

AGENDA
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
September 13, 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: Summer’s Roofing and Construction Co., Inc.
Property Address: 359 Chatham Street
Date of Approval: 8/10/04 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 25 year 3-tab fiberglass shingles, shadow gray in color.
2. Applicant's Name: Fred South
Property Address: 1318 Chamberlain Avenue
Date of Approval: 8/11/04 weh
Work Approved: Repair or replace rotten wood with materials matching existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing.
3. Applicant's Name: Kiker Corporation
Property Address: 1111 Government Street
Date of Approval: 8/11/04 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof flat roof with materials to match existing.
4. Applicant's Name: Kiker Corporation
Property Address: 209 North Washington Street
Date of Approval: 8/11/04 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof flat roof with materials to match existing.
5. Applicant's Name: John Moore
Property Address: 310 Charles Street
Date of Approval: 8/12/04 weh
Work Approved: Repaint house in American Tradition color scheme:
Body: Molear Vaquero Red
Trim: white
Replace existing columns with new box columns in stock design provided by MHDC staff – new columns to total 4, as original design.

6. Applicant's Name: Sand Dollar Properties
Property Address: 110 South Dearborn Street
Date of Approval: 8/13/04 asc
Work Approved: Replace roof decking as necessary; install new charcoal shingles to match existing.
7. Applicant's Name: Bill Zasiris
Property Address: 20 South Reed Street
Date of Approval: 8/16/04 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof house with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, charcoal in color.
8. Applicant's Name: Charles Alfred Cowley Jr.
Property Address: 955 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 8/16/04 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in material and profile and dimension. Repaint house in existing color scheme.
9. Applicant's Name: Donald's Roofing
Property Address: 110 S. Bayou Street
Date of Approval: 8/16/04 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building with materials matching existing.
10. Applicant's Name: Hero's Sports Bar
Property Address: 273 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 8/16/04 weh
Work Approved: Stain deck the following colors:
Deck/skirtboard – Linen
Railings – Oak Brown
Pergola – Terra
Canopy Framing – Dark Brown
11. Applicant's Name: Cooner Roofing Inc.
Property Address: 1457 Brown Street
Date of Approval: 8/18/04 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof house with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, charcoal black in color.
12. Applicant's Name: Contractors of Today/Gary Soutullo
Property Address: 206 Roper Street
Date of Approval: 8/18/04 weh
Work Approved: Remove existing concrete steps and replace with new wood steps with handrails matching existing porch rail. Paint to match existing.

13. Applicant's Name: Bernhardt Roofing Company
Property Address: 258 Dexter Street
Date of Approval: 8/25/04 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof with 3-tab fiberglass shingles, black in color.
14. Applicant's Name: Conrad Construction
Property Address: 253 St. Anthony Street
Date of Approval: 8/25/04 asc
Work Approved: Replace glass as necessary; repair/replace wood siding as necessary with new wood siding to match existing in profile and dimension; prime and paint new materials.
15. Applicant's Name: Larry and Cathy Burdette
Property Address: 1561 Luling Street
Date of Approval: 8/26/04 weh
Work Approved: Repaint house in the following colors:
Body – Lettuce Alone B68-3
Trim – Bistro White 7006-4
16. Applicant's Name: Mark and Denise Burks
Property Address: 1559 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 8/26/04 weh
Work Approved: Construct 3 car garage as per submitted plans. Design is modified MHDC stock plan utilizing building elements found on main residence. Building to measure 38' x 24' and is to be located at the rear of the property behind existing guest house. Siding to be hardiplank painted to match main house, hipped roof with timberline shingles matching that of the main residence.
17. Applicant's Name: Leland Moore Jr.
Property Address: 12 North Reed Avenue
Date of Approval: 8/26/04 weh
Work Approved: Repaint house in existing color scheme.
Repair existing flat roof – install 5-v crimp galvalume roofing over flat roof surface and flash into existing asbestos tile as necessary. Repair rotten soffit & fascia with materials matching in profile & dimension.
18. Applicant's Name: DNC of Mobile
Property Address: 113 South Dearborn Street
Date of Approval: 8/26/04 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials matching existing in material, profile and dimension. Prime new materials. Paint colors to be submitted at a later date.

