

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA
May 20, 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: Lanier Construction

- a. Property Address: 1 S. Royal St.
- b. Date of Approval: 05/04/09
- c. Project: Replace existing ATM with a new machine. It will fit exactly in the new opening. There will be no sign charge.

2. Applicant: Charles Weems for Dr. James K. Simpson

- a. Property Address: 201 Levert Ave.
- b. Date of Approval: 05/01/09
- c. Project: Install mansard brown colored hip roof over existing modified membrane roof of garage outbuilding. Pitch shall be 1.5:12.

3. Applicant: Brian Degregio

- a. Property Address: 656 Church St.
- b. Date of Approval: 01/01/09
- c. Project: Repair tongue and groove porch decking to match existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint windows and shutters Roof Top Garden (pale green). Repaint trim Ginger Palm (brown orange). Repaint boy Butterfly Wing (pale brown yellow).

4. Applicant: Mobile Eye Clinic.

- a. Property Address: 1365 Government St.
- b. Date of Approval: 04/27/09
- c. Project: Affix tenant panels to previously approved sign.

5. Applicant: Hargrove and Associates

- a. Property Address: 24 S. Royal St.
- b. Date of Approval: 01/27/09
- Project: Mount Reverse lit LED channel sign to building's marble face.

6. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley

- a. Property Address: 451 Dauphin St.
- b. Date of Approval: 04/30/09
- c. Project: Paint Building per submitted Mobile Paints colors. Body will be Flo Claire Crocus Yellow. Ironwork will be Savannah Street Dark Brown. Trim and shutters will be DeTonti Square Off White.

7. Applicant: Tom Steeley

- a. Property Address: 1451 Dauphin St.
- b. Date of Approval: 05/04/09
- c. Project: Repair soffit and fascia board to match existing in profile, dimension, and material. Install iron railing on left side of front porch. Repair flashing around chimney. Repair back door.

8. Applicant: Fred Krotine

- a. Property Address: 165 St. Emanuel St.
- b. Date of Approval: 04/29/09

- c. Project: Update COA of December 4, 2007.
- 9. Applicant: Mary S. Zoghby for Boys and Girls Club of South Alabama**
 - a. Property Address: 1102 Government St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 01/06/09
 - c. Project: Affix Boys and Girls Club lettering to Government Street entrance door.
- 10. Applicant: Ken McElhaney**
 - a. Property Address: 1615 Government St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 05/05/09
 - c. Project: Clean eaves of house and garage. Paint eaves green to match existing sashes and east side dormer. Repair porte-cochere timbers and reroof existing flat portion with rubberized membrane. .
- 11. Applicant: Bonnie and Thad Phillips**
 - a. Property Address: 200 South Georgia Ave.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/27/09
 - c. Project: Repaint house per submitted Sherwin Williams colors.
- 12. Applicant: Thomas Shell**
 - a. Property Address: 566 Dauphin St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 01/06/09
 - c. Project: Suspend 3 foot square sign from existing sign frame.
- 13. Applicant: Inness Harding for Ron Wilhelm**
 - a. Property Address: 1119 Government St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/30/09
 - c. Project: Place a generator to east side of property.
- 14. Applicant: Mike Kinnard for Charter South**
 - a. Property Address: 412 South Broad St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 05/08/09
 - c. Project: Place tent on property from May 14th to May 19th, 2009.
- 15. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Charles and Leslie Cutts**
 - a. Property Address: 1005 Government St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/24/09
 - c. Project: Paint house per submitted Mobile Paints color scheme.

