

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

June 1, 2011 – 3:00 P.M.

Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

Deleted: November 3

Deleted: 10

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: **Bradley Roe**
 - a. Property Address: 119 North Julia Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/10/11
 - c. Project: Reissue of an expired COA calling for the construction of a garage. The garage was halfway completed according to plans. The reissue of the COA will allow its completion.

Deleted: .

- 2. Applicant: **Douglas B. Kearley for William Cutts**
 - a. Property Address: 250 Chatham Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/10/11
 - c. Project: Reissue of an expired Certificate of Appropriateness dating from June 13, 2005. The Certificate of Appropriateness called for the installation of a 4' iron fence. The installation of 4' high iron fencing falls within Staff or Midmonth approvals.

Deleted: .

- 3. Applicant: **Wendell Quimby**
 - a. Property Address: Wendell Quimby
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/10/11
 - c. Project: Reroof the building to match the existing.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 21.6 pt, First line: 36 pt

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

- 4. Applicant: **Juanita Owens**
 - a. Property Address: 100 Hundred Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/12/11
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per a previously selected color palette.

Deleted: .

Deleted: Coastal Roofing

Deleted: .

- 5. Applicant: **Steve Miller**
 - a. Property Address: 209 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/13/11
 - c. Project: Replace rotten wood to match existing and repaint as per existing.

Deleted: .

- 6. Applicant: **Sue Stewart**
 - a. Property Address: 205 Michigan Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/17/11
 - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted Valspar color scheme. The body will be Polished Silver. The trim will be white.

Deleted: .

- 7. Applicant: **Jamey Watt with Watt Construction for Paulette Walsh**
 - a. Property Address: 715 Monroe Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/19/11
 - c. Project: Replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing. Touch up paint to match.

Deleted: .

- 8. Applicant: **Suzanne Fearn**
 - a. Property Address: 1561 Monterey Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/19/11

Deleted:

c. Project: Construct a storage building per MHDC stock plans. The shed will meet setback requirements.

9. Applicant: Cooner Roofing for the Government Street Presbyterian Church

a. Property Address: 51 South Jackson Street

b. Date of Approval: 5/19/11

c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork to match the existing. Replace gutters to match the existing. Repaint to match the existing color scheme.

Deleted: .

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 21.6 pt + Tab after: 39.6 pt + Indent at: 36 pt

10. Applicant: Dixie Carlson

a. Property Address: 1653 Dauphin Street

b. Date of Approval: 5/19/11

c. Project: This updates the COA for 11/30/09. Paint house, body Hotel St Francis Fawn. Trim and accents Flaming Torch. Shutters brown. Columns and balustrade white. Repair any rotten woodwork and siding to match existing in profile and dimension. Reroof as necessary to match existing.

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: .

11. Applicant: McGill Toolen Catholic High School

a. Property Address: 1414 or 1418 Dauphin Street

b. Date of Approval: 5/20/11

c. Project: Remove two sections of wooden fencing. Remove an eight foot section of wooden fencing located between the northwest corner of the lot and the front plane of the apartment house of the neighboring property to the north. Remove the southernmost section of the eastern lot. Install extensions of the approved ornamental metal on the aforementioned locations.

Deleted: .

12. Applicant: Chris Pringle

a. Property Address: 221 or 221 ½ Dauphin Street

b. Date of Approval: 5/20/11

c. Project: Remove a section of aluminum storefront. Repair rotten woodwork. Reinstall said section of aluminum storefront.

Deleted: .

13. Applicant: Gerry Graham for Robert Bantens

a. Property Address: 1565 Monterey Place

b. Date of Approval: 5/23/11

c. Project: Reroof the house with 3-tab shingles.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

14. Applicant: Robert Dobson

a. Property Address: 200 South Broad Street

b. Date of Approval: 5/20/11

c. Project: Repaint house Vanilla Cream and white trim. Replace rotten siding and fascia as necessary.

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 21.6 pt + Tab after: 39.6 pt + Indent at: 36 pt

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

15. Applicant: Benjamin Cummings for the Oakleigh Garden District Society

a. Property Address: Washington Square/251 Chatham Street

b. Date of Approval: 5/23/11

c. Project: Revise a Certificate of Appropriateness issued on 11/13/10 calling for the reinstallation of sculptural components on the Square's fountain. This revision calls for swapping of the approved figural components and existing planters to reflect the original fountains design.

