

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA
April 1, 2009 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Approval of Mid Month COAs Granted by Staff

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant: City of Mobile

- a. Property Address: 200 Government St.
- b. Date of Approval: 03/12/09
- c. Project: Paint dado zone and window frames Sherwin Williams' "Natchez Moss;" Paint window sills, belt courses, canopy, gutters, and wall panels Sherwin Williams' "Gazebo White."

2. Applicant: Tommie C. Majors

- a. Property Address: 1101 Savannah St.
- b. Date of Approval: 03/20/09
- c. Project: Install Pewter Grey Timberline roof.

3. Applicant: Monty Gilbert

- a. Property Address: 56 Semmes Ave.
- b. Date of Approval: 3/20/09
- c. Project: Paint body of house Olympic's "Smoky Slate;" paint trim Olympic's "Lotus Flower."

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 028-09: 400 Chatham St.
 - a. Applicant: Cheryl Shifflet
 - b. Project: Fencing Approval; painting; replace front door.
2. 029-09: 1626 Spring Hill Ave.
 - a. Applicant: Freeman Russell
 - b. Project: Rear Addition.
3. 030-09: 501 Monroe St.
 - a. Applicant: Karlos Finley
 - b. Project: Fencing.
4. 031-09: 210 South Washington St.
 - a. Applicant: Angie Odom
 - b. Project: Window replacement; add a new entry door; cover metal panels with stucco.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Finalize Architectural Review Board Application
2. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

028-09-CA: 400 Chatham Street
Applicant: Cheryl Shifflet
Received: 03/13/09
Meeting: 04/01/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fencing; painting; replacement of doors.

BUILDING HISTORY

This side hall cottage with recessed side wing was constructed in 1903.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. The applicant is a new resident in the Oakleigh Garden District having just purchased this home in October, 2008. The applicant seeks to enhance the historical integrity of the house while allowing for certain security measures and addressing many issues stemming from deferred maintenance.
- B. The Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building.
 - 2. Metal storm and metal screen door are not allowed on front doors. Wood screen and wood storm doors are acceptable.
 - 3. Fencing “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship the Historic District.
 - 4. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.
 - 5. All variances required by the Board of Zoning Adjustment must be obtained prior to issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Paint house per submitted colors:
 - a. Body, “La Fonda Copper;”
 - b. Trim, “Hubbell House Golden Maize;”
 - c. Shutters, “La Fonda Deep Olive.”
 - 2. Repair the existing front door in kind;
 - 3. Replace existing front security door with comparable example;
 - 4. Repair and install new fencing along perimeter per submitted plan:
 - a. Repair and paint the existing 3½’ paling picket fence along Chatham & Selma

- b. Replace existing chain link fence along Selma Street
 - 1. Install a four foot box top fence with 2' lattice
 - 2. See submitted photographs;
 - 3. Proposed fence violates setback requirements
- c. Replace existing chain link along west and south property line
 - 1. Install 6' box top fence from front porch to rear of property
 - 2. Continue 6' box top fence across rear to street;
 - 3. Install 3½' paling picket fence on South side from front to 6' fence.
 - 4. Rear fence encroaches on set back
 - 5. New paling picket is ½' too tall

D. Clarifications Needed:

- 1. Photograph of metal security door to be submitted.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The colors submitted by the applicant do not detract from architectural and historical integrity of the property or the district and Staff recommends approval of C(1).

Staff has discussed the original request for a replacement front door with the applicant. Staff believes the existing front door to be the original door and the applicant has agreed to repair the existing front door. The applicant intends to retain the existing burglary bars on the home. The homeowner seeks security at her front entrance but finds the current metal door unacceptable. Since a current security door exists, staff believes allowing a new security door while retaining the historic door is an acceptable compromise. Also, the security door can be removed in the future without harming the building. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of C(2)-(3).

Under the Guidelines, the applicant may repair and paint the existing front yard fence as necessary. The proposed replacement of the existing chain link fence with a 4' box top fence, topped with 2' of lattice violates city ordinance regarding setback as does the rear fence. Staff does not recommend approval of C(4)-b, but does recommend approval of C(4)-a and C(4)-c1. C(4)c2 would be acceptable with the correct setback and C(4)c3 would be acceptable at the lower height.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

029-09-CA: 1626 Spring Hill Avenue
Applicant: Freeman Russell
Received: 03/16/09
Meeting: 04/01/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-1
Project: The Ronald McDonald House Charities of Mobile proposes a substantial expansion to previous rear addition off their Spring Hill Avenue facility.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two story Colonial Revival House was constructed in 1937.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. On July 15, 1998, the Board approved a previous rear expansion which extended approximately 158 feet beyond the rear of the historic building. Due to an ever increasing number of patients, the Ronald McDonald House Charities submit this proposal for another addition, which will extend to the north beyond the rear wall of the existing addition.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior standards state:
 - 1. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
 - 2. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Construct a 15,701 square foot, two-story addition
 - a. Proposed addition will attach to an existing 14,897 square foot, two-story, Ronald McDonald House facility;
 - 1. the original house measured 41 feet and the earlier addition measured 158.29 feet;
 - b. the current, proposed expansion measures 172.71 feet; thus, making the total length of the side elevation measure 372 feet.
 - 2. Construct a brick pavilion on west elevation to replicate the existing brick end pavilion.
 - 3. Addition will feature
 - a. cedar lap siding to match existing siding on earlier addition

