

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA
January 20, 2010 – 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: Leak/Proof Roofing

- a. Property Address: 1008 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/28/09
- c. Project: Reroof using GAF 25 year shingles, charcoal in color. Replace drip edge and refelt the roof.

2. Applicant: Steve Marine

- a. Property Address: 1561 Bruister Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 12/28/09
- c. Project: Replace the existing 12/1 wooden windows with those of the same pattern. Repaint the windows white.

3. Applicant: Wayne Askew Contracting

- a. Property Address: 2305 Ashland Place Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 12/28/09
- c. Project: Repair rotten wood, replace siding to match in profile and dimension, reframe side room because of termite damage, reframe with board and batten as per existing.

4. Applicant: Lucy Kahalley

- a. Property Address: 66 Fearnway
- b. Date of Approval: 12/28/09
- c. Project: Demolish badly deteriorated garage.

5. Applicant: Rogers and Willard

- a. Property Address: 101 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/23/09
- c. Project: Install temporary support for an existing exterior column for 10 floors. Strapping, wood bracing and heavy duty geotextile fabric (temporary). All historic material is to be preserved, saved and reused. A scope of work for the permanent repairs will be submitted.

6. Applicant: Fauvre House Movers

- a. Property Address: 206 South Dearborn Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/21/09
- c. Project: Install six 2x8 pressure treated floor joists. Rebuild 14-15 concrete block piers beneath the house. Run 6x6 sills where needed. All the work will be underneath the house and not visible.

7. Applicant: Kenneth Winchester

- a. Property Address: 351 George Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/29/09
- c. Project: Install an aluminum sign measuring 1.75 square feet.

8. Applicant: Mike Henderson

- a. Property Address: 1181 Elmira Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/29/09

- c. Project: Repair/replace any deteriorated decking, fascia and soffits. Reroof with 3-tab composition, 25-year shingle. Charcoal in color.
- 9. Applicant: Susan Carley**
- a. Property Address: 353 George Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/30/09
 - c. Project: Suspend a metal sign measuring 36 x 30" from a wood frame (per submitted plan).
- 10. Applicant: Glenda Snodgrass**
- a. Property Address: 210 South Washington Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/05/10
 - c. Project: Install a steel gate over the southernmost entrance off Washington Street. The gate will match the existing northern gate accessing the parking lot.
- 11. Applicant: Mike Henderson**
- a. Property Address: 355 Rapier Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/29/09
 - c. Project: Repair/replace any deteriorated decking, fascia and soffits. Reroof with 3 tab composition, 25 year shingle, Charcoal in color.
- 12. Applicant: Jeremy Shade**
- a. Property Address: 1355 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/05/10
 - c. Project: Repaint house in existing color scheme, replace damaged lattice as per existing, patch damaged roof shingles in rear with 30 year architectural shingles to match color.
- 13. Applicant: Mark Watkins**
- a. Property Address: 53 South Julia Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/05/10
 - c. Project: Shutter two windows on the northern elevation. Extend siding over two windows located on the first floor of the rear addition to the house. This first floor of the rear elevation is a 1970s construction not visible from the street. Repair and replace three wooden windows on the rear elevation to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
- 14. Applicant: Melissa Rankin**
- a. Property Address: 312 South Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/07/10
 - c. Project: Repaint per existing color scheme. Install storm one-over-one functional storm windows.

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 06-10: 23 Lee Street**
 - a. Applicant: Wayne Gardner
 - b. Project: Demolish a house.
- 2. 04-10: 1219 Selma Street.**
 - a. Applicant: Lucy Barr for Mr. and Mrs. William Hannum
 - b. Project: Construct a rear addition.
- 3. 02-10: 263 South Broad Street**
 - a. Applicant: Dharam Parnu
 - b. Project: After the fact approval – demolish a chimney.
- 4. 07-10: 72 South Royal Street**
 - a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley for David Rasp
 - b. Project: Courtyard Improvements – Construct a wooden pergola over the existing rear courtyard. Install a roll-down canvas awning and a shade cloth. Install lattice on the

exterior face of the existing fence. Construct additional storage space.