Deleted: <#>Applicant: . ¶
<#>Property Address: . ¶
<#>Date of Approval: . ¶
<#>Project: .. ¶
.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2011-35-CA: 1712 Laurel Avenue

a. Applicant: Richard Tippy for Stephen & Lorna Hodges

b. Project: New Construction – Construct a rear addition.

Deleted: 0

Deleted: 82

2. 2011-37-CA: 18 North Monterey Street

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Kathryn Peterson & Owen Drey
- b. Project: Alter a side-facing gable.

3. ~~2011-38-CA: 956 Savannah Street~~

- a. Applicant: Edwena Seals
- b. Project: Demolition Request – Demolish a fire damaged house.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Alternative Decking Treatments
- 2. Discussion

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Right + Aligned at: 64.8 pt + Tab after: 82.8 pt + Indent at: 57.6 pt

Deleted: 83

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: 0

Deleted: <#>2010-83-CA: . ¶
 <#>Applicant: . . ¶
 <#>Project: . . ¶
 <#>2010-84-CA: . ¶
 <#>Applicant: . . ¶
 <#>Project: . . ¶
 <#>2010-85-CA: . ¶
 <#>Applicant: . . ¶
 <#>Project: . . ¶
 <#>2010-86-CA: . ¶
 <#>Applicant: . . ¶
 <#>Project: . . ¶

Deleted: .

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2011-36-CA: 1712 Laurel Avenue
Applicant: Richard Tippy for Stephen & Lorna Hodges
Received: 5/11/11
Meeting: 6/1/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This single story Arts & Crafts influenced house was constructed circa 1920. The façade features a porch with a clapboarded railing and a front door with an articulated door surround.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

1. 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...”

Deleted: ¶
Deleted: 0
Deleted: 82

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicants propose the construction of a small rear addition.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 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 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 will be unimpaired.”
 3. “Original window opening should be retained.”
 4. “Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms, or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and the style of the building.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**
 1. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The addition will measure 27.5’ by 22’ in plan.
 - b. The addition will rest atop either a slab foundation or brick foundation piers.
 - c. The addition will feature wooden siding matching the existing.

Deleted: last
Deleted: on
Formatted: English (U.S.)
Deleted: . Fences “.”
Formatted: English (U.S.)
Deleted: “
Formatted: English (U.S.)
Formatted: English (U.S.)
Formatted: English (U.S.)
Formatted: English (U.S.)
Formatted: English (U.S.)
Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 36 pt + Tab after: 54 pt + Indent at: 54 pt
Formatted: Indent: Left: 54 pt

- d. Corner posts will be utilized to demarcate the existing house from the addition.
- e. The addition's gable roof will maintain the pitch of rear wing's gable roof.
- f. The roofing shingles will match the existing.
- g. The addition will feature six-over-one wooden windows matching those found on the body of the main house.
- h. Windows from the North and East Elevations will be reutilized on the addition.
- i. The eave detailing and brackets will match that found on the body of the house.
- j. The East Elevation will feature two six-over-one windows. See C (3) a-c.
- k. The North Elevation will feature three six-over-one windows and a paneled & glazed door. The existing louvered vent will be reused or replicated.
- l. The West Elevation will feature one six-over-one window and a paneled & glazed wooden door.
- 2. Remove a secondary door from the South Elevation.
 - a. A multi light wooden window will replace the door.
- 3. Alter fenestration on the East Elevation.
 - a. Remove two windows comprising the rear block's tripartite window grouping.
 - b. The windows are not visible from the public view.
 - c. The two windows will be reused on the addition's East Elevation.
 - d. Center the remaining window.

- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 8 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 54 pt + Tab after: 72 pt + Indent at: 72 pt
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 72 pt
- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 8 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 54 pt + Tab after: 72 pt + Indent at: 72 pt
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 72 pt
- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 36 pt + Tab after: 54 pt + Indent at: 54 pt
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 54 pt
- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 36 pt + Tab after: 54 pt + Indent at: 54 pt
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 54 pt
- Deleted: . ¶
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 36 pt
- Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a rear addition and the alteration of existing fenestration.

The proposed addition would be minimally visible from the street. The submitted design successfully negotiates the main house's irregular grouping of a main block and an off set rear wing. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that in applications involving the additions to historic structures the old should be differentiated from the new. The proposed addition will be differentiated by corner posts thereby allowing the new construction to "read" as a later intervention to an older structure. As proposed the addition will be constructed atop either a concrete slab foundation or a raised pier foundation like that employed on the main house. Staff recommends the use of the latter. The roof will feature the form and continue the pitch of the rear wing. Siding, windows, roofing materials, and detailing will match the existing. Continuity massing and detail will allow the addition to complement the historic house. The proposed design and materials meet the standards outlined in the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. Staff does not believe the proposed addition will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building.