1. the siding will be used between the 1998 end pavilion and the proposed new end pavilion;
2. the same siding would continue on the north and south elevations.
3. the historic home was masonry
- b. Blind arches mimic those in the existing addition
- c. Cornice to match the existing cornice moulding
- d. Windows to match the windows on the existing addition
- e. Windows are vinyl-clad, single-light casement windows
- f. Match the existing roofing material: class A, asphalt shingles
4. East and south elevation to feature wooden deck and porch with details per submitted plan
5. Deck and porch details match those on existing addition
6. Install two entryways along the west elevation with detailing to mimic existing entryways
7. Paint per submitted Benjamin Moore colors:
 - a. brick, "Alexandria beige;"
 - b. siding and trim, "Shaker Beige;"
 - c. fascia, soffits, columns, and railings, "Brilliant White;"
 - d. exterior doors, "Heritage Red."

Staff Analysis

The proposed expansion would more than double the total square footage of the existing building. The architect of the 1998 expansion is responsible for this proposal. His design takes a visual queue from the previous addition in design, scale, and material. The brick pavilion terminating the existing west elevation would be replicated in the addition. The intervening expanse of wall between the two pavilions would employ the same lap siding used on the previous addition. The north or rear elevation replicates in wood the blind arch motif found on the existing end pavilion. The roof forms and lines continue the rhythm established by the 1998 addition. Because the proposed addition is similar, if not identical, in style to the existing addition, Staff finds the proposed design appropriate.

Though scale is a significant consideration when determining the appropriateness of an addition, site considerations allow for deviation from the Guidelines. The lack of visibility of the east elevation largely obscures the scale of the building. Unlike the west elevation facing Walshwood Avenue, the east elevation does not extend along a side street. Fencing, trees, and a drainage ditch provide a screen for pedestrian and vehicular traveling on Spring Hill Avenue. The previous expansion obscures the addition's south elevation. By taking into account his earlier addition, the architect downplays the increased size and scale of the proposed expansion. Staff recommends approval.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

030-09-CA: 501 Monroe Street
Applicant: Karlos Finley
Received: 03/29/09
Meeting: 04/01/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fencing.

BUILDING HISTORY

This late twentieth-century Colonial Revival residence at the corner of Monroe and Lawrence Streets was constructed in 1979.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. The applicant proposes removing a portion of a four foot aluminum fence which extends around three sides of his property. He seeks to replace the south and southeast sections of aluminum fencing with a six foot wooden privacy fence and electronic gate at driveway.
- B. The Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. Fencing “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship the Historic District.
 - 2. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.”
 - 3. All variances required by the Board of Zoning Adjustment must be obtained prior to issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Remove an existing, 3’ aluminum fence and gate
 - 2. Install a 6’ wooden privacy fence, per submitted plan:
 - a. Proposed fence to begin at east elevation at rear corner of house; fence angles from the southeast corner of the house to the Lawrence Street driveway. The drive provides access to the backyard.
 - b. Proposed fence continue along east property line to southeast corner of property
 - c. Proposed fence continues along south property line.
 - 3. Install a double gate extending across the drive
 - a. Gate will have an iron frame fronted by wooden palings that matched the proposed fencing.

Staff Analysis

The fence as presented violates city setback requirements. The Board cannot approve a non-conforming fence. Additionally, the Board has expressed concern about boxing in the neighborhood. Staff recommends that the Board not grant the applicant approval.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

031-15-CA: 210 South Washington Street.
Applicant: Angie Odom for Zito Russell Architects
Received: 03/18/09
Meeting: 04/01/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: B-1
Project: Replace windows; add new entry; cover metal panels with stucco

BUILDING HISTORY

This mid twentieth-century industrial building originally housed the Washington Street Welding Company. In 2005, Hargrove and Associates completed a major renovation of the non-contributing building.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. Hargrove and Associates remodeled this abandoned building in 2005. The new owners propose to make cosmetic changes to east, north, and south elevations.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior standards and general principles of historic preservation hold that alterations to, and rehabilitation of, non-contributing buildings within historic districts district should either be compatible with the style and character of each building, or cause the building to become more compatible with the district.
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. East Elevation
 - a. Add a new entrance to the east elevation
 - b. Insert a pair of fixed French doors within the frame of the existing entrance
 - c. Place a lanterns to either side of the new entrance door
 - d. Replace all windows with fixed French doors
 - e. Flank French doors (except new entrance) with fixed shutters
 - f. Stucco metal panels
 - g. Paint doors and panels per submitted colors
 - 2. North Elevation
 - a. Paint concrete walls per submitted color
 - 3. South Elevation
 - a. Install black fabric canopy over door per photographs
 - b. Insert French Doors into far right window units
 - c. Flank all fenestration with fixed shutters
 - d. Stucco metal wall expanse.

4. Paint in the following BLP colors

a. French doors: Oakleigh Place Ivory

b. Stucco panels and garage doors: Springhill Brown

D. Clarification Needed:

1. How are the shutters to be mounted?

STAFF ANALYSIS

Based on lack of impairment to the building and district, Staff recommends approval of the applicant's proposal, excepting the shutters which need further clarification.