

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA**  
**June 3, 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: Tim Gautreaux**
  - a. Property Address: 15 Gladys St.
  - b. Date of Approval: 05/18/09
  - c. Project: Replace wood siding in kind.
2. **Applicant: Tom Bierster**
  - a. Property Address: 1059 Dauphin St.
  - b. Date of Approval: 05/18/09
  - c. Project: Reroof flat commercial building with bitumen.
3. **Applicant: Nicholas H. Holmes, III**
  - a. Property Address: 109 Government St.
  - b. Date of Approval: 05/14/09
  - c. Project: Iron work to match existing.
4. **Applicant: Gator Signs**
  - a. Property Address: 255 Church Street.
  - b. Date of Approval: 05/15/09
  - c. Project: Place temporary (30 day maximum) sign over Ramada Inn sign. Sign materials to be canvas and coroplast.
5. **Applicant: Dr. Henry J. Koch**
  - a. Property Address: Levert Ave. and Old Shell Rd.
  - b. Date of Approval: 05/12/09
  - Project: Clean wood and stucco surfaces. Replace stucco as needed with appropriate lime-based mortar. Repaint stucco white. Affix urns or planters on pedestals.
6. **Applicant: Wendell Quimby**
  - a. Property Address: 914 Charleston St.
  - b. Date of Approval: 05/13/09
  - c. Project: Reissue COA from August 8, 2007. Reroof building with black 3-tab shingles..
7. **Applicant: Roy and Debbie Isbell**
  - a. Property Address: 910 Government St.
  - b. Date of Approval: 05/20/09
  - c. Project: Repairs to match existing in profile, scale, dimension, and material.
8. **Applicant: Mack Lewis for David Barnett**
  - a. Property Address: 1123 Church St.
  - b. Date of Approval: 04/22/09
  - c. Project: Work to be done per City Council overruling of the ARB; Intstll an 8' wood privacy fence along the west property line from the front body of the house south to the present gate. The gate will be relocated to the front. Fence is to match the existing to the east of the house..
9. **Applicant: Gary and Theresa Davidson**
  - a. Property Address: 166 Hannon Ave.

- b. Date of Approval: 05/29/09
- c. Project: Replace rotten wooden boards with new boards to match existing. Paint body per submitted Benjamin Moore color scheme. Paint body Gettysburg Gray. Paint trim Timid White. Paint door New Horizon.

**10. Applicant: Jerry Graham.**

- a. Applicant: 311 South Monterey St.
- b. Project: Reroof replacing shingles in kind.

**11. Applicant: Larry and Lela Bennett.**

- a. Applicant: 1012 New Saint Francis St.
- b. Project: Replace porch decking in kind.

**12. Applicant: Tommie Majors.**

- a. Applicant: 1101 Savannah St.
- b. Project: Repaint per existing color scheme.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

1. 050-09: 208 South Cedar St.
  - a. Applicant: Susan and Daniel Gianelloni
  - b. Project: Replace front door. Install new transom.
2. 051-09: 507 Saint Francis St.
  - a. Applicant: Mark of Jackson
  - b. Project: Replace siding and windows.
3. 052-09: 165 Saint Emanuel St.
  - a. Applicant: Krotine for Posner
  - b. Project: Remove and replace window sashes.
4. 053-09: 706 Government St.
  - a. Applicant: Joe Steen for JK Properties LLC
  - b. Project: Install shutters.
5. 054-09: 107 N. Lafayette St.
  - a. Applicant: Ben Cummings
  - b. Project: Landscaping Approval..
6. 055-09: 1007 Government St.
  - a. Applicant: Don Parden for ICM Foundation, INC.
  - b. Project: Landscaping and paving approval.
7. 056-09: 1862 Government St.
  - a. Applicant: Ultra Car Wash
  - b. Project: Sign Approval.

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. 412 Dauphin St.
2. Discussion

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**050-09-CA:** 208 South Cedar St.  
**Applicant:** Susan and Daniel Gianelloni  
**Received:** 05/12/09  
**Meeting:** 06/3/09

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Church Street East  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Insert beveled and leaded glass panels in door and transom; stain door.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This single-story side hall house with off-set wing exemplifies a popular late 19<sup>th</sup>-century housing type in Mobile. Examples are found in six of the city's historic districts. This house was built in the 1890s.

