

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA
March 6, 2012 – 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: Integrity Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 401 Flint Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/14/13
 - c. Project: Reroof the house. The roofing shingles will match the existing.
- 2. Applicant: Glynis Madison**
 - a. Property Address: 1111 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/8/13
 - c. Project: Renew temporary signage approval for 30 days (A permanent sign is on order.).
- 3. Applicant: Mobile History Museum**
 - a. Property Address: 111 South Royal Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/20/13
 - c. Project: Repair, repair (to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material when necessary), and repaint windows.
- 4. Applicant: Katharine Flowers**
 - a. Property Address: 922 Conti Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/21/13
 - c. Project: Install an iron handrail of simple design on the front steps.
- 5. Applicant: Mrs. Linda Cashman**
 - a. Property Address: 251 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/22/13
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles (asphalt/black in color).
- 6. Applicant: Jennifer Greene**
 - a. Property Address: 1260 Texas Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/22/13
 - c. Project: Remove and replace a front walk to match the existing in materials and dimension.

APPLICATIONS

1. 2013-14-CA: 501 Church Street

- a. Applicant: Karlos Finley
- b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval for Fencing – Retain a wall.

2. 2013-15-CA: 1005 Augusta Street

- a. Applicant: Carla M. Sharrow
- b. Project: Fencing – Install an 8' fence.

3. 2013-16-CA: 201 Saint Joseph Street

- a. Applicant: Patrick Tolbert with Dagley Engineers
- b. Project: Site Alterations for an unlisted building - Demolish a parking cover; level that portion of the site; pave the aforementioned; and install fencing to match the existing.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2013-14-CA: 501 Monroe Street
Applicant: Karlos Finley
Received: 2//13
Meeting: 3/6/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval for Fencing – Retain a wall.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house was constructed in 1979.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on April 4, 2009. At that time, the Board denied an application calling for the installation of 6’ high privacy fence. The applicant returns before the Board requesting the after-the-fact-approval of six foot high wall.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. Fences “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property of 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. All variances required by the Board of Adjustment should be obtained prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.”
 - 2. Under materials cited as inappropriate for fences, walls and gates “unstuccoed concrete block” treatments are listed.
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted materials):**
 - 1. Retain a six foot high concrete block wall.
 - a. The six foot high concrete wall features a brick cap.
 - b. The wall is painted to match existing expanses of wall. The wall is of the same design and treatment as the existing.
 - c. The first section of the new wall commences at the southeast corner of the house and continues at an angle until it reaches the vehicular entrance.

- d. The wall continues along the eastern lot line (along the inner edge of the Lawrence Street sidewalk) where it turns a corner and continues along southern lot line.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the after-the-fact-approval of six foot high concrete block wall.

The wall extends from the southeast corner of the house (a rear corner) in an angled manner to the sidewalk where it extends along the eastern (Lawrence Street) and southern (inner lot) sides of the lot. Upon reaching a pedestrian entrance located farther into the lot on the southern lot line, the fence drops down in height to a little over three feet. The design, construction, and treatment of the fencing match existing fencing located on the property.

The Board reviewed a previous application calling for a six foot high wooden fence that was proposed for the same location as the wall which is now up for review. That earlier application was denied. The wall as constructed violates municipal setback requirements. Additionally, the Board has expressed concern over fencing located on corner lot properties. Unfinished concrete blocks are listed as an inappropriate fencing material in Mobile's historic districts (See B-2)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (2) and previous Board rulings, Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and the historical character of the building. Staff does not recommend approval of this application

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2013-15-CA: 1005 Augusta Street
Applicant: Carla M. Sharrow
Received: 2/13/13
Meeting: 3/6/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fencing – Install fencing.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house is the oldest surviving house on Washington Square. The evolution of the dwelling into its present form is interesting. Virginia Goelet built the nucleus of the house in 1868. Originally consisting of only the three easternmost bays, the house evolved from a single-story side hall house to a coastal cottage circa 1875 when the second owner, Columbia Randlette, lengthened the façade, altered the roof, and extended the 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 September 15, 1986. The owner/applicant appears before the Board with a proposal calling for the installation of an 8’ fence.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. Fences “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property of 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. All variances required by the Board of Adjustment should be obtained prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.”
- C. Install fencing (per submitted site plan):
 - 1. Install an eight foot high fence.
 - a. The design of the fence will match that of existing fencing enclosing other portions of the rear lot.
 - b. The eight foot fence will commence at the property’s vehicular gate (behind the front plan of the house on the eastern lot line) and extend parallel to and shield from view a neighboring chain link fence.
The fence will tie into existing interior lot wooden fencing.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of an interior lot privacy fence. Staff approved an eight foot fence, on the belief that one of the adjoining properties was multi-family. It now appears the occupied apartment is not a legal use of the lot which has been reported to the City's 311 system. The Design Review Guidelines restrict the height of solid fencing to a height of six feet unless the property adjoins a multifamily or commercial property. This property is surrounded by R-1 properties and staff does not believe an exception to the guidelines should be granted based on an illegal use.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2013-14-CA: 201 Saint Joseph Street
Applicant: Patrick Tolbert with Dagley Engineers
Received: 2/18/13
Meeting: 3/6/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square (a portion of the parcel)
Classification: Not-Listed
Zoning: B-4
Project: Site Alterations - Demolish a parking cover; level that portion of the site; pave the aforementioned; and install fencing to match the existing.