5. **08-10: 1655 McGill Avenue**

- a. Applicant: Alice Warren for the Little Sisters of the Poor
- b. Project: Remove a chainlink fence. Construct a wooden fence. Relocate prefabricated ancillary buildings.

6. **09-10: 609 Conti Street**

- a. Applicant: Ross Holladay
- b. Project: Construct a fence.

7. **10-10: 50 South Franklin Street**

- a. Applicant: Tilmon Brown for the Archdiocese of Mobile
- b. Project: Install a steel spiral staircase unit to access a second story door off the rear elevation. Install iron brackets beneath the façade's wrought iron balcony.

D. **OTHER BUSINESS**

- 1. Guidelines
- 2. Discussion
- 3. Alabama School of Math and Science:

A report submitted by Bebe Lindsey on behalf of the Alabama School of Math and Science:

“On December 15th at 5:00 p.m. a meeting was held at Government Plaza at the request of Councilman William Carroll. In attendance were: Councilman Carroll, Jim Rossler (city council attorney) , Fran Hoffman (neighbor), Rennie Brabner (president of Mobile Historic Commission), Devereaux Bemis (ARB Director), Keri Coumanis (ARB), Mike Windom (ASMS Fdn chair), Bebe Lindsey (ASMS), Garvin Wattuhewa (ASMS interim President), Barbara Cadell (ODW), and Rudy Auerbach (ODW).

Most everyone agreed that ASMS is in financial hardship and could not do much of anything about that right now. Many options were discussed such as a wooden fence along one section, landscaping a little to make neighbors happy etc.

Plans to be discussed a next board meeting

- 1. Auburn architectural student doing a free site plan
- 2. Fundraising events to secure funding for a fence
- 3. Increasing student parking fees, but this would be an additional burden on parents during economic hardship times
- 4. Other options that would ensure the safety of the students and their vehicles without a fence.”

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

06-10-CA: 23 Lee Street
Applicant: Wayne Gardner for the Dauphin Way United Methodist Church
Received: 11/27/09
Meeting: 1/20/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition of a house. Remove a chain link fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

The nucleus of this house dates from 1920s. According to Sanborn Maps, the house achieved its present form prior to 1955.

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. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on January 6, 2010. Staff incorrectly identified this non-contributing building as contributing. The application reappears before the Board for reconsideration under the correct classification. The property’s most recent appearance prior the January 6, 2010 was on October 7, 2007. At that time, the applicant for the Dauphin Way United Methodist Church requested demolition approval for this house as well as houses located at 30 and 31 Lee Streets. The three demolition requests were denied. 31 Lee Street has since been sold and rehabilitated. 30 Lee Street reappeared before the Board on June 17, 2009 as a single demolition request. The Board approved the demolition of the deteriorated structure. The Church’s representative comes before the Board with a second demolition request for 23 Lee Street. If granted, the post demolition plan for the lot calls for planting of grass and installation of landscaping. The greenspace would serve as unpaved, overflow parking for the church.
- B. In regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the board shall consider:
 - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structures;

This building is a non-contributing structure within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.

- ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 1. While not an exemplar of a particular architectural style or building type, this house, by virtue of its date and location, is vital component of the streetscape along northern Lee Street. The alterations to the building make it marginal for historic importance. However, it does have some importance as part of an ensemble of residential buildings. A parking lot extends to the north of the building. The house at 30 Lee Street, just southwest of the property, was demolished in the summer of 2009. 23 Lee Street is then a physical anchor within this portion of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced.
- iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 1. The house at 23 Lee Street is not a surviving example of a single architectural style. The building does evidence the evolution and expansion of small one story single family dwelling over the last three quarters of the 20th Century.
- v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 1. If granted demolition approval, the applicant proposes removal the removal of all paved surfaces on the property. The lot would be planted with grass, along with additional landscaping features. At the recent meeting the Board requested more landscaping than just the proposed grass and hedge.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The Dauphin Way United Methodist Church acquired this property December 12, 2004 for \$90,000.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. The Church has investigated two alternative courses of action regarding the property. Renovation has been considered, but that option was found to be cost prohibitive. Relocating the house was the other option considered. Due to the low grade and physical state of the house, this option was not deemed feasible.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. Not applicable.
- ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 1. Not applicable.
- x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;

1. Not given
- xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and
 1. Check submitted.
- xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
 1. The Board has asked for a landscaping plan, particularly of the south property line.
3. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”
 1. The Board has asked for a landscaping plan, particularly of the south property line.