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 045-09: 262 South Monterey St.
 - a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley
 - b. Project: Demolish existing garage. Construct a workshop with adjacent patio.
- 2. 046-09: 302 Congress St.
 - a. Applicant: Dylan and Stephanie Pace
 - b. Project: Window and door replacement; landscaping approval; fencing approval; painting approval.
- 3. 047-09: 507 St. Francis St.
 - a. Applicant: Mark O. Jackson
 - b. Project: Replace deteriorated siding. Replace deteriorated and later windows.
- 4. 048-09: 412 South. Broad St.
 - a. Applicant: Mike Kinnard for Marvin Hewatt Enterprises
 - b. Project: New Construction.
- 5. 049-09: 1760 Dauphin St.
 - c. Applicant: William Graham
 - b. Project: Fencing Approval.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. 412B Dauphin Street
2. Guidelines
3. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

045-09-CA: 262 South Monterey Street
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Randy and Stacy Week
Received: 04/27/09
Meeting: 05/20/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolish existing garage; construct a new ancillary structure with adjacent patio.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house 1909 house melds the vernacular tradition of the Gulf Coast with the Arts and Crafts mentality of life and design.

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. On November 5, 2009 the Board granted the applicants approval to demolish the existing garage and construct a new ancillary structure in its place. The applicants return to the Board with a modified proposal.
- B. The state Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts in pertinent part:
 - 1. “An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. The appropriateness of accessory shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):
 - 1. Demolish existing one-story ancillary structure
 - 2. Construct a one-story ancillary structure per submitted plans
 - A. Measures 12’ x 25’;
 - B. Features Hardie shingles laced at the corners to match those on main house
 - C. East Elevation
 - 1. Features a glazed and paneled overhead door
 - D. North Elevation
 - 1. Features glazed wood door
 - 2. Features two four-over-four wood windows
 - E. West Elevation
 - 1. Features one four-over-four wood window
 - 3. Construct Brick 10’ x 10’ brick patio off north elevation

STAFF ANALYSIS

The Board previously approved a plan allowing the demolition of the existing garage and the construction of a new ancillary structure. The new proposal has many of the same features as the one approved last November. The design complies with the guidelines. This structure reflects the main house in both form and detail. Therefore, staff recommends approval.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

046-09-CA: 302 Congress Street
Applicant: Dylan and Stephanie Pace
Received: 05/11/09
Meeting: 05/20/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-B, Residential Business
Project: Window and Door Replacement; Landscaping Approval; Fencing Approval.

BUILDING HISTORY

Though parts of this house date to the 1867, the building underwent extensive renovations during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The first story façade dates from the 1920s, while the shingled gable above dates from 1900.

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 Board in April 2005. At that time a previous owner submitted an application for a second story connector between the main house and rear garage. The application was denied. The applicants then made an unsuccessful appeal to City Council. The current owner applicants acquired the property in April of this year. Prior to the applicant’s purchase, the previous owner removed window frames and casings as well as making other unapproved alterations to the building.
- B. The 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.”
 - 2. “The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
 - 3. “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 design and style of the house.
 - 4. “The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the existing in profile, dimension and material.”
 - 5. Fencing “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship the Historic District.”

6. “Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting. Asphalt is inappropriate for walkways. Gravel and shell are preferred paving materials. Hard surfaces may also be acceptable.”
 7. Ordinances relating to parking and landscaping will be enforced by the City of Mobile Urban Development Department in reviewing requests for parking.”
- C. Scope of Work:
1. South Elevation
 - a. Remove first story steel casement windows
 - b. Replace steel casement windows with wooden six-over-six wood true-divided-light windows
 - c. Replicate upper window sashes of gable windows in the lower sashes of same frames
 - d. Remove later six paneled door
 - e. Replace six paneled door with fifteen light wood French door
 2. East Elevation
 - a. Remove steel casement windows
 - b. Replace steel casement windows with six-over-six wood true-divided-light windows
 3. North Elevation (Rear)
 - a. Remove one-over-one first-story windows
 - b. Replace one-over-one windows with glass blocks
 - c. Remove center vinyl clad aluminum window in gable
 - d. Replace window with six-over-six wood true divided light window
 - e. Install six over six wood true-divided-light windows in frames flanking center gable window
 4. West Elevation
 - a. Remove ply board infill in closed doors
 - b. Stucco wall
 - c. Remove deteriorated French door opening onto porch
 - d. Replace French door with a fifteen light wooden French door
 - e. Remove door opening onto present drive
 - f. Replace door with fifteen light wooden French door
 - g. Remove door on rear ell
 - h. Replace door with fifteen light wood French door
 - i. Remove existing windows
 - j. Replace steel casement windows with six-over-six wood true-divided-light windows
 - k. Alter the level of fourth window
 5. Paint house per submitted Devoe Paint color scheme
 - a. Body – Shenandoah (Green)
 - b. Trim - Baby Girl (White)
 - c. Accent – Crowhill (Green)
 6. Remove existing wooden driveway gate
 7. Replace gate with a stuccoed masonry wall with central opening
 - a. wall to be located behind current utility connection
 8. Install an oyster shell drive
 9. Pave Backyard with Brick
 10. Install a Concrete pad for dog kennel

