

AGENDA
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

April 11, 2005 – 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: David and Tammy Donnelly
Property Address: 908 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 3/16/05 jss
Work Approved: Demolish non historic rear addition in order to restore house to single family dwelling.
Remove porch infill and replace porch railing to match existing.
2. Applicant's Name: Cooner Roofing Company
Property Address: 1311 Brown Street
Date of Approval: 3/17/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building with architectural shingles, charcoal grey in color.
3. Applicant's Name: John Weber and Gail Lisabeth
Property Address: 962 Augusta Street
Date of Approval: 3/17/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-paint house in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
Body: Homegrown sage green, Trim: Classical Light Buff or Classical White, Porch deck: Bellingraph green or dark black green.
4. Applicant's Name: Palmer Hamilton
Property Address: 1157 Palmetto
Date of Approval: 3/18/05 asc
Work Approved: Repaint residence in existing color scheme.
Body: Sherwin Williams Coconut Grove 2428
Trim: White
Shutters and porch floor: Bellingrath Green
5. Applicant's Name: Diversified Roofing
Property Address: 257 South Georgia Avenue
Date of Approval: 3/14/05
Work Approved: Re-roof with 3 tab charcoal shingle.

6. Applicant's Name: June Chambliss / Sharon Brooks
 Property Address: 161 S. Cedar Street
 Date of Approval: 3/22/05 weh
 Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint in the following Behr color scheme: Body: Contemplation, 700E-3, Trim: Country Beige, 760C-2, and Door and accent: Rich Mahogany, 710B-7.
7. Applicant's Name: Bayside Remodelers
 Property Address: 312 North Jackson Street
 Date of Approval: 3/21/05
 Work Approved: Construct front porch as per plans provided by MHDC staff. Install new windows matching existing in profile and dimension. Install triple double hung windows over sink in kitchen. Paint house in colors to be submitted at a later date.
8. Applicant's Name: W. Hunter March, Jr.
 Property Address: 210 George Street
 Date of Approval: April 7, 2005
 Work Approved: Repair to rotten wood with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile. Paint house in existing color scheme. Treat existing metal roof with coating.
9. Applicant's Name: Suzanne Cleveland
 Property Address: 957 Church Street
 Date of Approval: 3/23/05 asc
 Work Approved: Repair existing asbestos tile roof with materials to match existing in profile and dimension and material.
10. Applicant's Name: Yvonne Matthews
 Property Address: 1054 Old Shell Road
 Date of Approval: 3/23/05 asc
 Work Approved: Repair rotten wood with new wood to match existing in profile and dimension. To include siding, window sashes and window casings. Prime new wood to paint.
11. Applicant's Name: Timbes & Yeager
 Property Address: 263 N. Conception Street
 Date of Approval: 3/23/05 asc
 Work Approved: Install new weathered wood blend timberline roof to match existing.

12. Applicant's Name: Dobson Sheet Metal & Roofing, Inc.
Property Address: 1119 Church Street
Date of Approval: 3/23/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair shingle roof, recoat flat roof and replace rotten wood on siding as necessary with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Powerwash and paint to match existing.
13. Applicant's Name: Chris Conlon
Property Address: 306 George Street
Date of Approval: 3/34/05 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repaint building in the following Benjamin Moore paint Scheme, Body: HC 29, Dunmore Cream, Trim: HC-01 Brilliant White and Accent: HC41, Chrome Green.
14. Applicant's Name: Sumner Adams
Property Address: 211 Lanier
Date of Approval: 3/24/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof garage with 3tab fiberglass shingles, terra cotta in color to match color of main house tile roof.
15. Applicant's Name: Mary Lum, Owner/ Signs Now, Sign Contractor
Property Address: 460 Broad Street
Date of Approval: 3/24/05 asc
Work Approved: Erect signage, measuring 4' x 4' , double sided to total 32 sf. as per submitted sign design.
16. Applicant's Name: Precision Construction
Property Address: 52 LeMoyne Place
Date of Approval: 3/25/05 weh
Work Approved: Reconstruct deteriorated water heater enclosure as per submitted photographs. Paint to match existing.
17. Applicant's Name: Kenneth Palmertree
Property Address: 1112 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 3/25/05 jss
Work Approved: Replace rotten decking with tongue and groove. Repair columns as necessary.
18. Applicant's Name: Paul Anderson
Property Address: 1456 Brown Street
Date of Approval: 3/25/05 asc
Work Approved: Replace rear hollow core flush door with multi-lighted French wood door. Install 12' x 24' deck at rear of house with east side to have railing, the design provided by MHDC.

C. NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. 035/04-05/CA** 653 Government Street
Applicant: KSM, Inc.
Nature of Request: Replace hurricane damaged green & white striped awnings along the east & west sides of building with slate blue Bahama-style shutters (14 windows). Add entry awning at Dearborn Street entrance for weather protection. Repaint building trim white.
- 2. 036/04-05/CA** 1510 Government Street
Applicant: Saad Vallas, Developers, Owner/ Clark Geer & Latham, Architects & Engineers.
Nature of Request: Construction of a new commercial shopping center with adjacent parking.
- 3. 037/04-05/CA** 934 Conti Street
Applicant: Chilton Powell
Nature of Request: Demolish fire-damaged structure.
- 4. 038/04-05/CA** 62 Bradford Avenue
Applicant: Warren Bettis
Nature of Request: Construct front porch as per submitted plans.
- 5. 039/04-05/CA** 109 Government Street
Applicant: Goodwyn, Mills & Caywood, Architects
 Mobile County Commission, Owner
Nature of Request: Demolish ca. 1959 courthouse.

D. ADJUORNMENT

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

035-04/05-CA 653 Government Street
Applicant: KSM, Inc.
Received: 3/17/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: **4/30/05** 1) **4/11/05** 2) 3)

Nature of Request:

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Non - Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Nature of Project: Replace hurricane damaged green & white striped awnings along the east & west sides of building with slate blue Bahama-style shutters (14 windows). Add entry awning at Dearborn Street entrance for weather protection. Repaint building trim white.

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	Blinds, Shutters and Awnings	Install shutters and hurricane panel hardware

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:

- A. The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.
 - 1. The main structure is a one story masonry veneer structure with aluminum storefront windows.
 - 2. The proposed shutters will be operable in order to act as hurricane-resistant coverings.
 - 3. The structure itself is a non-contributing structure.
 - 4. The Arby's to the west is also a non-contributing structure.
 - 5. The shutters are to be painted BLP Monterey Dark Blue.
 - 6. Shutters, when used, were operable and oversized to cover double or triple windows (for utilitarian purposes) or fixed as decorative elements.
 - 7. The request for painting trim was handled on a mid-month basis.

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

036-04/05-CA 1510 Government Street
Applicant: Saad Vallas, Developers, Owner/ Clark Geer & Latham,
 Architects & Engineers.
Received: 3/18/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: **5/01/05** 1) **4/11/05** 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (new construction)
Zoning: LB-2, Limited Business
Nature of Project: Construction of a new commercial shopping center with adjacent parking.

The building site is located on the north side of Government Street between Etheridge and Catherine Streets.

The proposed building measures approximately 50’ wide by approximately 120’ long.

The building faces south towards Government Street, and the front building line is located at a distance of 73’ from the sidewalk. Two sides of the proposed one-story building are concrete block. The south and east walls are proposed to be constructed with a brick water table upon which rests a metal storefront system. Foundation is slab-on-grade. The ground plan is rectangular in design. The overall wall height is 20’ – 8” to the top of the parapet, with areas at the corners, the entrance, and over the drive thru windows raised to 21’-8”. The glazing system is anodized aluminum with clear insulated glass. A flat roof will be hidden behind the parapet wall.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation – concrete slab-on-grade
- b. façade – brick veneer over concrete block
- c. doors – clear glass in bronze anodized frames
- d. windows –clear glass in bronze anodized frames
- e. awnings – terra cotta barrel tile (matching that on the Shoppes of Midtown)
- f. roof – flat concealed behind a parapet

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 retail center
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	

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “ In the case of a proposed new building, that such building will not, in itself, or by reason of its location on the site, materially impair the architectural or historical value of the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity and that such building will not be injurious to the general visual character of the Historic District in which it is to be located.”