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):

1. Demolish the house at 23 Lee Street
2. Plant grass and install landscaping on the lot.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Demolition requests are reviewed on a case by case basis. The significance of the building, the nature of the proposed redevelopment, and the effect of the demolition on the streetscape are key concerns. The ARB must consider the applicant’s plans for the redevelopment of the site.

This house is a non-contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way historic district. While not an exemplar of a particular architectural style or a recognizable residential type, the house contributes to the physical density of a portion of Lee Street that has witnessed multiple demolitions in recent decades.

A paved parking lot extends to the north of the lot. If granted approval, the newly-cleared lot at 23 Lee Street would be planted with grass and the hedge of the neighboring parking lot would be extended. While the applicants do not plan to pave the lot, the further erosion of the built environment on Lee Street would impair the architectural and historical integrity of the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Given that this house is non-contributing and has undergone several modifications through the years, Staff does not oppose its demolition. In this instance, the applicants have submitted a minimal landscaping plan. In order to further protect the historic streetscape, Staff recommends that a landscaped buffer be planted between the property and 25 Lee Street and further landscaping features should be planted within the lot.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

04-10-CA: 1219 Selma Street
Applicant: Lucy Barr for Mr. and Mrs. William Hannum
Received: 12/14/09
Meeting: 01/20/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Arts and Crafts inspired house is situated at the southeast corner of Selma Street and Regina Avenue dates from 1924. The house features a complicated roofline marked by multiple gables and a prominent front terrace accessed by an entrance porch.

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. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on January 6, 2010. The application was tabled for clarifications. Prior to the January 6, 2010 meeting the house appeared before the Board most recently on March 15, 1993. On that date, the Board approved the construction of a small rear addition and rear porch/side deck. The applicants return to the Board with a proposal for another addition.

- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new shall be differentiated from the old 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 (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Build a Rear Addition.
 - 2. Brick foundation piers and lattice skirting will match the existing.
 - 3. Wood siding will match the existing.
 - 4. Corner posts and inset connector will demarcate the transition to the addition.
 - 5. Window surrounds will match the existing.

6. The roof pitch and eave brackets will match the existing.
7. The roof shingles will match the existing
8. The West Elevation (Regina Avenue) measures 46' 6" in length.
 - a. The addition's west elevation commences with a slightly recessed bay articulated by six-over-one window.
 - b. A cross gable extending from the body of the gabled roof addition features a fixed shuttered window.
 - c. A longer bay occupying the same plan as the recessed northern bay features a fixed shuttered window.
9. South Elevation (Rear) measures 22' 7" in length.
 - a. The addition's south elevation features a projecting gabled ell without fenestration (a storage room located within).
 - b. A relocated six-over-six window occupies the eastern section of the elevation.
10. East Elevation (Interior Lot) measures 46' 3" in length.
 - a. The east elevation features a porch located beneath the body of the addition's gabled roof.
 - b. Two square section columnar posts support the porch.
 - c. A picket railing extends between the columns across a small deck located at the juncture of the addition and the existing house.
 - d. A six-over-one window overlooks the deck.
 - e. Two fifteen light French doors open onto the porch.
 - f. An inner bay featuring a fixed shuttered window and a southern blind bay (the storage room) terminate the east elevation.

D. Clarifications

1. Has the applicant contacted Urban Forestry with regard to the trees which would have to be removed from the site?
2. How will the roof of the proposed addition affect the rear elevation's dormer window?
3. Does the addition meet setback requirements?

