approval: January 23, 3004 weh

- Work Approved: Repair or replace rotten wood with new materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
12. Applicant's Name: Kim Muse  
Property Address: 101 S. Lafayette  
Date of Approval: January 23, 2004 weh  
Work Approved: Repaint house in the following BLP color scheme:  
Body: Dauphin Street Light Gold  
Trim: DeTonti Square Off White  
Accent (steps and foundation infill): Savannah Street Dark Brown
13. Applicant's Name: Betty Shinn  
Property Address: 36 McPhillips  
Date of Approval: January 23, 2004 asc  
Work Approved: Repaint house in existing color scheme.
14. Applicant's Name: Todd Henson  
Property Address: 211 Dexter  
Date of Approval: January 26, 2004 weh  
Work Approved: Repaint house in the following Olympic color scheme:  
Body: Pollen  
Trim: White  
Porch floor and rails: Bellingrath green  
Porch Ceiling: Robin's egg blue
15. Applicant's Name: Lee Hale  
Property Address: 501 Church Street  
Date of Approval: January 26, 2004 jdb  
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new matching existing in profile and dimension. Repaint house as necessary in the existing color scheme.

**C. OLD BUSINESS:**

1. 017-02/03-CA Retirement Systems of Alabama/Smith Dalia Architects  
Property Address: 8 North Royal Street  
Nature of Request:

**D. NEW BUSINESS:**

1.     **043-03/04-CA**     1417 Brown Street  
Applicant:           Larry McKinstry  
Nature of Project:   Install 3' wood balustraded fence as per submitted drawing.
  
2.     **044-03/04-CA**     303 Rapier Avenue  
Applicant:           Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund/Douglas Kearley,  
                          Architect  
Nature of Project:   Install 6' wood privacy fence as per submitted drawing.
  
3.     **045-03/04-CA**     108 Levert Avenue  
Applicant:           Tim and Donna Goodwin/ Pete J. Vallas, Architect  
Nature of Project:   Construct side and rear addition as per submitted plans.

**E. OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**F. ADJOURNMENT**

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

**017-02/03 – CA**            8 North Royal Street/ Battlehouse Hotel, RSA Tower  
**Applicant:**                Smith Dalia, Architects  
**Received:**                 1/26/04                        **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:** 3/11/04                        1) 12/04/02    2) 2/09/04                        3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District  
**Classification:**         Contributing  
**Zoning:**                    B-4, General Business  
**Additional Permits Required:** (6) Demolition, Building, Electrical, Plumbing, HVAC, Right-of-Way  
**Nature of Project:**     Install new storefronts based on historic precedent; install balcony at second floor level based on historic precedent; construct new arbor at the 8<sup>th</sup> floor level.  
Rehabilitate historic Battle House hotel façade and storefront system as per submitted plans.

**History of Project:**    This application was first reviewed by the Board in July 2002. The applicants’ appearance before the Board at that time was more for informational purposes than requesting approval for proposed work. A copy of the Board’s comments to the applicants is attached for review. This current application is requesting approval for selective demolition in order to begin restoration of the main building and construction of the new tower. Due to the fact that this application overlaps the old and new formats, this staff analysis will be a hybrid of the two.

The latest submission is a request for approval to reconstruct storefronts, install balconies at the second floor level, and level 8 arbor facing Royal Street. While the plans include information about the St. Francis Street bridge at level 3, the transmittal letter states that the bridge is undergoing “value added engineering”. Therefore, at this stage staff did not prepare a review of the bridge design. In addition, sections through the bridge were omitted from the plans provided. The Board may wish to require a rendering given the unique curve and materials of the bridge.

The transmittal letter also notes that the Coley Building, parking garage and signage will be handled separately.

Staff Comments 017-02/03-CA (first review) and the Certified Record from the ARB meeting are included as Attachments 1 and 2.

**Additional Information:**  
One set of full-scale drawings will be available for review prior to and at the Review Board meeting.

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**

**Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts  
Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Design Guidelines**

<b><u>Sections</u></b>	<b><u>Topic</u></b>	<b><u>Description of Work</u></b>
4,C	Building Condition Example 2 Original Design Slightly Altered	Rehabilitate existing facades Add balconies at the second floor level Construct roof top arbor at 8 <sup>th</sup> level

**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 COMMENTS**

- A. The Guidelines stat that “When considering work on a downtown building, respect of the original design character of the building is of utmost importance.”

Work Item 1 - Storefronts

1. The existing storefronts date from a ca. 1949 rehabilitation.
2. The proposed storefront design is based on historic photographs taken in the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.
3. The proposed restoration and will consist of a flood-proof bulkhead, storefront with operable and fixed casements, and an art glass in lead comes triple transom.