**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 application concerns fenestration changes to a Queen Anne style house's Cedar Street facade
- B. The state Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts in pertinent part:
  - 1. "Original doors and windows will be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replaces should respect the age and style of the building."
  - 2. "Doors with leaded or art glass may be appropriate when documentation exists for their use, or when they are compatible with the design and style of the structure."
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):
  - 1. Strip paint from nine panel door
  - 2. Remove larger middle panel from door
  - 3. Replace wooden panel with beveled and leaded glass panel per submitted plan
  - 4. Remove existing single light transom
  - 5. Replace with beveled and leaded glass transom
    - a. street numbers to be executed in blue glass
  - 6. Stain door with a mahogany finish

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

While documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence all indicate that this house did not have a leaded and beveled glass transom, Queen Anne houses often featured this type of decoration. The existing front door is not the original door. The original door was a four panel door with taller upper panels featuring glazing. The existing door is of comparable date to the missing original. The applicant believes that the larger middle panel of the existing door was once glazed. This is quite possible since that panel is larger than

others and surrounded by molding. The other panels have raised or fielded centers. The center panel is flat, indicating later replacement. Staff does not object to the use of a glazed panel, but the treatment is too elaborate for this house. Staff recommends that the applicant use a beveled glass, but not leaded glass panel and transom. The street number can be etched in transom.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**051-09-CA:** 507 Saint Francis St.  
**Applicant:** Mark O. Jackson  
**Received:** 05/05/09  
**Meeting:** 06/03/09

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Remove and Replace Siding.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This house dates from 1908. It was originally a two-story house with tiered side galleries. The building served as a multi-tenant property. The second story has since been removed and the side gallery in-filled.

**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 house last appeared before the Board on May 20, 2009. The applicant made unauthorized changes to the dilapidated building. A previous owner proposed to demolish the building. The request was denied. The present applicant acquired the property in 2008. Staff granted a midmonth approval to stabilize the foundation on February 5, 2009. The midmonth did not include a provision authorizing the removal or replacement of siding or windows. The applicant proceeded to remove the existing siding and windows. Staff received a 311 notification. Subsequently, Staff visited the site and granted a midmonth “to replace siding in kind.” The applicant was informed he would need to appear before the Architectural Review Board. The applicant continued to go beyond the approved scope of work on both this property and the adjacent property, 505 St. Francis Street. A Notice of Violation was issued on May 6<sup>th</sup>. A stop work order was issued on May 11<sup>th</sup>. The applicant appeared before the Board at the May 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. The application was tabled. The applicant was asked to submit a full design proposal to Staff no later than Tuesday, May 26, 2009 for inclusion in the June 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. The original siding should be retained and repaired.”
  - 2. “Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the existing in profile, dimension and material.”
  - 3. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on a building help establish the historic character of a building. Original windows should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing.”

4. "Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building."
  5. "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."
  6. "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."
  7. "The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch."
  8. "Foundation screening should be recessed from the front of the foundation piers. Lattice, if used, should be hung below the skirt board or siding, between the piers and framed with trim."
  9. "Doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building."
- C. Scope of Work:
1. Remove deteriorated wooden novelty (2 1/2"-3" reveal) lap siding
  2. Remove deteriorated drop-lap siding
  3. Replace entire wood siding with new, wood drop-lap siding
  4. Paint house per submitted color scheme
    - a. Body – Softened Green
    - b. Trim - Pure White
  5. North Elevation (per submitted plan)
    - a. Remove tripartite grouping comprised of six-over-six double hung sash windows
    - b. Replace windows with two wood frame windows with non-divided lights
    - c. Remove brick foundation of later porch
    - d. Replace continuous brick foundation of later porch with brick piers interspersed with lattice skirting
    - e. Remove later brick front porch steps
    - f. Replace steps with wooden steps with balustrade to match C(4)(h)
    - g. Remove later brick front porch coping wall
    - h. Replace coping wall with MHDC recommended wooden balustrade
    - i. Remove later wooden posts from coping wall
    - j. Replace posts with full length box columns
  6. West elevation
    - a. Remove metal windows
    - b. Replace windows with wood double sash windows with non-divided lights
  7. East Elevation
    - a. Remove two metal and four six-over-six wood frame windows
    - b. Replace windows with wooden double sash windows with non-divided lights
  8. South Elevation
    - a. Construct a deck
    - b. Insert a pair of French doors

