

Agenda
Architectural Review Board
September 11, 2006 – 3:00 P.M.
Mayor's Pre-Council Chamber – Government Plaza
205 Government Street

A. Call to order – Chair

B. Approval of Minutes

C. Approval of Mid-Month Permits by Staff

- 1. Applicant's Name:** Golden Gate Properties/Tuan Titlestaad
Property Address: 155 Marine Street
Date of Approval: August 14, 2006

Remove unfinished rear addition approved and begun in 2000. The original house is not to be disturbed.

- 2. Applicant's Name:** Hilton Construction
Property Address: 1551 Eslava Street
Date of Approval: August 15, 2006

Repair to rear porch deck—replace with 1 x 4 tongue and groove decking and paint new materials to match existing color scheme;
Repair roof over front porch to match existing.

- 3. Applicant's Name:** M.R. Kopf Contracting
Property Address: 225 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: August 15, 2006

Perform exterior work to include: repaint exterior to match existing color scheme; replace balcony decking to match existing; repair roof as necessary to match existing.

- 4. Applicant's Name:** Rhonda W. Smith
Property Address: 361 Regina Avenue
Date of Approval: August 16, 2006

Repair windows to match existing: replace glass as necessary; repair sashes and wood casing as necessary. Storm shutters to be added on interior.

- 5. Applicant's Name:** Walker Brothers
Property Address: 550-56 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: August 17, 2006

Repaint building in existing color scheme.

- 6. Applicant's Name:** Walker Brothers
Property Address: 661 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: August 17, 2006

Repaint building in existing color scheme.

7. **Applicant's Name:** Coulson Roofing
Property Address: 1359 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: August 17, 2006

Install new architectural shingle roof, charcoal in color.

8. **Applicant's Name:** Briley Shirah
Property Address: 915 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: August 18 2006

Construct smooth stucco fence to match stucco finish on house. Fence is to be 6ft tall with brick cap and brick piers. To run along the north property line from the front corner of the house to the back corner of the house. Set back from the street is to be determined by the owner in consultation with the Urban Development Department.

9. **Applicant's Name:** Ken Palmertree
Property Address: 1111 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: August 22, 2006

Remove infill from original front porch area for investigative purposes. Applicant to return with column and rail design.

10. **Applicant's Name:** Diana Allen
Property Address: 310 Regina Avenue
Date of Approval: August 24, 2006

Paint building in the following color scheme: (unpainted brick to remain unpainted) body-tan or taupe; accent: darkest green; eaves-off-white or taupe. Install 4 new aluminum windows on front of building to replace existing aluminum windows.

11. **Applicant's Name:** Henry Callaway
Property Address: 205 S. Georgia Avenue
Date of Approval: August 24, 2006

Install wood shutters as per submitted plans.

12. **Applicant's Name:** Joe Pierce
Property Address: 121 N. Lafayette Street
Date of Approval: August 25, 2006

Repaint house white.

13. **Applicant's Name:** Michael Smith
Property Address: 1000 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: August 25, 2006

Repair rotten wood as necked to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint repair and peeling areas to match the existing paint scheme.

14. **Applicant's Name:** Ray Lamb
Property Address: 1551 Monterey Place
Date of Approval: August 25, 2006

Repaint house in the following Sherwin-Williams color scheme:
Body-Bird's Eye Maple;
Trim-Weathered Shingle;
Accent:-Roycroft Vellum and Polished Mahogany.

15. **Applicant's Name:** Damon Lett Roofing Company
Property Address: 10 Oakland Terrace
Date of Approval: August 28, 2006

Install new 20 year GAF 3 tab shingles, slate in color.

16. **Applicant's Name:** Jo Beth Murphree and Marie Dyson
Property Address: 103 S. Dearborn Street
Date of Approval: August 28, 2006

Widen sidewalk and drive2way as per submitted plans. Remove asphalt and install aggregate.

17. **Applicant's Name:** Ranita Smith
Property Address: 910 Charleston Street
Date of Approval: August 28, 2006

Install new roof shingles to match existing profile and color.

Old Business:

1. **087-05/06-CA** 155 Marine Street
Applicant: Tuan Titlestaad/Douglas Kearley, architect
Nature of Application: Renovate existing building per the submitted plans. Recent rear addition to be rebuilt to match existing; install new section of privacy fence and repair existing portions of fencing.
2. **089-05/06-CA** 308 St. Louis Street
Applicant: Renaissance Development Company, LLC/ John Dendy, architect
Nature of Request: Development of Mobile Fixture warehouse building into 21 residential condominiums with indoor parking garage.