Clarifications

1. Design of proposed driveway wall and gate

STAFF ANALYSIS

This house has undergone many alterations. The 1867 masonry, single story nucleus is discernable only in portions of the interior. The 1900 Queen Anne remodeling survives in the south facing gable. The previous owner's interventions greatly comprised the historical integrity of the house.

Concerning the south elevation, the previous owner removed the steel casement windows off the front porch, replacing them with vinyl windows sash windows. The applicants want to remove these later insertions and replace them with six-over-six wooden true-divided-light windows. The lower sashes of the gable windows are missing which allows deterioration of the house's interior fabric. The applicants want to replicate the surviving upper four-over-four sashes in the lower portion of the window. This change would return the gable to its 1900 appearance. The existing six panel front door is not of historical significance. The applicants propose replacing the door with a fifteen light wooden French door. A west facing French door also found on the front porch was part of the structure's 1920s remodeling. The 1920s front door was likely a French door. The replacement of the existing front door with a French door would reinforce the Mediterranean appearance of the ground floor façade. Staff believes proposed changes to the south elevation do not impair the historic or architectural character of the house, therefore recommends approval.

The east elevation is obscured by recent historical infill and is only minimally visible from the street. The applicants would like to replace a deteriorated one-over-one window with the same wood true-divided-light windows proposed for the façade. In addition, they would like to replace all the steel casement windows on this elevation with the same six-over-six windows proposed for the other elevations, but defer to the Staff and Board's recommendations. Given the many changes this property has seen throughout the years, the building lacks a distinct architectural style. While the steel casement windows contribute to the 1920s appearance, Staff believes the removal of the steel casement windows and their replacement with other historically accurate windows does not result in an impairment of the historic or architectural character of either the property or the district. Staff would like to leave this open for discussion with the Board.

The rear or north elevation is a result of numerous additions. The applicants would like to replace the one-over-one windows with glass blocks. One of these windows opens onto a utility closet. Staff recommends approval of changes to the north elevation.

The fenestration of the west elevation has been modified on a number occasions. The applicant wants to replace the existing windows (a mixture of six over six and modern aluminum windows) with wooden true-divided-light windows. One of the windows would be lowered to its original sill level thus regularizing a portion of the elevation. The removal and replacement of ply board door coverings with stucco would unify the façade and reiterate the Mediterranean informed 1920s remodeling. The replacement of two deteriorated doors with wooden French doors would further this objective. Staff recommends approval for the changes to the west elevation.

The removal of the wooden gate and its replacement with a stuccoed wall set further within the drive would allow for both additional parking and easier access to the house. A design of the wall and gate is needed. Staff recommends approval of the fencing and paving proposals, pending the clarification of the former and approval of the latter by the Department of Urban Development.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

047-09-CA: 507 St. Francis Street
Applicant: Mark O. Jackson
Received: 05/05/09
Meeting: 05/20/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Siding and window replacement; new construction

BUILDING HISTORY

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

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 November 27, 2006. 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 house 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,” but 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 6th. A stop work order was issued on May 11th.
- 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.”
- 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. North Elevation
 - 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
5. West elevation
 - a. Remove metal windows
 - b. Replace windows with wood double sash windows with non-divided lights
6. 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
6. Construct off south elevation

STAFF ANALYSIS

This building was in a dilapidated state. The ARB has received demolition requests for this property in the past, as it was being sited for blight.

Wooden drop-lap siding covered the entire west and south elevation of the house. The same siding surrounded the area around the door of the north elevation. Staff recommends that the in kind replacement of siding be approved for the west elevation. The same siding is recommended for the new addition.

