

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA
January 21, 2009 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, 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: Rentz Home Maintenance

- a. Property Address: 11 Lee Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/28/08
- c. Project: Reroof with 3 tab shingles

2. Applicant's Name: George Swann

- a. Property Address: 56 Fearnway
- b. Date of Approval: 1/06/09
- c. Project: Repair rotten wood on rear of house, matching existing in profile dimension and material. Paint to match the existing house.

3. Applicant's Name: D & B Construction

- a. Property Address: 56 S Hallett St.
- b. Date of Approval: 1/05/09
- c. Project: Reroof with 3 tab shingles.

4. Applicant's Name: Leek Proof Roofing

- d. Property Address: 1210 Government Street
- e. Date of Approval: 12/31/08
- f. Project: Exterior repairs and reroof.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 009-09-CA: Corner of Chatham and Church

- a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley
- b. Request: New Residential Construction

2. 010-09-CA: 1306 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Regina Finnegan
- b. Request: Privacy fence and aluminum fence

D. OTHER BUSINESS

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

009-09-CA: Corner of Chatham and Church
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Received: 1/05/09
Meeting: 1/21/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a vacant lot in the Oakleigh Garden District.

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 applicants wish to construct a new residence on this property.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior standards state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “the goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district, but to avoid creating a false sense of history. . .
 - 2. 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. . .
 - 3. 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. Applicants propose:
 - 1. constructing a two-story, brick home per the submitted plan
 - a. masonry exterior and foundation
 - b. hipped roof with Timberline shingles
 - c. L-shaped side galleries with wood columns and railings
 - d. two-over-two, vinyl clad wood windows with soldier courses
 - e. wood door
 - f. other details to be wood
 - 2. construct a one-story garage per the submitted plan
 - a. Brick exterior
 - b. Fiberglass/composite door
 - 3. construct a brick wall per the submitted plan

- a. 6' high
- b. Wall will enclose front yard to create courtyard
- c. provide for privacy to side gallery home
- d. brick to match home
- e. pilasters at intervals
- f. gate to be installed at driveway
 - 1. gate to be determined at later date

STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposed new residence seeks to emulate side gallery homes which can be found throughout the southern, coastal communities in the nineteenth century. While few examples of this style remain in Mobile, the review board has in the past approved such contemporary renditions. As such, the style, massing and form are all appropriate for a historic district. Staff does have a concern about the window arrangement on the east elevation and the use of the arched window. The applicants intend to use materials routinely approved for new construction, including vinyl-clad wood windows. Therefore, Staff recommends approval upon Board consideration of the east elevation.

Under the zoning code and the historic district guidelines, solid walls in front yards must be kept to 3'. The proposed wall may require a variance. Though the Board has on occasion approved side yard walls, it has made it a policy that tall fences, in particular solid fences or walls are not allowed in front yards or along street frontages where they will box in the street. Therefore, Staff does not recommend approval for the proposed masonry wall.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

010-09-CA: 1306 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Regina Finnegan
Received: 01/05/09
Meeting: 01/21/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fence

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story Italianate home was constructed by Duncan T. Parker in 1871. The size of the lot reflects the early transition of this part of Mobile from country estates to townhomes, when this lot was carved from the Chamberlain estate. The Chamberlain home faced North Ann Street, approximately where the Mauvila Court apartments are now located.

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 applicants are seeking approval for a new 8’ privacy fence along their rear, east property line. The applicants are also seeking approval for an iron fence and 5’ wood privacy fence along the front east property line.
- B. The Mobile Historic Guidelines, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Fences should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. 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. The finished side of the fence should face toward public view.”
- C. Applicants propose:
 - 1. 8’ privacy fence, dog-eared, along the rear, east property line;
 - 2. aluminum fence to match existing along the front, east property line to the front plane of the home;
 - 3. 5’ wood privacy fence to match existing along east property line from iron fence to existing 5’ fence to match existing, per submitted plan.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Because the applicant’s property is adjacent to an apartment building, the applicants are permitted to construct an 8’ fence. Furthermore, since the Board routinely approves 6’ privacy fences for side yards,

the applicants may construct a 5' wood privacy fence along the east property line. Finally, the applicants intend to match an existing aluminum fence in the front yard along the east front yard boundary. This new fence will tie in with the existing aluminum fence which was approved at an earlier date. For these reasons, the application complies with the applicable guidelines. Therefore, Staff recommends approval.