New Business

1. **088-05/06-CA** 1751-1759 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Cornell Family Properties
Nature of Request: Request to install parking behind 1757 and 1759 Old Shell Road
2. **090-05/06-CA** 152 Charles Street
Applicant: Andrea and Suzanne Gherzi
Nature of Request: Request t install 7 ft. stuccoed masonry fence on south property line.
3. **091-05/06-CA** 114 Providence Street
Applicant: Archdiocese of Mobile/Ben Cummings, architect
Nature of Request: Construct wood handicap ramp on north side of house at rear.
4. **092-05/06-CA** 506 Eslava Street
Applicant: David M. Moore

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| | Nature of Request: | Construct 38 ft. bedroom addition with adjoining covered deck. |
| 5. | 093-05/06-CA
Applicant:
Nature of Request: | 307 West Street
Kim and Chris Husting
Remove elevator shaft at rear and square off area for downstairs utility room and upstairs bathroom. |
| 6. | 094-05/06-CA
Applicant:
Nature of Request: | 110 Ryan Avenue
Norman and Victoria Wood
Construct wood frame garage and asphalt or concrete drive. |
| 7. | 095-05/06-CA
Applicant
Nature of Request | 1255 Springhill Avenue
F.S. Land Company, LLC
Build 8 x 10 pad for dumpster and relocate dumpster to end of driveway. Construct a section of 6 ft. wood privacy fencing with two gates. |
| 8. | 096-05/06-CA
Applicant:
Nature of Request: | 312 N. Conception Street
Helene Shatto
Construct 16 x 14 ft. outbuilding. |

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

087-05/06 – CA 155 Marine Street
Applicant: Tuan Titlestaad/Douglas Kearley, architect
Received: 8/14/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 9/28/06 1) 8/28/06 2) 9/11/06 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single family residential
Nature of the Project: Renovate existing building per the submitted plans. Recent rear addition to be rebuilt to match existing; install new section of privacy fence and repair existing portions of fencing.

STAFF REPORT

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…”

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work is in compliance with the *Design Review Guideline*.

1. The one story frame residential structure dates from 1892.
2. Only a few turned posts remain on the front porch and the railing is missing.
3. Dormer to be installed on south side and a skylight to be installed on the north slope of the roof.
4. Chain link fence to be removed and a wood privacy fence to be installed on north side.
5. Existing wood fencing to be repaired.
6. New Victorian details to be added per existing photographs.
7. Porch to be added on rear elevation.
8. Paint colors to be submitted at a later date.

The architect has submitted a written letter of clarification for those items in the application that were questioned by the Board. A copy of his comments are included:
Dear Ann and fellow ARB board members

I hope this email will serve to clarify the questions raised by the Board at the last ARB meeting concerning the above property. I have not received a copy of the minutes, nor was I able to find them on the web site, so here goes:

1. Dormer on the East elevation, North side was supposed to be erased after we decided to substitute skylights. I was in a hurry and forgot to do it. I will bring white out to the meeting.

2. There is a variety of windows currently on the job- 6 over 6, 2 over 2, etc. The building seems to date from several different periods and the decision was made to leave the window to reflect the buildings history, rather than make them all the same and create a "false history"
3. When preparing drawings of existing structure, I like to hatch or draw in new materials and leave existing material blank. An example would be that clapboards are drawn as horizontal lines on an addition, but an existing wall would not have the horizontal lines. I believe that is the case here. If the reproductions in the members packet had been copied at a slightly larger scale, I believe the notes to this effect would have been evident!!!!!! (Hint, hint)

Please let me know if this is not sufficient.

Douglas B. Kearley, AIA, NCARB

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

- 9. All masonry walls to be repaired to match existing.
- 10. All existing windows to be repaired and reglazed.
- 11. Install iron fence on east elevation.