The unused door is located on the front of the recessed rear wing. Though facing the street, the South Elevation's secondary door is minimally visible from the public right of way. Siting and landscaping not only obscure the door, but also allow cause it to resemble a window. The Guidelines address main, prominent, and/or significant entrances, not secondary non-character defining points of ingress and egress.

Similarly, the fenestration alterations proposed for the main house's east elevation affect a secondary feature and elevation. The windows cannot be seen from the public right of way. The windows would be reused on the addition. On account of the location and treatment of the proposed alterations to existing fenestration, Staff does not believe the proposed changes will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

Deleted: . ¶

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-4), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application on the condition that the application employ a pier supported foundation instead of a continuous foundation treatment.

Deleted: , Staff.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2011-36-CA: 19 North Monterey Street

Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Kathryn Peterson & Owen Drey

Received: 5/16/11

Meeting: 6/1/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: R-1

Project: Alter a side-facing gable.

BUILDING HISTORY

This transitional house dates from circa 1914. The asymmetrical massing belies the continued influence of Queen Anne planning methods while the simple detailing indicates an ongoing wave of neoclassical resurgence.

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 December 3, 2007. At that time the Board approved the construction of a fence. In this submittal, the applicants propose the alteration a secondary side gable.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing.”
 - 2. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
 - 3. “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 be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
 - 4. “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 will be unimpaired.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

- 1. Alter the North or Side Elevations gable.

← --- Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

- a. The gable will be heightened 4' above the existing horizontal cornice line.
- b. The gabled wall dormer will feature siding that will match the existing.
- c. The gabled wall dormer will feature a six-over-one wooden window.
- d. The detailing and composition of the gable surround will be replicated.
- e. The roof pitch of the gable will remain the same.
- f. The roofing shingles will match the existing.
- g. The work will be painted to match the existing color scheme.

← --- **Formatted:** Outline numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Right + Aligned at: 64.8 pt + Tab after: 82.8 pt + Indent at: 57.6 pt

← --- **Formatted:** Bullets and Numbering

← --- **Formatted:** Indent: Left: 36 pt

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the alteration to a side elevation gable. The house features a complicated roof configuration. A primary hipped roof is skirted and punctuated by secondary gables and dormers. Some of the dormers date from construction of the home. Later dormers, gables, and other roof forms ensued (The most recent are Board approvals.)

This proposal calls for raising the height of a North or side Elevation's gable four additional feet. The house is situated on a corner lot. The gable faces a New Hamilton Street. Though the proposed alteration would be largely concealed by the tree canopy, the historic roof form and window configuration would be changed.

--- **Formatted:** Font: Not Bold

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-4), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2011-37-CA: 956 Savannah Street
Applicant: Edwena Seals
Received: 5/13/11
Meeting: 6/1/11

Deleted: 0

Deleted: 83

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition Request – Demolish a fire damaged house.

Deleted: .

BUILDING HISTORY

This single story, hipped roof Craftsman-influenced dwelling dates from circa 1920.

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. A neighboring property burned to the ground on February 8, 2011. The subject dwelling suffered extensive damage as consequence of the fire. The owner/applicant appears before the Board with a request to demolish the burned out building.
- B. The 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 structure:

This house is contributing structure in the Oakleigh Garden District. The single-story hipped roof dwelling is one of many minimally detailed Arts & Crafts influenced houses located across the Southeast. Like many other regional examples, the house features a full-length gallery.
 - ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 1. This house is located on Savannah Street, a street in the heart of the Oakleigh Garden District. As characteristic of the larger district,

Deleted: ¶

A. . This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on,¶

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 pt, First line: 0 pt

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Savannah Street exhibits a variety of architectural styles and housing types. The northern and southern sides of the 900 block of the street are lined with shotgun dwellings, Queen Anne cottages, and Craftsman "bungalows." The subject dwelling is an example of the latter.

- 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. This single-story house of Craftsman inspiration is one of many Arts & Crafts informed houses featuring single story porches. These simple box-like hipped roof dwellings are found across the Southeast.
 - 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 applicants will salvage the few remaining materials from the house, level the site, and plant grass on the lot.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The owner/applicant purchased the property in 2006 at a purchase price of \$10.00.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. The fire damage was so extensive that the applicant has not entertained the idea of restoring the house.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. The property has not been listed for sale.
 - 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. Application submitted.
 - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
 1. See submitted materials.
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."