## CLARIFICATIONS

1. Detailed drawings of the proposed posts
2. Materials for front door
3. Detailed drawings of the proposed deck

## STAFF ANALYSIS

This building was in a state of disrepair stemming from deferred maintenance and unsympathetic alterations. The recent unapproved alterations greatly altered the building's façade. Furthermore, though the building was listed as a contributing building when surveyed, upon review, the house should have been considered non-contributing. Research reveals the original home was a two-story, two-bay tenement with side galleries running the length of the west façade. Entry into the units were from the side galleries. Thus, previous alterations included the removal of the second story, closing in the side gallery, and the replacement of the historic windows with aluminum windows. Given these earlier changes, all of which impaired its historic character and appearance, Staff now recommends treating this building as a non-contributing resource. In doing so, the ARB will have greater discretion when applying the historic district guidelines.

However, current, proposed changes to the building's façade should not distract from the character of the district. The surrounding streetscape with its attendant buildings must be taken into account. With regard to the façade or **north elevation**, the applicant's proposal calls for the removal of the later continuous brick foundation porch and its replacement with a wooden porch supported by brick foundation piers. This façade treatment is in keeping with other porches on St. Francis Street and within the larger historic district. **Staff recommends approval of proposed changes to the north elevation pending clarification of the porch post dimensions, removal of the center window from the bank of windows, and use of a four paneled door.**

The applicant would like to construct a deck off the **south elevation**. A pair of French doors would open onto the proposed deck. Though the applicant was instructed at the May 20, 2009 ARB meeting to return with a complete set of plans, he has failed to do so. Staff has asked for clarification of the plan to the rear deck, including the deck's foundation, steps, and railing. Staff request permission to work with this applicant and approve these plans, as well as those on the front, as a mid-month provided the plans conform to the guidelines.

Since this building has undergone many unsympathetic changes and was faced in different types of siding, Staff recommends approval of the replacement siding on all four elevations. Staff also recommends approval of the replacement windows, minus the addition of the adhesive window dividers.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**052-09-CA:** 165 St. Emanuel Street  
**Applicant:** Larry Posner for the Fort Conde Restoration Venture  
**Received:** 05/18/09  
**Meeting:** 06/3/09

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Church Street East  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: H-B  
Project: Window Replacement

**BUILDING HISTORY**

The Hall-Ford House is one of Mobile’s most significant surviving Antebellum structures. This 1836 house represents the application of Georgian planning, seen in the symmetrical façade and center hall plan, and classical detailing, seen in the subtle proportioning and Doric columns, to the traditional Creole cottage. Additionally, the house is a rare example of the Creole cottage type with a fully finished first floor.

**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 Review Board in December, 2007. The Board approved a proposal that would have converted the house into a bed and breakfast inn. The COA involved the rehabilitation of the historic structure and the addition of a new wing. The rehabilitation required existing materials, when necessary, be replaced to match the existing in profile and dimension.

The plans, in regards to the windows, specifically called for the following scope of work:  
“Carefully remove and store all glass and remove all putting from glazing rebates; strip all paint from the interior and exterior of the sash, and from the exterior of the frames; replace all broken deteriorated or missing muntins with matching members run from clear heart redwood or mahogany; replace all broken, deteriorated elements from sash or frame; reglaze all sash with existing glass (as much as possible) and furnish and install new glass, as specified; then repair interior of sash and frames, leaving interior of sash just primed; adjust all sash prior to and after painting so that all sash operates smoothly and well; where they exist, rehabilitate hewn spandrel beneath sash and where missing furnish and install new sash in existing frame; rehabilitate sash and frame as noted; rebuild damaged sills with materials matching existing.”

- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines read as follows:



1. “The type, size and dividing light of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building.
2. Original windows openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.
3. Where existing windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Remove historic windows from all elevations
2. Replace windows with Kolbe double hung custom-made wooden true-divided-light windows

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

The Hall-Ford House is one of the region’s most important 19<sup>th</sup>-century residential buildings. It is located in the Fort Conde Village. The building has suffered from deferred maintenance and neglect over the past twenty-five years. While some of the original windows are in various states of decay, the majority of the sashes are in good state of repair.

The applicant has restored several houses in the Fort Conde Village. He plans to open a bed and breakfast in the Hall-Ford House. The applicant has applied for a tax credit for the proposed work on the Hall-Ford House. In order to realize the federal historic rehabilitation tax credit, the applicant must repair the historic windows as much as possible; any replacement of the historic windows must precisely match the original historic sashes, frames, jambs, sills and muntins. See page two of the Part 2 Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit application (attached).

The applicant proposes replacing the historic windows with true-divided-light, six-over-six Kolbe windows. The dividing lights would not replicate the original narrow muntins; thus, impairing the historical character of the house. It is unclear from the information submitted as to how closely the proposed window unit replicates the historic one.

Numerous window sashes are stored in the service dependency off the southeast corner of the house. The narrow muntins or dividing lights of these windows and those on the house are very thin in profile, which makes them appear unstable. Additionally, the framing members securing the windows within the wall and the putty securing the lights within the frames give the impression that the windows are unsalvageable. Staff recommends that the applicant repair the existing windows, following the scope of work approved in 2007, which calls for reglazing the windows, applying putty as necessary, install new single lites where missing and new hardwood carpentry elements when necessary. All replacement windows should match the existing in size, material, profile, and dimension.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**053-09-CA:** 706 Government St.  
**Applicant:** Joe Steen for JK Properties LLC  
**Received:** 05/15/09  
**Meeting:** 05/06/09

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Church Street East  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Affix Shutters to concrete section of facade.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This single story commercial building is traditional interpretation of mid twentieth-century Modern architecture. The asymmetrical façade and non-historical treatment espouse Modern theory, but the use of brick and ironwork for half the elevation harks back to traditional construction methods and materials.

**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 Review Board. The applicants received midmonth approval in February 2009 to replace the front door. They now wish to cover a section of the façade with shuttering.
- B. The Design Guidelines for Mobile’s downtown commercial buildings, state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Operable units, hung with appropriate hinges are encouraged. Where blinds or shutters must be fixed, they should be hung on the window casing in a manner to replicate those that are operable. Decorative shutters are appropriate on some 20th Century buildings. Evidence must be presented of their original use when requested.”
  - 2. In addition, the ARB has been routinely approving shutters constructed of both wood and a heavy composite material.
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Cover unarticulated concrete portion of façade with shutters.

**CLARIFICATIONS**

- 1. What is the material composition of the proposed shutters?

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This mid twentieth-century commercial building is a non-contributing building structure within the Church Street East Historic District. The wall expanse the applicants propose to shutter is covered by sixteen concrete blocks. Seven of the concrete blocks have holes marring their surfaces. The holes were

likely the screw holes used to hold removed signage. Staff does not the believe shuttering of half the façade would impair the architectural or historical character of the building or district. Staff recommends approval of this application upon clarification of the shutter material.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**055-09-CA:** 107 North Lafayette Street  
**Applicant:** Ben Cummings  
**Received:** 05/18/09  
**Meeting:** 06/03/09

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Non-contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Site and parking lot alterations

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This application involves the contemporary building within the historic St. Mary's school campus.

**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 project involves the parking area around St. Mary's School. The applicants wish to pave an existing play yard in order to create more parking and remove a basketball court in order to create play yard. The project also involves the installation of an asphalt driveway along the southern perimeter of the school.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. "Chain link fences are inappropriate for historic districts.
  - 2. Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property. The appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design.
  - 3. Parking areas should be screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences or landscaping.
  - 4. Circular drives and parking pads in the front yard are generally inappropriate in the historic districts
  - 5. Ordinances relating to parking and landscaping will be enforced in reviewing requests for parking lots."
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Construct new parking area and driveway where there is now green space
  - 2. Remove existing asphalt basketball court and create green space
  - 3. Fencing
    - a. Remove chain link from perimeter
- D. Clarification
  - 1. Fence removal and replacement