STAFF ANALYSIS

According to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, additions to historic structures should be differentiated from, yet compatible to the existing building. The proposed addition to 1219 Selma Street draws stylistic details from and observes proportional relationships of the main house. That said the addition is made distinct from the historic fabric by way of corner posts and setbacks that successfully allow the addition to "read" as a later expansion to a historic house. An existing privacy fence will further obscure the proposed addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Pending the above the clarifications, Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical character of the house or the district. Staff finds the proposed addition in compliance with Guidelines B(1) and B(2), therefore Staff recommends approval of the proposed addition.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

02-09-CA: 263 South Broad Street
Applicant: Dharam Pannu
Received: 12/03/09 * 311 of November 8, 2009
Meeting: 01/20/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-3
Project: After the fact approval – Demolish a chimney.

BUILDING HISTORY

The physical history of this house is unclear. According to the 1901 Sanborn Maps, a house occupying this lot and building footprint faced Augusta Street. If the present dwelling is the same structure, it has been extensively remodeled.

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. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on January 6, 2010. The applicant returns to the Board with documents pertaining to the demolition a chimney. According to the owner, the chimney, which was located on the building’s south elevation, was damaged by lightning in September 2009. The demolition occurred without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff was notified of the unapproved work via a 311 call made on November 8, 2009. The applicant appears before the Board with a request to retain the replacement siding that covers the wall space previously occupied by the chimney shaft.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of the features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.”
 - 2. “The exterior material of the building helps define its style, quality and historic period. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Approve the demolition of the chimney formerly located on the south elevation.
 - 2. Retain wood siding installed over the wall expanse occupied and covered by the chimney.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This building has undergone numerous renovations over the course of many years. The renovations have been both sympathetic and unsympathetic to the character and fabric of the building. The chimney was demolished in September of 2009. The applicant failed to obtain a building permit to demolish the chimney. Staff was not consulted. A Certificate of Appropriateness was not issued. The Board does not approve the demolition of chimneys when they are engaged to the walls of a buildings exterior. The owner does have a report from the alarm company about damage to the alarm dated in September of 2009. The Reports states that the damage to the alarm panel was caused by a lightning. Since no permit was sought, neither staff nor the Board had an opportunity to establish the extent of the damage to the chimney.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff believes the unauthorized demolition of the chimneys impairs the architectural and historical integrity of the building and the district, but recommends approval of the demolition based on the force-de-majeure damage and further recommends the Board adopt a policy on after-the-fact approvals.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

07-10-CA: 72 South Royal Street
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for David Rasp
Received: 1/4/10
Meeting: 1/20/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Courtyard Improvements - Construct a wooden pergola over the existing rear courtyard. Install a roll-down canvas awning and shade cloth. Install lattice on the exterior face of the existing fence. Construct additional storage space.

BUILDING HISTORY

This single story commercial building appears in the 1925 Sanborn Maps.

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. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on March 13, 2006. The Board approved renovations to the building’s façade. The applicant returns to the Board with a scope of work pertaining to the rear courtyard. The proposal calls for the construction of a pergola, the facing of an existing fence, and the construction of additional storage space.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
 - 2. Fencing “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 the historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if commercial or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face toward the public view.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 3. Construct a pergola
 - a. Six wooden posts placed along the wall of the adjoining building to the north will support a wooden truss to support the trellised roof.

- b. The pergola's roof trellis will terminate in shaped rafter tails supported by the existing fence posts.
 - c. Five ceiling fans will be extend downward from the apex of the roof vault created by the truss and the trellis.
- 4. Install a roll-down canvas shade awning for use during inclement weather.
- 5. Install a retractable shade cloth on the southern fence and the roof.
- 6. Install lattice to the exterior face of the existing fence to cover the shade cloth.
- 7. Construct two additional storage rooms to either side of the gate at the western end of the courtyard.
 - a. Hardiplank siding will sheath the walls of the storage rooms (excepting a portion of lattice on west elevation of the southern room).
 - b. A metal shed roof with a west facing slope will cover the storage rooms.
 - c. The southern storage room (that proposed opposite the existing storage room) will measure 4' 6" by 13.
 - d. The storage room adjacent to the existing storage room located at the northwest corner of the courtyard will measure 6' x 7' 4."
- 5. Face the existing the exterior storage room with Hardiplank

D. Clarifications

- 1. What type of roof will be on the sheds?

STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposed pergola and storage sheds would be located in the property's rear courtyard. Parking lots are located south and west of the site exposing the area to public view from several directions. An existing landscape buffer further obscures the western side of the courtyard. The pergola and storage sheds meet the design and material standards set by the Guidelines, found under B(1) and B(2).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical character of the district, and, therefore, recommends approval of this application.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

08-10-CA: 1655 McGill Avenue
Applicant: Alice Warren for the Little Sisters of the Poor
Received: 01/20/10
Meeting: 12/22/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Remove a chain link fence. Construct a wooden fence. Relocate prefabricated ancillary buildings.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Mobile Chapter of the Little Sisters of the Poor was founded in 1901. The present structure, a design by Edward Baumhauer, was constructed in 1970s. The symmetrical composition, block-like massing, and centralized plan ascribe to the so-called “Corporate Versailles” approach to planning and form that informed many mid 20th-century Modernist institutional compounds.

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

This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on May 5, 2009. The applicants submitted a two part proposal that called for the extension of the chain link fence enclosing the rear service area and the relocation of prefabricated storage units within the expanded enclosure. The application was withdrawn. There is no record of the storage units being presented to the ARB. The Little Sisters’ representative returns to the Board with an altered fencing proposal and a second request to relocate the storage units within the enclosure. The current site plan is also undergoing approval as a PUD and has been drawn to conform with the City’s Zoning Ordinance.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:

Fencing “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement, materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”

“The finished side of the fence should face toward the public view.”

“All variances must be obtained prior to the issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness.”

An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.

Scope of Work (See submitted Plan):

1. Cut down one popcorn tree and one oak tree.
2. Remove the diagonal section of the existing chain link fence.
3. Construct a 6' wooden privacy fence based on the design of the MAWSS fencing located on the opposite side of Conti Street.
 - A. The fence will be set back 13' from the sidewalk.
 - B. The fence will extend 110' along Conti Street.
 - C. The fence will be 36' into the lot (from the 13' setback).
 - D. The fence extension will square off the service entrance enclosure.
4. Relocate the existing prefabricated storage sheds from the complex's west lawn to the expanded service enclosure.

Clarifications

1. What are the heights of the storage sheds?
2. What are the dimensions of the storage sheds?

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicant proposes relocating two prefabricated storage sheds from the open west lawn to an expanded rear service enclosure. The expansion of the service area would entail the removal of a portion of an existing chain link fence. The replacement fence would be set back from the street. Existing landscaping would further obscure the fencing and storage units. While the storage sheds would be relocated closer to the sidewalk they would be located within a fenced area.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

From the information provided, Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical integrity of the building or the district. Pending clarification of the size and height of the storage sheds, Staff recommends approval of this application.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

09-10-CA: 609 Conti Street
Applicant: Ross Holladay
Received: 12/29/09
Meeting: 01/20/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Construct an 8' wooden dog-eared fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house, which features an "American 4-Square" plan which most likely dates from the early twentieth century. With stuccoed walls, battered wall piers, and stuccoed eaves, this Arts & Crafts informed house shows the influence of the Spanish Mission style.

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. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application calls for the enclosure of the parking area located at the southwest corner of the property with an 8' wooden fence.
- B. The Design Guidelines for Mobile's downtown commercial buildings, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. Fencing "should complement the building and not detract form it. Design, scale, placement, materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District."
 - 2. "The finished side of the fence should face toward the public view."
 - 3. "All variances must be obtained prior to the issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness."
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Construct a 8' wooden dog-eared privacy fence (per submitted site plan).
 - A. The fence will extend two feet west of the southwest corner of the later rear addition.
 - B. The fence will extend 25' along the property's south lot line.
 - C. The fence will extend 48' ½" along the west property line abutting the Dearborn Street sidewalk.
 - 1. A 10' double gated vehicular entrance will be located 15' north of the southwest corner of the lot.
 - 2. A single pedestrian gate will be located 2' from the northwest termination of the fence.

- D. The fence will extend 10' into the lot where it will tie into the southwest corner of the house.