Work Item - Exterior Doors

1. The proposed exterior doors are four panel with glazing.
2. Either solid pane and doors with the bottom line of the bottom panels lining up with the adjacent fixed glazing would create a more compatible design.
3. Beveled glass would also help achieve compatibility.

Work Item 3 – Extension of Second Floor Balcony

1. A historic photo taken in the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century shows the second floor balcony extending the full width of the building.
2. The proposed balcony replacement replicates this design element.

Work Item 3 – Roof Top Arbor at 8<sup>th</sup> Floor

1. A historic photo taken in the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century shows a very substantial wood and masonry arbor, an original design feature of the building.

2. The proposed arbor is a modern interpretation of the original.
3. The proposed arbor is lightweight in design, and is constructed of composite recycled plastic wood supported by steel columns.
4. The proposed arbor in no way relates to the original in terms of massing, scale or materials.

Staff suggests that the Review Board grant Approval for the application as submitted to allow the applicants continue exterior work.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
STAFF COMMENTS**

**043-03/04 – CA**            1417 Brown Street  
**Applicant:**                Larry McKinstry  
**Received:**                 1/16/04                     **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**    3/01/04                    1) 2/9/04                2)                                3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Old Dauphin Way Historic District  
**Classification:**        Contributing  
**Zoning:**                    R-1 Single Family Residential  
**Additional Permits Required:** (1) Fence  
**Nature of Project:**        Install 3’ wood balustraded fence as per submitted drawing.

Wood fence to run across front property line at sidewalk, turn and die into the east and west corners of the residence as demarcated on site plan.

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

<b><u>Sections</u></b>	<b><u>Topic</u></b>	<b><u>Description of Work</u></b>
3	Fences, Walls and Gates	Install wood balustraded 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**

- A. The Guidelines state that “These 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. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally limited to six feet…”
  - 1. The main structure is a one story frame residence with late Victorian detailing.
  - 2. The proposed fence material replicates a late Victorian porch balustrade.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.



**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
STAFF COMMENTS**

**044-03/04 – CA**            303 Rapier Avenue  
**Applicant:**            Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund, Douglas Kearley Architect  
**Received:**            1/16/04                    **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**    3/01/04                    1) 2/9/04                    2)                    3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Oakleigh Garden Historic District  
**Classification:**        Contributing  
**Zoning:**                R-1 Single Family Residential  
**Additional Permits Required:** (1) Fence  
**Nature of Project:**        Install 6’ wood privacy fence as per submitted drawing.

Wood fence to begin at rear of existing house, with a pair of 6’ gates at the driveway, then turn east and run along the property line to the southeast corner of the property line, then turn north and run a distance of 52.42’ across the rear property line, then turn west and run along property line a distance of approximately 100’, then turn and die into house, as per submitted site plan.

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

<b><u>Sections</u></b>	<b><u>Topic</u></b>	<b><u>Description of Work</u></b>
3	Fences, Walls and Gates	Install 6’ wood privacy 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**

- A. The Guidelines state that “These 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. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally limited to six feet...”
1. The main structure is a one story frame residence with bungalow detailing.
  2. The proposed fence material replicates a late Victorian porch balustrade.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
STAFF COMMENTS**

**045-03/04 – CA**            108 Levert Avenue  
**Applicant:**                Tim & Donna Goodwin/ Pete J. Vallas, Architect  
**Received:**                 1/16/04                        **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**    3/01/04                        1) 2/9/04                        2)                                        3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Ashland Place Historic District  
**Classification:**         Contributing  
**Zoning:**                    R-1 Single Family Residential  
**Additional Permits Required:** (4) Building, Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing  
**Nature of Project:**       Construct side and rear addition measuring 32’ wide by the depth of the house,  
as per submitted plans.

Addition to be placed to the right/south of the existing structure.

The proposed work includes the addition of a master bedroom and bath wing to the south of the existing kitchen and the addition of a porch along the entire south side of the existing house. All exterior work will match existing roof pitch and eave details. The entire house is to be re-roofed, existing and new areas, with asphalt shingles to match existing. All new exterior walls to be brick to match existing as close as possible with accents of stained cedar shingles. Due to the difficulty in matching the existing brickwork and mortar, more so in color than texture, the owner also requests permission to paint all existing and new brick work.

**Additional Information:** The ca. 1927 Noble House is a one story brick residence constructed in the English Tudor Revival style. The textured brick of mottled yellow and brown earth-tones reinforces the Tudoresque style.