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

The proposed driveway will cross the front entrance to the contemporary wing of St. Mary's school in order to provide a place for school students or teachers to be dropped off and picked up. Although the main, historic school building is oriented towards Old Shell Road, this building and its entrance is oriented towards North Lafayette Street. Therefore, the proposed driveway will cross the front yard of this building and will result in paving most of the green space currently found in front of the building. Under the Mobile Historic District Guidelines, paving the front yard, as well installing circular drives, are generally inappropriate. This green space is a key component to North Lafayette streetscape. Looking north along the street, one finds residential homes, with typical front yards. In order to comply with our guidelines and protect the historic streetscape, Staff recommends the applicants be denied permission to install the driveway.

The applicants also propose installing a parking lot just north of this building (in the northeast corner of the campus), while removing a parking lot found in the northwest corner of the campus. This northwest parking lot (also a basketball court) will be returned to green space for recreation use. The new parking lot will allow for 28-30 cars and will feature an asphalt surface. Staff finds these projects appropriate.

The school has been in the process of replacing black, chain link fence with new, aluminum fencing, This application will necessitate removal of some of the existing black, chain link fence. Staff understands the applicant intends to reuse some of the black chain link, but not necessarily in the same location where it is now. Under the guidelines, chain link fences are not allowed in historic districts. Those that were in existence prior to the creation of the guidelines (2000) may remain, however, new chain link fence may not be added to a site. As such, Staff request clarification regarding the applicants plan for the fencing.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**056-09-CA: 1007 and 1009 Government Street**  
**Applicant: Don Parden for ICM Foundation, Inc.**  
**Received: 05/18/09**  
**Meeting: 06/03/09**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Construct two parking lots

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This property contains two structures. The two-story masonry structure in the center of the property was once the servants quarters to the Gage-Ketchum mansion. The mansion and its accessory structures were constructed approximately 1859-1860 and embodied the Italianate style, a then-popular alternative to the Greek Revival. Two accessory structures remain (there is also a carriage house which faces Church Street and now on its own legal lot of record) but the original home was destroyed in 1935. Research conducted by the applicant reveals that the buildings were most likely either designed by New York architect Calvert Vaux or modeled after a design in Vaux's book, *Villas and Cottages*, released in 1857.

The one-story, masonry church on the corner of Chatham and Government street was constructed in 1960 and designed by Cooper Van Antwerp.

**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 has recently been in the process of subdividing this property. One parcel has already been subdivided out, leaving this parcel which fronts Government Street in its entirety. This parcel is on the market, and in order to comply with current zoning regulations, the applicant needs planning approval to operate a church in an R-1 district. The applicant needs parking for the church. Currently, church members park on grassy areas located around the two-story masonry structure.

The applicant intends to create a formal parking lot immediately in front of the nineteenth century, two-story masonry structure. The applicant proposes paving the area with grasscrete using a Percstonre Grid Paver. The site fronts onto Government Street, a major street, and a minor street, Chatham Street. All streets have adequate right-of-way.