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Demolish a single story Craftsman-influenced dwelling.
2. Level the lot.

3. Plant grass on the lot.

STAFF ANALYSIS

When reviewing applications calling for the demolition of property's principal building, four primary areas of concern are taken into account: the architectural significance of the building; the effect of the demolition on the streetscape; the condition of the building; and the nature of the proposed redevelopment.

With regard to architectural significance, this structure is a contributing residential building in the Oakleigh Garden Street. The fire damaged house is one of many single story Craftsman-influenced houses. A large number of these dwellings are box-like in form and simple in detail. Like the subject dwelling, they feature full-length galleries and hipped roofs. Houses of this type are found across Mobile and the Southeast.

Prior to the devastating fire of February 8, 2011, this house was integral component of the 900 block of Savannah's Street. The block comprised one of the most physically intact residential blocks in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The fire had a tremendous impact on the streetscape. The blaze, which originated 958 Savannah Street, engulfed that building in addition to largely destroying the subject building. 960 Savannah Street also suffered extensive damage. The 900 block's surviving buildings are situated on relatively small, albeit deep lots. All buildings are located in close proximity to the street. The demolition of the fire-gutted dwelling will leave a hollow in the center of the block, but the effect thereof would be more pronounced if the building was located on a corner lot.

As per condition, 956 Savannah Street was in a good state of repair prior to the fire. The fire took out the western wall and destroyed the sill system, wall system, and roof structure. Vandals subsequently looted the building.

On account of the extent of fire damage, the applicant's have not investigated restoring the house. The proposal calls for the leveling of the lot and the planting of grass.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Though the loss of this contributing building will impair the streetscape and the district, Staff regrettably recommends approval of the demolition on account of the extent of fire damage.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 pt, First line: 0 pt

Formatted: Justified, Indent: Left: 0 pt, First line: 0 pt

Deleted: B. . The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:¶
1.¶
2.¶
¶
C. . Scope of Work: . . .¶
1.¶
2.¶

Deleted: ANALYSIS

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: ¶
STAFF RECOMMENDATION¶

Deleted: -----Page Break-----
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS¶
STAFF REPORT¶
¶
2010-84-CA: ¶
Applicant: ¶
Received:¶
Meeting: ¶
¶
INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION¶
¶
Historic District:¶
Classification:¶
Zoning:¶
Project:¶
¶
BUILDING HISTORY¶
¶
.¶
¶
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.¶
B. . The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:¶
1.¶
2.¶
¶
C. . Scope of Work:¶
1.¶

... [1]

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2010-84-CA:

Applicant:

Received:

Meeting:

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:

Classification:

Zoning:

Project:

BUILDING HISTORY

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.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “”
 - 2. “.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. .
 - 2. .

STAFF ANALYSIS

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2010-85-CA:

Applicant:

Received:
Meeting:

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:
Classification:
Zoning:
Project: .

BUILDING HISTORY

.

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.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “.”
 - 2. “.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. .
 - 2. .

STAFF ANALYSIS

.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Page Break

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS STAFF REPORT

2010-86-CA:
Applicant:
Received:
Meeting:

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:
Classification:

Zoning:
Project: .

BUILDING HISTORY

.

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 .
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. Fences “.”
 - 2. “.”
 - 3. “.”
 - 4. “.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):
 - .
 - .
 - .
 - .
 - .

STAFF ANALYSIS

.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (), Staff.

Page Break

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS STAFF REPORT

2010-87-CA:
Applicant:
Received:
Meeting:

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:
Classification:

Zoning:
Project: .

BUILDING HISTORY

.

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.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “.”
 - 2. “.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. .
 - 2. .

STAFF ANALYSIS

.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Page Break

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS STAFF REPORT

2010-88-CA:
Applicant:
Received:
Meeting:

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:
Classification:
Zoning:
Project: .

BUILDING HISTORY

.

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.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “”
 - 2. “”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. .
 - 2. .

STAFF ANALYSIS

.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

-----Page Break-----

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS STAFF REPORT

2010-89-CA:

Applicant:

Received:

Meeting:

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:

Classification:

Zoning:

Project: .

BUILDING HISTORY

.

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.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “.”
 - 2. “.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. .
 - 2. .

STAFF ANALYSIS

.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION