

AGENDA
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
May 9, 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: Jerry Foy
Property Address: 105 Espejo Street
Date of Approval: 4/13/05 weh
Work Approved: Remove existing deteriorated picket fence from front property line. Construct new wood fence recessed back to the line of the corner house facing Brown Street as per submitted site plan.
2. Applicant's Name: Rhett Barry
Property Address: 1557 Luling Street
Date of Approval: 4/14/05 weh
Work Approved: Construct wood deck as per submitted design using MHDC stock rail design number 1.
3. Applicant's Name: Wrico Signs
Property Address: 1358 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 4/14/05 weh
Work Approved: Change out sign face as per submitted design.
4. Applicant's Name: Cecelia Murphy
Property Address: 1112 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 4/15/05 asc
Work Approved: Repaint house in existing color scheme.
5. Applicant's Name: Florita Williams
Property Address: 930 Conti Street
Date of Approval: 4/15/05 weh
Work Approved: Repair or replace rotten wood as necessary with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing.
6. Applicant's Name: Steve May
Property Address: 932 Conti Street
Date of Approval: 4/15/05 weh
Work Approved: Repair or replace rotten wood as necessary with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing. Install MHDC stock rail design 2 on front porch.

7. Applicant's Name: Manuel C. Souto and Jeanne Souto
Property Address: 110 Espejo
Date of Approval: 4/15/05 jss
Work Approved: Re-roof house with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, black in color. Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint house in the existing color scheme.

8. Applicant's Name: Kathie Lee Gifford
Property Address: 156 Roberts Street
Date of Approval: 4/15/05 weh
Work Approved: Construct storage shed measuring 12x14 as per mhdc stock plans. Siding to be board & batten, painted to match garage.

9. Applicant's Name: Skip Shirah
Property Address: 204 Dexter Street
Date of Approval: 4/20/05 weh
Work Approved: remove porch infill and restore porch to original configuration. Demolish deteriorated outbuilding.

10. Applicant's Name: Steve Guerin
Property Address: 210 Rapier Avenue
Date of Approval: 4/20/05 weh
Work Approved: Remove deteriorated picket fence and replace with new wood picket fence, painted Bellingrath Green.

11. Applicant's Name: Mobile County Commission
Property Address: 304 Government Street
Date of Approval: 4/20/05 weh
Work Approved: Install building signage as per submitted design.

12. Applicant's Name: Royer Downing/Gwatkin Construction
Property Address: 16-22 S. Conception Street
Date of Approval: 4/20/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair second story windows as necessary to prevent water infiltration; paint window trim white.

13. Applicant's Name: Penny Howell (agent for contractor)
Property Address: 100 Bradford Avenue
Date of Approval: 4/22/05 asc
Work Approved: Install new shingle roof on rear porch of residence; shingles to be charcoal to match existing.

14. Applicant's Name: Leland Moore/A-1 Roofing
Property Address: 12 N. Reed Avenue
Date of Approval: 4/22/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof flat section to match existing.

C. OLD BUSINESS:

- 1. 086-03/04 – CA** 6-8 St. Joseph Street
Applicant: The Cybil Smith Trust, AnnBedsole, Owner
Douglas Kearley, Architect
Nature of Request: Alter previously-approved design for construction of new office building.

D. NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. 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.
- 2. 045/04-05/CA** 163 South Dearborn Street
Applicant: David M. Tacon
Nature of Request: Demolish existing structure and construct new residence on lot as per submitted plans.
- 3. 046/04-05/CA** 22 South Ann Street
Applicant: Susan K. Rhodes
Nature of Request: Construct “L”-shaped drive as per submitted site plan. Construct garage/workshop as per submitted plans. Install fencing around property as per submitted plans.
- 4. 047/04-05/CA** 264 Stocking Street
Applicant: Neese Properties, LLC represented by Nathan Friedlander, Attorney
Nature of Request: Demolish fire-damaged building.
- 5. 048/04-05/CA** 302 Congress Street
Applicant: D.C. Smith
Nature of Request: Construct raised breezeway between main house and second level of garage as per submitted plans.
- 6. 049/04-05/CA** 205 Marine Street
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
Nature of Request: Construct residence as per submitted plans.
- 7. 050/04-05/CA** 8 South Joachim Street
Applicant: Center for the Living Arts/Saenger Theater
Nature of Request: Construct canopy along Joachim and Conti Street sidewalks as per submitted plans.
- 8. 051-04/05 – CA** 1004 Elmira Street Street
Applicant: City of Mobile – Urban Development Department
Nature of Request: Demolish vacant historic structure.

D. ADJOURNMENT

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – STAFF COMMENTS

086-03/04 – CA 6-8 St. Joseph Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley, Architect/ The Cybil Smith Trust, Ann Bedsole, Owner
Received: 4/25/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 6/9/05 1) 5/9/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (vacant lot/new construction)
Additional Permits Required: (4) Building, Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing
Nature of Project: Construct new 2 ½ story brick veneer structure.

History of the Project: This project was originally approved in August of 2005. The revised drawings reflect a change from a Charleston Side House to a Charleston Meeting House. All porches have been removed to utilize interior space. The foundation has been lowered, and the elevations have been redesigned.

Element 2: Construction of a new Charleston Meeting House

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 office
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 Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with a 5’ setback.
 - B. This is a lot in the middle of the block, facing Bienville Square.
 - C. A multi story highrise with parking deck at the ground level to the north occupies the southeast corner of the lot and has a zero lot line setback.
 - D. The structure to the south, the Franklin Fire Station, faces St. Joseph Street and has a zero lot line front setback
 - E. The proposed front setback for this building is 4’- 8” from the sidewalk/property line; the proposed north side setback for this building is 0’.

3,II

II. **Massing and Scale:**

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. Buildings ranging in height from 2 stories to multi-story highrises are common throughout the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District.
 - 2. The proposed building is a 2-story structure featuring brick veneer exterior.
- B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. Historic buildings in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District are typically commercial in nature and have entrances at grade.
 - 2. The proposed foundation is a concrete slab, at a height 1'-6" above 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 roof shapes exist in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District, but the most common are flat/sloping roofs concealed by commercial parapets.
 - 2. The proposed roof shape is front gable with tripartite window.

3, III

III. **Façade Elements:**

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. Proposed doors are wood six panel topped with a six lite transom.
 - 2. Proposed brick detailing includes a projecting running bond course and a projecting running bond and saw tooth brick course at the cornice line.

3, IV

IV. **Materials and Ornamentation:**

- A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
- B. The guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
 - 1. The proposed design utilizes a single entry door and double-hung nine-over-nine and six-over-six windows.
 - 2. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends approval of the application 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) **5/9/05** 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 bronze 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

- V. **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 73’ with two rows of parking toward Government Street.

3,II

- VI. **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

- VII. **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 header band below the parapet add interest to the shoppes.

3, IV

- VIII. **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 in place of painted concrete block, since concrete block is not allowed by the Guidelines.
2. Add visual elements to break up massing of the west and north elevations compatible with 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 CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

045-04/05-CA 163 South Dearborn Street
Applicant: David Tacon, Owner/ Douglas Kearley, Architect
Received: 3/18/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: **5/01/05** 1) **5/9/05** 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (new construction)
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential

History of the Project:

The existing building was constructed ca. 1910, and is listed as a contributing structure in the Church Street East Historic District. However, due to demolition by neglect by the former and present owners, the house is in a high state of deterioration. Interior photos included in this application show the level of deterioration.

In 2000, the Board granted Concept Approval to the applicant to make alterations and additions to the structure to improve its appearance and increase interior space.

In 2002, the ARB staff received a request to demolish the existing structure, however, the applicant did not supply the necessary information required for demolition such as current photographs or proposed plans for the site.

The house has been cited on numerous occasions by Urban Development for violation of the Minimum Maintenance Ordinance.

Nature of Project: Demolish deteriorated structure and construct new structure as per submitted plans.

The building site is located on the east side of South Dearborn Street between Church and Monroe Streets.

The proposed building measures approximately 34' wide by approximately 62' long.

The building faces west towards South Dearborn Street, and the front building line is located at a distance of 8' from the sidewalk. Foundation is a floating concrete slab. The ground plan is rectangular in design. The overall wall height is 36' – 6" to the top of the parapet. The windows are proposed to be wood six-over-six. Doors are proposed to be four panel wood and multi-light. A side gable roof will have parapet walls rising on the north and south elevations.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation – floating slab
- b. façade – brick veneer over wood studs
- c. doors – four panel wood and multi-light wood
- d. windows – six-over-six wood
- f. roof – side gable with end parapets

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 residence
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

Placement and Orientation:

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. Setbacks in the Church Street East Historic District range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with 0-10’ setbacks.
 - 2. The proposed setback is approximately 8’.

3,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 two story wood frame and brick veneer structure.
- B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. Adjacent residential buildings, both frame and brick veneer, have a pier foundations.
 - 2. The proposed foundation is a floating slab with a water table.
- 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 residential roof shapes exist in the Church Street East Historic District.

3, 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 six-over-six wood windows and four panel wood doors is compatible with similar adjacent historic structures.
 - 2. The use of a brick veneer water table, brick lintels, and corbelling at the roof line add interest to the residence.

3. Porches are a regional characteristic found on almost every residence in the Church Street East Historic District.
 - a. All surrounding historic structures have front porches.
 - b. Porches are character defining features of the residences on South Dearborn Street.
 - c. In order to be compatible, a porch should be an integral part of the building and the streetscape.
 - d. The proposed new construction does not have a front porch but does include a recessed side courtyard.

3, IV

Materials and Ornamentation:

- A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
 1. There are a number of residential brick veneer structures in the Church Street East 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 as submitted with the following condition:

1. In order to be compatible with the neighborhood, a front porch should be added to the proposed plans.

Item 2 – Construct a garage/workshop.

- A. The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.
1. The main structure is a two story Antebellum residence with wood lap siding and a two story 5 bay front porch, and a monolithic hipped roof.
 2. The proposed garage measures 20' x 40' with an attached 20' x 20' workshop.
 3. The proposed garage is a 1 ½ story building.
 4. Proposed materials include:
 - a. foundation: slab on grade
 - b. siding: wood lap siding to match house, painted to match
 - c. roof: asphalt shingle, 7 and 12 pitch hipped to match house
 - d. windows: fixed louvered blinds on all elevations
 - e. doors: 2 garage doors, 9' wide x 12' high
1 pair of wood French doors onto deck upstairs on west elevation
2 single wood nine light half glass doors

Staff recommends approval of the garage design as submitted.

Item 3 – Install perimeter fence.

- A. The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.
1. The main structure is a two story Antebellum residence with wood lap siding and a two story 5 bay front porch, and a monolithic hipped roof.
 2. The proposed fence is to be located at the rear of the yard and constructed of iron panels between 7' tall capped brick piers spaced 12' apart.

Staff recommends approval of the fence as submitted.

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

047-04/05 – CA 264 Stocking Street
Applicant: Neese Properties, LLC represented by Nathan Freidlander, Attorney
Received: 4/25/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 6/9/05 1) 5/9/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of the Project: Demolish existing fire-damaged historic residential structure. Grass vacant lot once structure is removed.