There was deteriorated, novelty lap siding on the east elevation. More likely than not, this was the original, historic siding remaining on this elevation. The applicant has since removed this siding and replaced it with drop siding to match the replacement siding on the other elevations. While the guidelines call for new siding to match the historic siding, Staff recognizes that this residence underwent many changes throughout the years. Staff views this work as an after the fact approval for the Board to consider.

The applicant is amenable to the Staff's recommendation of replacing the non-divided light wood windows on the north elevation with windows with true divided lights. The windows on west elevation and the addition were metal. There were four six-over-six wood frame windows on the east elevation and three on the north.

Under the guidelines, replacement windows must match the existing historic windows. As a general rule, the ARB requires applicants to utilize true divided light wood windows when those were present historically, barring any compelling or unusual circumstances. Staff recommends the Board deny the application for the new windows. Staff recommends the applicant be required to either repair and reinstall the existing six-over-six windows or buy new wood windows which match the historic windows in profile, dimension and design.

In addition, Staff encourages the Board to advise the applicant to retain existing architectural features (including historic doors, trim and windows) presently seen on the site for reuse as necessary.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

048-09-CA: 412 South Broad Street
Applicant: Mike Kinnard; Marvin Hewatt Enterprises
Received: 04/27/09
Meeting: 05/20/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non- contributing Property
Zoning: B-2
Project: New Commercial Construction

BUILDING HISTORY

This property is a vacant parcel located on South Broad between Elmira and Selma streets.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The applicants proposed construction of a new, multi-tenant gas station at this site, featuring both a convenience store and a canopy over the gas pumps. The site comprises almost half of an entire city block and contains many live oaks and foliage. Adjacent to this vacant lot, there are residences to the north (across Selma); a historic church and commercial property to the east (across Broad), and commercial to the south (across Elmira). There are residences located on the rear and sides of the block, contiguous to this property.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines for New Commercial Construction state, in pertinent part:
 1. **“Placement and Orientation:** Placement has two components: setback, the distance between the street and a building; and spacing, the distance between its property lines and adjacent structures. New construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings. New buildings should not be placed too far forward or behind the traditional “facade line”, a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the facade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape. Current setback requirements of the City of Mobile Zoning Ordinance may not allow the building to be placed as close to the street as the majority of existing buildings. If the traditional facade line or “average” setback is considerably less than allowed under the Zoning Ordinance, the Review Boards will support an application for a Variance from the Board of Adjustment to allow for new construction closer to the street and more in character with the surrounding historic buildings.
 2. **MASS:** Building mass is established by the arrangement and proportion of its basic geometric components - the main building, wings and porches, the roof and the foundation. Similarity of massing helps create a rhythm along a street, which is one of the appealing aspects of historic districts. Therefore, new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.

- a. **FOUNDATIONS:** The foundation, the platform upon which a building rests, is a massing component of a building. Since diminished foundation proportions have a negative effect on massing and visual character, new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
- b. **MAIN BODY AND WINGS:** Although roofs and foundations reinforce massing, the main body and wings are the most significant components. A building's form or shape can be simple (a box) or complex (a combination of many boxes or projections and indentations). The main body of a building may be one or two stories. Interior floor and ceiling heights are reflected on the exterior of a building and should be compatible with nearby historic buildings.
- c. **ROOFS:** A building's roof contributes significantly to its massing and to the character of the surrounding area. New construction may consider, where appropriate, roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings.
3. **SCALE:** The size of a building is determined by its dimensions - height, width, and depth - which also dictate the building's square footage. Scale refers to a building's size in relationship to other buildings - large, medium, small. Buildings which are similar in massing may be very different in scale. To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.
4. **FAÇADE ELEMENTS:** Facade elements such as porches, entrances, and windows make up the "face" or facade of a building. New construction should reflect the use of facade elements of nearby historic buildings. The number and proportion of openings - windows and entrances - within the facade of a building creates a solid-to-void ratio (wall-to-opening). New buildings should use windows and entrances that approximate the placement and solid-to-void ratio of nearby historic buildings. In addition, designs for new construction should incorporate the traditional use of window casements and door surrounds. Where a side elevation is clearly visible from the street, proportion and placement of their elements will have an impact upon the visual character of the neighborhood and must be addressed in the design.
5. **MATERIALS AND ORNAMENTATION:** The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples. The choice of materials and ornamentation for new construction is a good way for a new building to exert its own identity. By using historic examples as a point of departure, it is possible for new construction to use new materials and ornamentation and still fit into the historic district. Historic buildings feature the use of a variety of materials for roofs, foundations, wall cladding and architectural details. In new buildings, exterior materials – both traditional and modern - should closely resemble surrounding historic examples.