19. Applicant's Name: Barbara and Fred South
 Property Address: 1112 Dauphin Street
 Date of Approval: 8/26/04 asc
 Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
 Repaint house in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
 Body: SW6325
 Trim: Cream
 Base: SW 6328
 Cedar Shakes: SW6326
20. Applicant's Name: Goldengate Properties/E. Bradford Ladd
 Property Address: 2301 DeLeon Ave.
 Date of Approval: 8/26/04 asc
 Work Approved: Minor wood repair with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile.
 Paint in the following Benjamin Moore colors: body-Rockport Gray; trim-Titanium, window sashes - white.
21. Applicant's Name: Thomas Roofing/Robert Ramsey
 Property Address: 311 West Street
 Date of Approval: 8/26/04 asc
 Work Approved: Install new charcoal 3 tab shingle roof on pitched roof and modified flat roof system on flat roof sections.
22. Applicant's Name: O. C. Wiggins
 Property Address: 1005 Augusta Street
 Date of Approval: 8/26/04 jss
 Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Re-roof house in timberline shingles heather in color to match existing.

C. OLD BUSINESS:

1. **020-03/04-CA** 165-67 State Street
 Applicant: Devereaux Bemis
 Nature of Project: Retain prototype fence type constructed at the Board's request.

D. NEW BUSINESS:

1. **090/03/04/CA** 12 North Reed Avenue
 Applicant: Ryan Freisen
 Nature of Project: Install 6' privacy fence around perimeter of property as per submitted plans.

2. **091-03/04-CA** 203 Church Street
Applicant: The McMillan Family Trust of 2002
Nature of Project: Retain 43' cell tower installed without proper federal permits,
 without zoning clearance, without a building permit, and without
 ARB approval.

E. OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Discussion with the Board by Steve Walker
2. Federal Courthouse Review by Staff

F. ADJOURN

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – STAFF REVIEW

020-03/04 – CA 165-67 State Street
Applicant: Devereaux Bemis
Received: 8/23/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/07/04 1) 11/10/03 2) 9/13/04 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-B, Residential Business
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Nature of Project: Construct 8’ high wood and Hardiplank fence as per submitted design. Stain fence dark brown.

Fence to be constructed of 4’ x 8’ panels of Hardiplank mounted between 6”x 6” treated wood posts. Panels to have ½” x 4” applied batten strips spaced evenly between the panel. Fence to be stained.

History of the Project:

At the November 10, 2003 meeting, the Board had questions concerning the use of Hardiplank for fencing in the historic district. It also had questions concerning the structural integrity of the fence as designed. The Board noted it would be willing to review a full scale mock up of the fence.

The fence has been erected as presented, and Board Members are encouraged to visit the site and examine the fence.

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 and Gates	Construct wood and hardiplank 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

General

- A. The Guidelines state that “The standards listed and shown...illustrate elements that contribute to the architectural character of the buildings in Mobile’s historic districts. These define the architectural style of the buildings and establish a repetition of forms and details, which create harmony and character of the historic districts.
1. The existing structure is solid masonry.
 2. The building materials are compatible for use in the district.
 3. The building materials have been approved for use in the district.
 4. The Board encourages the use of new materials when appropriate.

Staff has no recommendation for this application.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS - STAFF COMMENTS

090-03/04 – CA 12 North Reed Avenue
Applicant: Ryan Friesen
Received: 8/27/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 10/11/04 1) 9/13/04 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 6’ high wood privacy fence as per submitted plans.

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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Fences, Walls & Gates	Install 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 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 District.”
1. The main structure is a one story frame structure.
 2. The residence is located on the northwest corner of North Reed Avenue and New Hamilton Streets.
 3. Typically, the Design Guidelines limit fences to 6’ in height.
 4. Typical side yard setbacks for fences is 12’ for standard (60’ or wider) corner lots.
 5. The subject lot is 50’ in width at the front, so due to the substandard lot size, a setback of 9.8’ is allowed.
 6. The applicant is requesting to construct the fence on the sidewalk.
 7. A common alley separates the houses facing North Reed Avenue from North Monterey Street.
 8. The house that faces North Monterey Street directly behind the subject property has a wood privacy fence with brick columns located directly on the sidewalk.
 9. As this is a corner property, the applicant will have to apply for a zoning variance to allow the fence to be closer to the sidewalk.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

7. Typically, towers of this nature have up to 2 co-locations for cell phone use, requiring additional buildings to house equipment. The plans provided show no additional buildings.
8. The Applicant has agreed to paint the pole black or dark green or any other color as directed by the Board.
9. The Applicants will be required to submit information to the Alabama Historical Commission for Section 106 Review to mitigate any negative impact on the Church Street East Historic District.

Staff was unable to reach a consensus on whether or not the tower impaired the historic integrity of the Church Street East Historic District. Staff suggests the Board visit the site and determine an appropriate decision.