NEW INFORMATION

- 13. Windows will be single hung, double sash, General Aluminum, Series 1900.
- 14. There will be two sizes of transoms, also General Aluminum.
- 15. Windows will be double glazed with internal mullions in a bronze finish.
- 16. The new storefront will be bronze anodized aluminum.
- 17. Fencing will surround the court yard area adjacent to Jackson Street per the site plan provided.
- 18. Fencing will be prefinished aluminum 48 inches high.
- 19. Fence will be white in color.
- 20. Enclosed windows will be opened per sheets A-2.1 and X-2.1
- 21. Panels above and below the new windows to be EIFS in a smooth sand finish, Amber Leaf in color.
- 22. EIFS was chosen to allow movement in the wall and are not structural.
- 23. Various areas of concrete block will be covered in EIFS (units 109-113 and 116 & 117).
- 24. New garage door by Cookson Roll Up Doors to match the existing doors and painted to match wall.
- 25. Awnings to be used according to the submitted plan.
- 26. Colors are as follows:

Walls	Behr color “Amber Leaf”
Garage door	Same
Doors & Trim	Behr “Autumn Hills”
Awning	Sunbrella “Gaston Jewell” Stripe
Fence	White

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

ARB approves the present request, it must be contingent upon review by the Planning Commission. However, at this stage it appears the application is not complete: pictures of buildings to be demolished; materials; landscaping; fencing and lighting. Staff is attempting to get these materials in time for the meeting. If the information can not be obtained, staff recommends denial due to lack of information and that the applicant resubmits with a complete package. Staff also recommends the Board consider internal landscaping in the back parking lot, and that the fence be constructed with the finished side to the neighbors and have a cap.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

090-05/05-CA – CA 152 Charles Street
Applicant: Andrea and Suzanne Ghersi
Received: 8/28/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 10/12/06 1) 9/11/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence;
Nature of Project: Remove existing wood privacy fence (50 feet) and replace it with a 7 foot tall concrete cinderblock wall which will begin at the back of the property and extend forward (toward the street) 50 feet.

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 concrete block wall

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…”

The Design Review Guidelines state that fences “...should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic Districts.”

STAFF REPORT

1. The house is a 1930 wood bungalow with masonry porch and battered piers typical of the style and date.
2. There is a porte-cochere on the right side of the house with a ribbon drive.
3. Plans call for the removal of an existing 8 foot wood privacy fence.
4. The new fence will be located in the same place as the existing fence.
5. There is an apartment building adjacent to the property where the fence is proposed.
6. The concrete block wall will have piers located along its length.
7. The wall will be capped and stuccoed.

Since the property is located alongside an apartment complex, it qualifies for an exception to the six foot restriction on fences. Concrete walls are allowed in the districts if finished and capped as stated in the analysis. Staff recommends approval provided the applicants agree to the design of the piers and caps as shown in the illustration or present an acceptable. Also, the distance between the piers and color of the wall should be determined.

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

091-05/06 – CA 114 Providence Street
Applicant: Catholic Archdiocese of Mobile/Ben Cummings, Architect
Received: 8/25/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 10/09/06 1) 9/11/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, residential
Nature of the Project: Install wood handicap ramp on the north side at the rear.

STAFF REPORT

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…”

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work is in compliance with the *Design Review Guidelines*.

1. This building dates from c. 1930 and is a contributing Bungalow in the district.
2. The building will be used to supplement St. Mary’s classroom space.
3. The handicap ramp will be a permanent fixture until the building is no longer functioning as part of St. Mary’s.
4. The handicap ramp will be placed on the north side at the rear.
5. The handicap ramp slopes from the drive to a platform; from the platform there is a right angled slope to the rear porch of the house.
6. The ramp will be 3 ft. in height and be simply detailed with a 3 part handrail.
7. The ramp will be hidden from view by an existing 6 ft. wood privacy fence.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

092-05/06-CA 506 Eslava Street
Applicant: David M. Moore
Received: 8/24/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 10/8/06 1) 9/11/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single family residential

Additional Permits Required: Applicant should check with UDD for site coverage and setback requirements; building permits

Nature of Project: Add a 38’ bedroom addition with adjoining covered deck; replace existing fence.

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...”

The Design Review Guidelines state that fences “...should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic Districts.”

STAFF REPORT

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

1. 506 Church is a highly unusual house, extremely narrow but long.
2. The file suggests the original house was constructed about 1855 with alterations about 1910.
3. It is a one story, frame house with a later dormer.
4. The proposed addition to the house is in line with the current house.
5. A porch is proposed for the east side of the lot (called a covered deck).

6. The proposed addition will be built of Hardiboard.
7. The Board does not allow the use of Hardiboard on additions to historic houses.
8. The materials for the porch deck are not called out.
9. The additions windows are 4/4.
10. The house windows are 6/6.
11. The porch has a very classical Corinthian type column.
12. The house will be painted: BLP Fort Gaines Blue.
13. The piers are to be brick.
14. There is no information on the fence to be erected.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed work on the house with the following conditions: the material be wood to match the existing siding in dimensions and material (wood); windows should be 6/6 wood, true divided light or 1/1 wood; a new design for the post should be submitted; and the applicant provide the materials to be used for the porch decking. It should be noted that this porch will be a living space with an outside bar area and hot tub. The request for the fence should be denied for lack of information and a new submission be made at a later date.

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

093-05/06 – CA 307 West Street
Applicant: Kim and Chris Husting
Received: 8/22/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 10/06/06 1) 9/11/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, residential
Nature of the Project: Remove elevator shaft and square off rear corner of house per the submitted drawings.

STAFF REPORT

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…”

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work is in compliance with the *Design Review Guideline*.

1. The residence is a c. 1926 American Foursquare with offset gabled porch.
2. The building is frame with a hipped roof and projecting profiled rafters.
3. The rear of the building has a partial width one story porch and a two story elevator shaft.
4. The plan calls for removing the elevator shaft and squaring off the rear of the house to provide for a laundry room on the first floor and a bathroom on the second floor.
5. The new addition will be covered by an intersecting hip roof with projecting rafters and roofing material to match the existing structure.
6. All materials and features will match the existing structure

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

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

094-05/06 – CA 110 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: Norman and Victoria Wood/Douglas Kearley, architect
Received: 8/27/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 10/11/06 1) 9/11/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single family residential
Nature of the Project: Construct 2 story garage with dormers on front slope; entrance stair to be located at north side. Install new driveway of asphalt or concrete.

STAFF REPORT

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…”

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work is in compliance with the *Design Review Guideline*.

1. The residence dates from 1928 and is an example of the English Revival style.
2. The garage will be two story with dormers on the front slope.
3. A pair of simulated true lite clad wood windows will be placed on the north side.
4. There will be a pair of clad casement windows with simulated true divided light and half round transom on the north side.
5. There will be an automatic embossed metal garage door, Renaissance series.
6. There will two 6 panel metal man doors on the building.
7. The building will be constructed of wood siding or hardiplank.
8. Dutch lap siding will mimic the main house.
9. Architectural shingles will be used.
10. The building will be set back 5 ft. from the side property line and 10 ft. from the rear property line.
11. Concrete driveways are permitted under the guidelines while asphalt drives are prohibited.

Staff recommends approval of the garage as submitted and the installation of a concrete driveway.

5. There will be gates on the east and west side, set back from the sidewalk a distance greater than 25 ft and connecting with the building and fences on either side, respectively.
6. The proposed fence will be left natural to weather.
7. There is a third gate listed on the plans at the front of the property.
8. Staff cannot determine the exact location of the gates, but the distance of two from Springhill Avenue should be acceptable, while the front east gate placement is difficult to determine.
9. There will be an 8x10 concrete dumpster pad in the SE (rear) corner of the property.

Staff recommends approval of the fence once its exact location is determined. Staff also recommends approval of the east and west gates toward the middle of the property, upon clarification of the sites and the design. Staff recommends approval of the dumpster pad, but notes there may need to be a variance from Urban Development. Staff recommends denial of the front east gate due to lack of information.

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

096-05/06 – CA 312 N. Conception Street
Applicant: Helene Shatto
Received: 8/25/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 10/09/06 1) 9/11/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: RB, Residential-Business
Nature of the Project: Construct 14’ x 16’ outbuilding in rear yard.

STAFF REPORT

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…”

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work is in compliance with the *Design Review Guideline*.

1. The Bolling House was constructed in 1852 and has had changes over time.
2. The building will have traditional construction on brick piers.
- 3.. The proposed building will be constructed of hardiplank.
4. The outbuilding will be placed in the rear corner of the yard, 5 ft. from the rear and south property lines.
5. The outbuilding will have square classical columns on its full width porch.
6. The building is accented with a cupola.
7. The roof will have cedar shakes.
8. Window openings will be permanently shuttered.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