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):

1. Overall Site Work
 - a. Clear all top soil and vegetation
 1. Need to consult Urban Forestry for tree removal approval
 - b. Pave with a combination of asphalt and concrete the area containing the building pads and parking lot
 1. Need specifications on transition from asphalt to concrete
 - c. Two drive ways fronting S Broad Street, 35' wide
 - d. One driveway fronting Elmira Street 35' wide
 - a. Dumpster located in northwest corner of site
2. Construct a one-story commercial structure per submitted plans,
 - a. Store dimensions are 122' by 50' single story convenience store

- b. Situated approximately 115' from the Broad Street
 - 1. Need distance from Elmira Street
- c. East (main elevation) Elevation Details
 - 1. features three distinct store fronts with columns, casement windows, lamps and pilasters interspersed per submitted plan
- d. South and North Elevation
 - 1. features pilasters, awning and two faux windows with false "crane house" blinds and 4" raised stucco trim surround
- e. West Elevation
 - 1. features 3 exterior doors covered with bracketed awning, six faux windows with blinds and trim to match those on the sides,
- f. Materials include
 - 1. aluminum store front system
 - 2. stucco walls above 4' split CMU base
 - 3. stucco parapet
 - 4. pre-cast trim work
 - 5. metal awning with Permatile 24 gauge terracotta roof and awnings
 - 6. 30" by 30" by 6" -- "Massive Arch" brackets
 - 7. doors appear to be metal with glass commercial doors and metal flush doors in the rear
- g. Construct a covered gas station area
 - 1. situated approximately 25' from the Broad Street
 - a. Need distance from Elmira Street
 - 2. Dimensions are 136' wide and 24' deep
 - 3. featuring
 - a. five gas pumps
 - b. Metal permatile 24 gauge terra cotta roof
 - c. Stucco pillars over 4' split face CMU
 - d. 30" by 30" by 6" -- "Massive Arch" brackets (to match those on the main building)

B. CLARIFICATIONS

- 1. Site plan clarification regarding distance from Elmira Street and paving materials
- 2. Elevation clarifying changes in grade, the application of concrete to the site, height of the finished building floor and ceilings
- 3. Input from Urban Forestry
- 4. Detail drawing showing relationship between window, storefronts, awnings and columns
- 5. Material of rear doors

STAFF ANALYSIS

When evaluating new commercial construction in historic districts, the ARB determines the appropriateness of the proposed project by evaluating several key factors. These factors are site placement and orientation, mass, scale, façade elements, materials and ornamentation.

Comparing the proposed site plan to that of nearby historic properties is a key component to determining whether or not the new construction is appropriate for the district. Under the guidelines, new construction in historic districts should be setback and situated in relation to other structures on the street. Likewise, the city's zoning code, utilizing the Historic District Overlay specifications, provides for

narrower setbacks in order to bring the new construction in line with other historic structures along the street.

Along South Broad Street, there is a mixture of residential and commercial structures. Most of the commercial structures are in close proximity to the right of way. For instance, the adjacent commercial property at South Broad Street and Elmira is situated approximately 9' from the South Broad Street curb. Directly across the street, there are two commercial structures which are situated within one foot of the sidewalk. Further north along South Broad, at the corners of both Charleston and Savannah, the commercial structures abut the sidewalk. The proximity of these structures to the street reflects the traditional nature of the streetscape and contributes to the historic landscape.