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:

- A. Historic or Architectural Significance
 - 1. The Leinkauf Historic District was created in 1986.
 - 2. 264 Stocking Street is a two story frame vernacular structure, constructed ca. 1905 by the Mobile Improvement and Building Company.
 - 3. The property in question was part of the Tuttle Addition of 1896.
 - 4. 264 Stocking Street is a contributing structure within the Leinkauf Historic District.
 - 5. The architect/builder for this structure was W.W. Thompson.
 - 6. The first residents of 264 Stocking Street were the J.W.H. Handley Family.
 - 7. J.W. Homer Handley was manager of the Marine Oil Company and later president of the Palm Oil Company.

- B. Importance to the Integrity of the District
 - 1. The Leinkauf Historic District represents early 20th Century suburban expansion in Mobile to the west and south. This area is typical of Mobile’s housing boom west of downtown between 1900 and 1940 which was first settled as upper class suburbia and later infilled by working class residents as city limits extended westward. Regional architectural characteristics, style and building material blend the various subdivisions together to form a homogenous district. Everett, Stocking and Dexter Streets, the earliest north-south streets in the district, were constructed perpendicular to Government Street prior to 1856.
 - 2. 264 Stocking Street was one of four residences, including 256, 262, and 266, that was built as speculative development by the Mobile Improvement and Building Company.

- C. Ability to Reproduce Historic Structures
 - 1. The type and quality of the materials used in the construction of 264 Stocking are no longer readily available.
 - 2. The structure dates from the first quarter of the 20th 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 264 Stocking Street would be prohibitively expensive.

D. Ensemble of Historic Buildings Creating a Neighborhood

1. The subject area along Stocking Street is an intact, thriving neighborhood complete with both commercial and public educational facilities (small offices and Leinkauf Elementary School), and adjacent to LaPizzeria restaurant.

E. Proposed Redevelopment Plans for the Site

1. The application states that the site will be cleared and/or landscaped. A one bedroom cottage is located at the rear of the property and will remain as a rental property.

F. Effect of Proposed Project on the Leinkauf Historic District

1. The removal of 264 Stocking Street would degrade the streetscape along this relatively intact section of Stocking Street .
2. The removal of 264 Stocking Street would adversely affect the architectural, cultural, historical, social, aesthetic and environmental character, of not only this section of Stocking Street, but also the Leinkauf Historic District.

G. Content of Application

1. Property information:

- a. 264 Stocking Street was acquired by the applicant in 1975 for \$10,000.
- b. The applicant states that the property is in poor condition due to fire and water damage.
- c. An engineering and insurance report is attached.

2. Alternatives Considered

- a. The applicants state that no alternatives have been considered due to the “extensive fire damage and amount of insurance.”

3. Sale of Property by Current Owners

- a. Information presented in the application notes that 264 Stocking Street has not been listed for sale, nor does the applicant intend to list the property for sale.

4. Financial Proof

- a. Information from the GAB Robbins Insurance Company states that the total amount received in insurance for the loss was \$92,000.
- b. The actual cash value of the property is listed as \$99,095.
- c. The whole loss and damage is listed as \$118,154.86.

H. Other:

1. While the roof appears to have sustained considerable damage, and has been open to the elements, upon inspection by staff, the structure appears to be salvageable.

Staff recommends denial of the request to demolish.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

049-04/05-CA 205 Marine Street
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund/ Douglas Kearley, Architect
Received: 4/2505 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: **6/9/05** 1) **5/9/05** 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (new construction)
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Construct new one and one-half story Greek Revival cottage as per submitted plans.

The building site is located on the east side of Marine Street between Palmetto and Savannah Streets.

The proposed building measures approximately 40’ wide by approximately 59’ long.

It faces west towards Marine Street, and the front building line is located at a distance of 25’ from the sidewalk. Foundation is a floating concrete slab. The overall height is approximately 27’. The windows are proposed to be wood six-over-six. Doors are proposed to be four panel wood and multi-light. The main front of the house has a hipped roof; the rear has an end gable roof, and the ell portion has an end gable roof.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation – floating slab
- b. façade – brick veneer over wood studs
- c. doors – four panel wood and multi-light wood
- d. windows –six-over-six wood
- e. roof – front hip and side & rear gables

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 residence
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

Placement and Orientation

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. Setbacks in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District range from buildings constructed near the sidewalk to buildings with 25' setbacks.
 - 2. The proposed setback is approximately 25'.

3,II

Massing and Scale

- B. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. There are multiple examples of Greek Revival cottages in the Historic Districts.
 - 2. The proposed structure is wood frame with hardiplank siding.
- C. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. Adjacent residential buildings, both frame and brick veneer, have pier foundations.
 - 2. The proposed foundation is a floating slab with false piers and lattice infill.
- D. 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 residential roof shapes exist in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

3, 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 six-over-six wood windows and four panel wood doors is compatible with similar adjacent historic structures.
 - 2. The use of a brick veneer water table, brick lintels, and corbelling at the roof line add interest to the residence.
 - 3. Porches are a regional characteristic found on almost every residence in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
 - a. All surrounding historic structures have front porches.
 - b. Porches are character defining features of the residences on South Dearborn Street.
 - c. In order to be compatible, a porch should be an integral part of the building and the streetscape.
 - d. The proposed new construction has a main front porch and a porch across the wing further back from the sidewalk.

3, IV

Materials and Ornamentation

- A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
 - 1. There are a number of residential brick veneer structures in the Oakleigh Garden 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 as submitted.

- 6 . Placement of the sign to the left of the niche in a blank space on the building's façade would be preferable to the proposed location.

C. Size:

1. The Sign Design Guidelines state that "The size of a sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.
2. The proposed double-sided sign measures 4' – 3" wide, 17'-8" tall and 2' thick.
3. The Sign Design Guidelines state that "The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet.
4. The total proposed square footage is approximately 151 square feet.

Staff recommends approval of the canopy design as presented.

Staff recommends denial of the sign design as submitted based on the fact that the size of the sign exceeds the maximum signage amount allowed by law.

However, staff recommends that the sign be reduced in size and placed in a different location on the façade.

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

051-04/05 – CA 1004 Elmira Street Street
Applicant: City of Mobile – Urban Development Department
Received: 5/02/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 6/16/05 1) 5/9/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of the Project: Demolish existing vacant historic residential structure. Grass vacant lot once structure is removed.

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:

- A. Historic or Architectural Significance
 - 1. The Oakleigh Garden Historic District was created in 1986.
 - 2. 1104 Elmira Street is a one story four room shotgun structure.

- B. Importance to the Integrity of the District
 - 1. 1004 Elmira Street is one of a series of shotguns along the street.

- C. Ability to Reproduce Historic Structures
 - 1. The type and quality of the materials used in the construction of 1004 Elmira 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 1004 Elmira Street would be prohibitively expensive.

- D. Ensemble of Historic Buildings Creating a Neighborhood
 - 1. The subject area along Elmira Street is an intact, thriving neighborhood.

- E. Proposed Redevelopment Plans for the Site
 - 1. The application states that the site will be cleared and/or landscaped.

- F. Effect of Proposed Project on the Leinkauf Historic District
 - 1. The removal of 1004 Elmira Street would degrade the streetscape along this relatively intact section of Elmira Street .

2. The removal of 1004 Elmira Street would adversely affect the architectural, cultural, historical, social, aesthetic and environmental character, of not only this section of Elmira Street, but also the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

G. Content of Application

1. Property information:

- a. As this is a city-cited property, there is no property information other than the fact that the owner is either deceased or unable to be located.

2. Alternatives Considered

- a. The Notice of Violation from the city states either “demolish or repair”.

3. Sale of Property by Current Owners

- a. Information presented in the application notes that 1004 Elmira Street has not been listed for sale.

4. Financial Proof

- a. No financial information was provided.

H. Other:

- a. While the structure is not cosmetically pleasing, it does appear to be structurally sound and should be saved.

Staff recommends denial of the request to demolish.