- B. The following are **Recommendations from the City Planning Commission** in order to approve the Planned Unit Development. Based upon the preceding, the application is recommended for Approval, subject to the following conditions:
1. Compliance with Engineering comments (comments);
  2. Compliance with Forestry comments (comments);
  3. Compliance with Traffic Engineering comments (comments);
  4. Revision of the site plan to eliminate parking and access proposed on the West side of the church, from Chatham Street;
  5. Revision of the site plan to depict all parking and circulation as one way, on the East side of the church, maximizing to the greatest extent possible greenspace area for the existing 96-inch live oak;
  6. Revision of the site plan to depict parking bumpers, curbing or other method of prevent vehicular traffic onto greenspace areas;
  7. Revision of the site plan to depict and label a 6-foot high wooden privacy fence along the southern and southwestern property lines, where the site abuts existing residences, with no fence required within the 25-foot setback from Chatham Street or along the eastern boundary of the site;
  8. Depiction and labeling of surface storm water detention facilities, if required;
  9. Compliance with the tree and landscaping requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, including the addition of 3 frontage trees on the Chatham Street side;
  10. Placement of a note on the site plan stating that any changes to the site plan will require new applications for Planning Approval and Planned Unit Development approval prior to the issuance of any permits;
  11. Placement of a note on the site plan stating that the site will be illuminated in accordance with the requirements of Section 64-4.A.2. of the Zoning Ordinance;
  12. Submission of applications to the Board of Zoning Adjustment and the Architectural Review Board for required approvals, and proof of approvals provided prior to any applications for building permits or land disturbance;
  13. Submission of a revised PUD site plan and landscape plan, and Planning Approval site plan and landscape plan, prior to applications for building permits or land disturbance; and
  14. Full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances.
- C. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines state, in pertinent part:
1. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.
  2. The appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design.
  3. Parking areas should be screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences or landscaping.
  4. Circular drives and parking pads in the front yard are generally inappropriate in the historic districts
  5. Ordinances relating to parking and landscaping will be enforced in reviewing requests for parking lots.”
- C. Scope of Work:
1. From the **City Planning Commission Report**: The existing sanctuary building contains 5,825 square feet and pews to seat 229 people. The applicant proposed reducing the number of pews so that only 128 people can be seated, with the remaining space to be converted to classrooms. Conversion of sanctuary area to classroom area may require building permits. The second building on the site is a two-story building, with

The applicant also proposes to provide parking to accommodate 32 vehicles, as no designated parking is currently provided on the property. The applicant is proposing concrete block pavers that allow grass to grow within a concrete-bounded grid – this alternative parking surface will require an application to the Board of Zoning Adjustment, as such parking surfaces are only allowed “by-right” as overflow parking.

The proposed parking area will be divided into two parts: 4 spaces will be provided on the West side of the church, requiring two new curb-cuts onto Chatham Street, with 28 spaces provided on the East side of the church, with a widened curb-cut onto Government Street. Currently, parking on the site occurs on the East side, on grass, utilizing a residential width curb-cut onto Government Street. The proposed widening of the curb-cut onto Government Street is limited by two existing live oak trees. The East side parking area is proposed to incorporate an existing 96-inch DBH live oak tree, that has a canopy width estimated to be 115 feet across. The applicant proposes providing some green space around the trunk, in addition to using the permeable pavers. The proposed parking area is designed to provide one-way traffic around the tree, thus providing access to the two story structure at the rear of the site. It is recommended that the 28-space parking facility be redesigned to provide one-way circulation and parking only, increasing the area dedicated to green space in the vicinity of the 96-inch oak, and providing parking bumpers around the green space area to ensure that there is no vehicular intrusion into greenspace areas. It is also recommended that the 4 spaces proposed on the West side of the church be eliminated, and that the variance request that will be necessary for the alternative paving surface also include a request to reduce the number of required parking spaces.

While the proposed parking area will be surfaced with permeable paving, compliance with the storm water regulations may be required. If a surface storm water detention facility will be provided, it should be depicted and labeled on the site plan.

A final note about the parking area, any spaces provided for handicap parking and accessibility may need to be paved with asphalt, concrete, or solid pavers, as grass-pavers may not meet surfacing requirements of the Americans with Disability Act.

Regarding the tree and landscape plan, it appears that the site will be short 3 frontage trees along Chatham Street. If the proposed parking area along Chatham is removed, adequate room will be available to plant the required frontage trees.

If the site will be illuminated at night, lighting shall comply with the requirements of Section 64-4.A.2. of the Zoning Ordinance, which states that *“lighting facilities used to illuminate signs, parking areas, or for other purposes shall be so arranged that the source of light does not shine directly into adjacent residence properties or into traffic.”*

Finally, where no buffering exists between the site and adjacent properties, a 6-foot high wooden privacy fence should be provided. The locations for the buffer, identified by staff, are the property lines on the southern and southwestern boundaries of the lot, where the site abuts residences. No fence should be required within the 25-foot setback from Chatham Street, or along the eastern property line, where there is an existing masonry wall.