BUILDING HISTORY

This automotive building was constructed circa sometime between 1925 and 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 has never appeared before the Architectural Review. Since a portion of the parcel upon which this building stands is part of the DeTonti Square Historic District, the whole of the parcel falls under the jurisdiction of the Architectural Review Board. The applicants would like to demolish a small two-bay vehicular wing that extends from the northeast corner of the property’s northernmost building, the building that extends along State Street (See the City Map for reference.).
- 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(s):
 - 1. This building is not officially listed in the Detonti Square Historic District Inventory. The building appears on the 1955 Sanborn Map, but is not depicted on the 1925 Sanborn Map. Dating from the middle third of the 20th Century, the building is representative of the numerous automotive and commercial established constructed during that period in

- this area. Other surviving contemporary examples can still be found lining St. Louis and Saint Anthony Streets.
- iii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. While this building is listed as part of the DeTonti Square Historic District, the building contributes to the built density of area. The portion of the building in question engages extends along State Street, but engages the inner lot. With the exception of the fascia and a single window, this small vehicular wing is experienced as a wall when viewed from the street.
 - iv. 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.
 - v. 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. As a complex, this buildings is one of two structures of what once an automotive repair facility. Other surviving contemporary examples can still be found lining St. Louis and Saint Anthony Streets. This example has been has been successfully reused for other purposes.
 - vi. 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. The applicants want to demolish one small portion of the building. If granted demolition approval, the site of the small vehicular wing in question would be leveled, the concrete would be removed, asphalt would be installed, and fencing would be extended. The site would function as an extension of the existing parking lot.
 - vii. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. Not provided.
 - viii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. The main part of the building in question will continue to serve its present use. Only the small wing would be demolished.
 - ix. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The owners do not want to sell the property.
 - x. 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. NA.
 - xi. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amount expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. NA.
 - xii. 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
 - 2. Not Necessary.
 - xiii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.

1. See submitted Materials.
 2. *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 small two-bay vehicular wing that extends from the northeast corner of the property’s northernmost building, the one extending along State Street.
 2. Remove concrete paving.
 3. Level the affected area.
 4. Install asphalt paving atop the affected area. Asphalt paving is installed elsewhere on the site.
 5. Extend an existing fence along the sidewalk.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a lower-one story vehicular wing that extends from the northeast corner of one of the property’s two principal buildings. The buildings are not officially listed as being a part of the DeTonti Square Historic District, but are brought into the district through a re-subdivision of the property. As a consequence of a small portion of the larger parcel being part of Detonti Square Historic District, the whole property falls under the jurisdiction of the Architectural Review Board. This partial demolition involves review of the following: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the effect the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

The building in question is one of roughly two dozen surviving automotive building constructed in this area during the middle third of the 20th Century. As a cultural phenomenon, they are representative of the increased commercialized presence that eventually overwhelmed what had been one Mobile’s most 19th-Century and early 20th- Century residential quarter quarters. Other examples line St. Louis and St Anthony Streets.

This portion of the building is in a good state of repair.

While this portion of the building in question extends along State Street, it engages the inner lot. With the exception of the fascia and a single window, this small vehicular wing is experienced as a wall when viewed from the street.

If granted demolition approval, the site of the small vehicular wing in question would be leveled, the concrete would be removed, asphalt would be installed, and fencing would be extended. The site would function as an extension of the existing parking lot.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the historic district. Staff recommends approval of this application. Staff also recommends that owners relocate the fencing now fronting the vehicular enclosure proposed for demolition to areas with without matching fencing.