Staff met with the architect prior to this submission. Among the items discussed were placing the addition behind the south end gable in order to maintain the original appearance of the front façade. The architect expressed the owner’s concern about optimizing the side/rear yard open space.

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**

**Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts**

<u><b>Sections</b></u>	<u><b>Topic</b></u>	<u><b>Description of Work</b></u>
3	Piers, Foundations and Foundation Infill	Construct addition
3	Exterior Materials and Finishes	
3	Doors and Doorways	
3	Windows	

### 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...”

#### GENERAL

- A. Item 9, The Secretary of The Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, states that “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
1. The existing residence contains approximately 2100 sf.
  2. The proposed addition contains approximately 693 sf, an increase to the existing structure of approximately 33%.
  3. The porch addition adds an additional 572 sf., a total increase to the existing structure of approximately 60%.
  4. The width of the existing historic front façade measures 36’-6”.
  5. The width of the proposed front addition measures 32’-3 ½”, an increase of approximately 88%.
- B. Item 10, The Secretary of The Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, states that “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
1. The addition begins at the southwest corner and protrudes out from the existing front of the historic residence a distance of 1’-6”. A single bay with cross gable roof, and covered in cedar-shake shingles measures 14’-7” wide.
  2. The addition then steps back in line with the existing front of the main residence and runs a distance of approximately 14’-2” before stepping back a distance of 3’ to accommodate a 3’6” x 8’-5” garden tub bay.
  3. The porch addition, and access onto the porch from the proposed great room will displace 4 original windows and their masonry openings.
  4. The rear addition will displace 4 original windows and their masonry openings, and one exterior door.
- C. If approved as submitted, the changes and alterations to the structure would render the structure non-contributing and no longer historic when the Ashland Place Historic District is resurveyed.

#### STAFF REPORT

- A. Piers, Foundations and Foundation Infill: The Guidelines state that “foundation screening should be recessed from the front of the foundation piers.”
1. The existing foundation is solid brick with foundation vents.
  2. The proposed addition is brick matching existing.
- B. Exterior Materials:
1. The Guidelines state that “ Replacement...must match the original in profile and dimension and material.”
    - a. The existing exterior sheathing is brick veneer.
    - b. The proposed exterior sheathing for the addition is cedar shake shingles and brick veneer.
  2. The Guidelines state that “Painting of unpainted brick is inappropriate in some cases”
    - a. The existing textured brick of mottled yellow and brown earth-tones reinforces the Tudoresque style.
    - b. The applicants are proposing to paint the new and existing brick.
- C. Doors and Doorways:  
The Guidelines state that “ Original doors and door openings should be retained along with any mouldings, sidelights and transoms.”
1. There are no exterior doors on the south elevation.
  2. There is one exterior door on the east elevation that will be removed due to the addition.
  3. Six pairs of 15 light wood French doors are proposed for the addition
  4. One single 15 light wood French door is proposed for the rear kitchen addition.
  5. The proposed wood French doors will remove approximately 75% of the existing south elevation.
- D. Windows:
1. The Guidelines state that “Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.
    - a. Along with the proposed side porch addition will be the removal of approximately four original windows, and the alteration of four original window openings. These include: two pair of 6-over-6 sash, one small 6-over-6 sash, four 2 light-over-5 light casement windows
    - b. The proposed rear addition will require the removal of approximately five original windows and the alteration of five original window openings. These include: 3 pair of 2 light-over-5 light casement windows and one small 6-over-6 wood sash.
    - c. Where possible, existing historic windows should be reused.
  2. The Guidelines state that “The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
    - a. Windows in the historic residence are single, double and triple wood 6 -over-6 double hung, and wood casement.
    - b. Proposed windows in the addition are paired wood double hung 6-over-6, and single casement two rows of four panes.
- E. Roofs:  
The Guidelines state that “...historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained.”
1. The predominant roof form is end gable with decorative cross gable over front door.
  2. The roof for the proposed addition continues the line of the existing end gable, with a cross gable over the new master bedroom.

Staff recommends denial of the application as submitted due to the fact that the proposed changes would impair the historic integrity of the structure and the Ashland Place Historic District.

Staff further recommends the following:

That the addition be located at the rear of the residence, creating a wing off the kitchen; a stucco-covered masonry wall across the front from the screened porch to the property line would screen the side yard and create a private courtyard-type setting, per the owner's intention.

That the addition be stucco-covered masonry painted to coordinate with the existing historic brick.

That the south elevation should remain intact with only one opening altered to allow the installation of a pair of wood French doors

That the existing historic brick not be painted.