D. Clarifications

- 1. Are there setback issues with either UDD or Traffic Engineering?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This property is zoned B-4. A busy fast food restaurant is located opposite the proposed parking enclosure. Several other commercial establishments are located in the close vicinity. The Board has required a planted buffer between privacy fences and the right of way in several cases. Though this is a secondary street, because of the McDonalds and the traffic patterns, this area receives considerable foot and vehicular traffic. Staff believes an 8' foot dog eared fence would loom over pedestrians and create a sense of foreboding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff does not believe the construction of a fence would impair the architectural integrity of the house or the district, but recommends that approval of the application be conditional on a setback two or three feet from the sidewalk, that it be no higher than six feet, and that a design with a finished top be used rather than a dog-eared design.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

10-10-CA: 50 South Franklin Street
Applicant: Tilmon Brown for the Archdiocese of Mobile
Received: 1/04/10
Meeting: 1/20/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install a steel spiral stair to access the second story door of the rear elevation.
Install iron brackets beneath the façade's wrought iron balcony.

BUILDING HISTORY

Completed in 1854, the Elkus House is one Mobile's grandest surviving Greek Revival side hall houses. The monumental stuccoed door surround, which features huge battered jambs supporting a broad lintel, provides a contrast to the delicacy of the handcrafted balcony above. The balcony is one of the finest examples of wrought ironwork in the city.

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. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The Archdiocese's representative submits a two part application.
 - 1. The first part of the proposal concerns the rear elevation. According to the 1901 Sanborn Maps, a brick service wing extended from the southwest corner of the rear elevation. An L-shaped two-tiered wooden porch embraced the rear elevation of the main house and north elevation of the rear wing. The rear wing has been demolished. The southern portion of the surviving main block's rear elevation has been infilled and expanded. The northern half of the elevation, the location of a proposed spiral staircase, features a door and a window on first and second floors. The proposed stair would ascend to the second floor where a platform would provide access to the second story door. An intermediate platform would break the ascent or descent.
 - 2. The second part of this application addresses the front elevation's wrought iron balcony. The applicant proposes the removal of the five original scroll brackets attached to the tie rods that support the balcony. Six cast iron brackets would replace the original brackets.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved."

2. “Deteriorated historic features shall be preserved rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture and other visual qualities and where possible materials.”
3. “The porch is an important regional characteristic in Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
4. “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain the historic appearance. The materials should blend with the style of the building.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Project I – Install a steel spiral staircase (per submitted photograph).
 - A. The spiral stair unit will ascend from ground level.
 - B. The stair unit will be 5’ in diameter and 18’ in height.
 - C. The stair will be located at the western termination of the existing stoop that accesses the first floor door.
 - D. The stair would ascend to an intermediate landing as required by fire regulations.
 - E. The stair will ascend to a four foot square landing platform allowing ingress and egress to the second story door.
 - F. A railing will enclose the landing platform
2. Project II – Install six cast iron brackets.
 - A. Remove the five original wrought iron brackets.
 - B. Install six cast iron brackets.

Clarifications

1. Project I Install a steel Spiral staircase.
 - A. How will the intermediate landing affect the plan and elevation of the stair unit?
 - i. Will the intermediate platform result in stepped configuration that would extend westward into the lot?
 - B. Will the intermediate landing and the platform have the same railing as the stairs?

PROJECT I.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The rear elevation of this house has been extensively altered. While the applicant submitted a photograph of the spiral stair, he failed to provide a drawing showing how the proposed stair unit will engage the building and extend into the lot. The submitted photograph of the stair leaves much to conjecture. A steel spiral staircase is not appropriate to the period and the style of this house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff believes the proposed stair may impair the architectural and historical character of the building and the district; however, does not believe there is no information before the ARB to make that determination. Therefore Staff recommends tabling the application, in reference to Project I, in order to allow the applicant to submit additional drawings illustrating how the stair will look adjacent to the historic building.

PROJECT II.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Porches, galleries, and balconies are a defining feature of Mobile architecture. The original balcony survives intact. Historic fabric should always be maintained where possible and this is an integral part to the historic integrity of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

As one of the finest examples of wrought ironwork in the City, the proposed removal of the scroll brackets would impair the architectural and historical character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of Project II.