- D. Clarifications:
1. Use of both properties

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

Under the Mobile Historic District Guidelines, parking areas should be relegated to the rear of the property. Staff recommends denial for the parking along the west elevation of the church. This is a prominent corner along Government Street, within the Oakleigh Garden District. Though the church is a newer building, it is gaining historic significance in its own right and the corner has not been degraded by parking or inappropriate construction. A parking lot at this juncture interferes with and threatens the historic streetscape and is therefore inappropriate.

Staff recommends denial for the proposed parking in front of the two-story masonry structure and encompassing the oak tree. First, there is a historic brick walkway in this area which extends from Government Street to the main entrance to the servants quarters. Second, this building is highly significant, both for its architecture and its historic, cultural landscape. As an architect-design, Italianate, two-story masonry structure, there is not another servant's quarter of this caliber and design within Mobile. Further, the building has been minimally altered throughout the years and still retains its historic appearance. As such, it represents an era of which few, if any, artifacts remain. Removing the brick paving and allowing parking in front of this structure destroys this historic, cultural landscape, as well as impairs the historic building. Third, more investigation should be done into the proposed pavings affect on the historic oak tree found in this location. The tree is approximately 450+ years old. At the time of writing this report, Urban Forestry had not commented on the proposed plan. Staff will remain in contact with Urban Forestry. Finally, since the property has not yet sold, the anticipated use of the property is undetermined. While Staff applauds the applicant's desire to use grasscrete, given that the new use of the property may not necessitate as many parking places as are currently planned and that the new owner is not yet determined, Staff recommends denial of the proposed plan.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**057-09-CA:** 1862 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Chip Hackett for Ultra Car Wash  
**Received:** 05/18/09  
**Meeting:** 06/03/09

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Out of District Signage  
Classification: Non-contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Install signage

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This signage will be located on a new building currently under construction. The new construction will house an “Ultra Car Wash.”

**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 wishes to install both a monument and wall sign on the Government Street frontage of their property. This site is unique because it has access both from Government Street and Airport Boulevard. The applicants will return with plans for signage along Airport Boulevard.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Signage in Mobile’s Historic Districts and along Government street state in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs. The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet. A multi-tenant building is also limited to a maximum of 64 square feet.
  - 2. “The total allowable square footage for the display area of a monument sign is (50) fifty square feet, for pole signs 40 square feet, and for projecting 40 square feet.
  - 3. “Menu Boards for drive-through windows at restaurants need to be reviewed for size, material, etc. They are not counted toward the maximum square footage allowed for on-site signs. Menu boards are limited to a maximum of 25 square feet and shall not have information or signage on the reverse side.
  - 4. The size of the sign shall be determined by measuring the area within each face of a geometric shape enclosing all elements of informational or representational matter including blank masking. Structural supports not bearing information shall not be included in the computation of display area. For double faced signs, each side shall be counted toward the maximum allowable square footage.

5. The structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building. Wood, metal, stucco, stone or brick, is allowed. Plastic, vinyl or similar materials are prohibited. Neon, resin to give the appearance of wood, and fabric may be used as appropriate.
6. Internally lit signs are prohibited. Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination. Such lighting shall not shine into or create glare at pedestrian or vehicular traffic, nor shall it shine into adjacent areas. Light fixtures mounted on the ground shall be screened by landscaping.

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):

1. Install monument sign at southeast corner of property
  - a. 8' high
  - b. Approximately 9' x 4' oval sign
  - c. Situated above 10' base, 6' tall
  - d. Reverse channel LED lighting
  - e. Total square feet = 50.63 sq.ft. (both sides)
2. Install wall sign on south elevation building
  - a. Approximately 9' x 2'8" oval sign
  - b. Non-illuminated

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

The above site has street frontage on both Government and Airport Boulevard. Though the sign ordinance was placed into effect to regulate signage along Government Boulevard, the entire parcel is subject Architectural Review Board control. Maximum signage allowed in this district is 64 square feet, without first acquiring a variance. Staff has been working with these applicants. The applicants will seek a variance for signage facing Airport Boulevard.

Presently, the signage along Government Boulevard conforms to the Sign Review Guidelines, though, more recently the ARB has been limiting monument signs to six feet. Therefore, Staff recommends approval provided 1) the monument sign is further decreased in height to accommodate a pedestrian scale and 2) traffic and engineering approve the location.