Given the precedent set in the neighborhood for commercial construction to be in close proximity to the street (i.e., no further than 9' from the curb in the immediate vicinity), Staff believes the proposed site plan for this project, which situates the gas canopy 25' from the curb and the main building 115' from the curb, is not appropriate to the existing, historic commercial context found along South Broad Street. Staff encourages the applicant to resubmit altered site plans which rework the parking lot, gas station and building footprint to allow for the main structures to be closer to Broad Street.

Other factors considered include the overall scale of the proposal, choice of materials and ornamentation. As with other nearby commercial structures, the proposal seems to indicate that the building will be located at grade atop concrete slab. Staff finds this appropriate for the district, but would like drawings specifically illustrating the buildings height from the ground. In other words, its unclear from the drawings how much in fill soil work will take place or whether there will be a curb from the parking lot to the store, etc. However, since the property is one story, with 10' ceilings (approximately) and 17' total height, Staff finds the overall scale of the building appropriate to the district.

The proposal's design seeks to instill a traditional sense of style, utilizing Mediterranean revival motifs, with contemporary use. Staff does note, however, the application of split face CMU to the base of the proposed structure lacks precedent as a commercial structure in the nearby neighborhood. The adjacent commercial structures are masonry. Mediterranean revival inspired commercial structures would have had stucco from floor to ceiling. Given the application of brackets and tile roof, Staff finds the design conducive to the neighborhood. Staff also finds the window fenestration and the use of shuttered and real windows compatible. However, Staff recommends applicants consider pulling the windows (both blind and real) away from the CMU wall base and potentially align the windows with the tops of the storefront plate glass (if they are not already). Staff would like a drawing detailing these changes with exact dimensions. Further, a detail drawing showing the relationship between the Tuscan columns and storefront pilasters would be useful.

Overall, though, Staff is most concerned about the site plan and recommends adjustments to the plan be made in order for the proposal to be more in keeping with adjacent historic structures along South Broad street. Staff recommends the application be tabled and a design committee be established to work with the applicant

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

049-09-CA: 1760 Dauphin Street
Applicant: William Graham
Received: 04/29/09
Meeting: 05/20/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fencing Approval.

BUILDING HISTORY

This classically detailed house dates from 1906. It combines the L-shaped form of a late Victorian house with the generous proportions and prominent porch of the Gulf Coast Creole cottage.

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 March 21, 2008. The applicants received approval to construct a two-car wooden carport with a storage room. The fencing enclosing the backyard was removed to facilitate the construction of the fence. The applicants return to the Board with a fencing proposal.
- 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.”
 2. “The height of solid fences is usually restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.”
 3. “The finished side of the fence should face toward public view.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 1. Remove remaining sections of existing six foot wood privacy fence
 2. Construct a seven foot wooden privacy fence with a one foot lattice top per submitted plan
 - A. Fence to extend from 3’ behind the east-facing side porch 12.7’ to the east property line
 - B. Fence will extend northward for the remaining length of east property line
 - C. Fence will extend across the north property line stopping six feet before the the sidewalk off Gladys Street
 3. Construct a six foot wooden privacy fence at the point the eight foot fence stops
 - A. Fence to extend to the northwest corner of the lot
 - B. Fence will run at an angle along Gladys Street to a point slightly west of the northwest corner of the house
 6. Suspend a six foot aluminum gate over driveway entrance

C. Clarification

1. What direction will the gate open – inward or outward?

Clarification

1. In which direction will the driveway gate open?

STAFF ANALYSIS

The height of solid fencing in the historic districts is normally restricted to six feet. Concerns for privacy and security motivated the applicant's proposal. Multi-family rental properties surround their lot. The Board considers proposals for fencing up to eight feet when multi-family housing abuts a property. In the past the Board has denied requests for lattice topped fencing. The applicant constructed one panel of the proposed eight foot fencing to show the Board its appearance. While staff recommends approval of the proposal in concept, the executed portion of the fence exceeds eight feet. Pending the clarification of the swing of the gate, observance of the eight foot height limit, and removal of the lattice top, Staff recommends approval.