STAFF REPORT

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 with setback.
 - B. The proposed setback is approximately 73’ with two rows of parking toward Government Street.

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 concrete block and brick veneer structure.
 3. Concrete block is not an approved material according to the Guidelines.
 - 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 and a header band below the parapet add interest to the shoppes.

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.

Staff recommends approval of the application with the following conditions:

- 1. That either brick matching the east and south elevations, or split face concrete block, be used where there is to be painted concrete block used, since concrete block is not allowed by the Guidelines.
- 2. Add visual elements to break up massing of the west and north elevations compatible to what is called for on the south and east elevations.
- 3. Require that all trees currently noted as 3" – 3 ½" be changed to 4" trees to fall under the Tree Ordinance for maintenance purposes.

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

037/04-05/CA 934 Conti Street
Applicant: Chilton Powell
Received: 3/18/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: **5/01/05** **1) 4/11/05 2) 3)**

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of the Project: Demolish fire-damaged structure.

History of the Project:

This residence was damaged by fire December 25, 2004. In March the owner was issued a Municipal Offense Ticket instructing him to either repair or demolish the structure. The applicant has an April 18, 2005 court date. The owner's insurance adjuster noted the structure as a "total loss" and Liberty Mutual Insurance settled the claim for the damages.

STAFF REPORT

Section 10 of the Preservation Ordinance prohibits the demolition or relocation of "any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such buildings will not be detrimental to the historical and architectural character of the district..." In making this determination, the Board must examine a number of factors set out in the ordinance, each of which is discussed below:

Based on the information contained in the application, Staff finds that the loss of this structure will impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

A. Historic or Architectural Significance

1. The Old Dauphin Way Historic District was created in 1984.
2. 934 Conti Street is a one story frame vernacular structure, constructed in the last quarter of the 19th century.

B. Importance to the Integrity of the District

1. Old Dauphin Way is significant as Mobile's earliest suburban neighborhood dating largely from the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Building in the district began in the 1830s with development along major thoroughfares such as Dauphin Street, Old Shell Road and Springhill Avenue. An increase in building construction appeared in the 1870s and 1880s as a result of the establishment of a horse-drawn trolley, which permitted residential living outside the city's core. The presence of the automobile and a general boom period at the turn of the 20th Century spurred construction in the district west of Ann Street.
2. Most buildings are small scale residential structures, most often 1 or 1 ½ stories in height, with similar setback from the street throughout the neighborhood, creating a feeling of homogeneity.
3. 934 Conti Street is a modest 1 story vernacular Victorian residence constructed around the end of the 19th Century.

C. Ability to Reproduce Historic Structures

1. The type and quality of the materials used in the construction of 934 Conti Street are no longer readily available.
2. The structure dates from the last quarter of the 19th century, before the introduction of nominal dimension lumber. Components include old growth pine structural members and siding, historic windows, doors and interior decoration, etc. Replacement material would have to be garnered from salvage yards or specially milled.
3. In the event that reconstruction was attempted, the cost to reproduce 934 Conti Street would be prohibitively expensive.

D. Proposed Redevelopment Plans for the Site

1. Applicant states that there are no plans for the vacant lot once the structure is removed.

E. Effect of Proposed Project on the Old Dauphin Way Historic District

1. The removal of 934 Conti Street would create a void in the streetscape.

F. Content of Application

1. Property information:
 - a. The property was purchased by the applicant's mother in 1980.
 - b. The property is now in an estate, with the applicant as trustee.
2. Alternatives Considered
 - a. The applicant has stated that no other alternatives to demolition have been considered.
3. Sale of Property by Current Owners
 - a. Information presented in the application notes that the property has not been listed for sale.
 - b. The property has been used as residential rental for over 20 years.
4. Financial Proof
 - a. No information on financial proof was presented.

G. Other Information:

1. Demolition/materials salvage has occurred without a permit and precludes the Review Board from being able to ascertain the post-fire condition of the building.
2. There is a public easement between 944 Conti Street, Chilton's Frame Gallery, and 934 Conti Street, the subject property.

Staff recommends the complete demolition be approved with the following conditions:

1. That the building be completely removed from the site including the concrete steps.
2. That the salvaged materials be removed from this and any adjacent lots.
3. That the property be appropriately landscaped with sod.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

038-04/05-CA 62 Bradford Avenue
Applicant: Warren Bettis
Received: 3/28/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: **5/12/05** 1) **4/11/05** 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Construct front 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	Construct new front 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:

- A. The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.
 - 1. The main structure is a one story asbestos veneer structure with a pair of picture windows flanking an extruded entry.
 - 2. There is an existing concrete stoop with ceramic tile surface.
 - 3. There is evidence that a porch did exist at one time.
 - 4. The new porch is in keeping with the character of the historic dwelling.
 - 5. The following materials are appropriate for use in the historic districts:
 - foundation: Brick veneered concrete block with lattice infill
 - porch deck: wood tongue & groove 5/4 x 6 decking
 - porch columns: combination of square box columns and Doric columns
 - roof: shed roof with gable section over entry, shingled to match existing.

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

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

039/04-05/CA 109 Government Street
Applicant: Goodwyn Mills & Caywood, Architects/ Mobile County Commission, Owners
Received: 3/18/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: **5/01/05** **1) 4/11/05 2) 3)**

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Non - Contributing (less than 50 years of age)
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Nature of the Project: Demolish existing ca. 1959 Courthouse

STAFF REPORT

Section 10 of the Preservation Ordinance prohibits the demolition or relocation of “any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such buildings will not be detrimental to the historical and architectural character of the district...” In making this determination, the Board must examine a number of factors set out in the ordinance, each of which is discussed below:

Based on the information contained in the application, Staff finds that the loss of this structure will NOT impair the *historic integrity* of the structure and the district since the building has not reached 50 years of age..

- A. Historic or Architectural Significance
 - 1. The Church Street East Historic District was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1974.
 - 2. 109 Government Street is a three story masonry veneer Modernist structure, constructed from 1957-1959.
 - 3. Due to its age, the old Courthouse building is not a contributing structure within the district.
- B. Importance to the Integrity of the District
 - 1. The Church Street East Historic District contains the primary governmental, religious, educational, commercial and residential buildings which have provided a focus for the activities of the city from the nineteenth century to the present day.
 - 2. Buildings vary in size from 10 story mid-rise offices to one story shotguns.
 - 3. 109 Government Street is an imposing masonry veneer structure, and has served as the Mobile County Courthouse from 1959 until the present.
- C. Ability to Reproduce Historic Structures
 - 1. The type and quality of the materials used in the construction of 109 Government Street are readily available, however, the craftsmanship to reproduce some elements such as the mosaic murals, and sculptural elements is not readily available.
 - 2. The structure dates from the second half of the twentieth century.
- D. Proposed Redevelopment Plans for the Site
 - 1. Applicant states that there is to be a park dedicated to Mardi Gras developed on this site.
- E. Effect of Proposed Project on the Church Street East Historic District
 - 1. The removal of 109 Government Street would create a void in the streetscape.
- F. Content of Application
 - 1. Property information:
 - a. The property was constructed by the Mobile County Commission in 1959.
 - b. The property is currently owned by the Mobile County Commission.

2. Alternatives Considered
 - a. The applicant has stated that no other alternatives to demolition have been considered.
3. Sale of Property by Current Owners
 - a. Information presented in the application notes that the property has not been listed for sale.
 - b. The property has been used as the offices of the Mobile County Probate Court, Revenue and Board of Registrars since 1959.
4. Financial Proof
 - a. No information on financial proof was presented.

G. Other Information:

Staff has examined the park plans submitted as conceptual drawings with the demolition request. Staff finds several elements of the plan inappropriate to a historic urban setting.

1. Surrounding 95% of the perimeter of the park with trees is inappropriate for an urban setting. It shields the central lawn from public view, creating an area that many would consider unsafe. Generally successful urban parks utilize lower plantings and larger trees as site features.
2. The recreation of the historic watch tower along side the modern courthouse would create an inappropriate juxtaposition of styles and would create a false sense of history.
3. It is recommended that the park designers investigate successful urban parks in the southeast and incorporate a design which would enhance the historic character of the district and the National Historic Landmark across Royal Street.

Staff recommends the complete demolition be approved.