

**AGENDA**  
**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

February 6, 2008 – 3:00 P.M.

**A. CALL TO ORDER – Chair**

Chair Tilmon Brown called the meeting to order at 3:00. MHDC Staff member Devereaux Bemis called the roll as follows:

- **Members Present:** Harris Oswalt, Tilmon Brown, Bunky Ralph, Craig Roberts; Tom Karwinski; Carlos Gant; Jim Wagoner and Cameron Pfeiffer.
- **Staff Present:** Devereaux Bemis and John Lawler

**The minutes** as posted on the web were unanimously approved per the motion of Carlos Gant and second of Bunky Ralph.

**The mid-months** as presented were unanimously approved per the motion of Jim Wagoner and second of Harris Oswalt.

**B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS**

1. **Applicant's Name:** Tom Neese  
**Property Address:** 1179 Texas Street  
**Date of Approval:** January 10, 2008  
Repaint residence in the existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant's Name:** Thomas Arensberg/Ken Harper Contracting  
**Property Address:** 1312 Azalea Street  
**Date of Approval:** January 15, 2008  
Install new sills underneath house with new concrete piers and footers. Piers are not to be visible.
3. **Applicant's Name:** Marshall McLeod  
**Property Address:** 30 Hannon Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** January 18, 2008  
Remove the remaining storm-damaged rear shed.
4. **Applicant's Name:** Mike Henderson Roofing  
**Property Address:** 1261 Elmira Street  
**Date of Approval:** January 22, 2008  
Replace flat roof with new materials to match existing.
5. **Applicant's Name:** Advanced Construction  
**Property Address:** 26 Blacklawn  
**Date of Approval:** January 24, 2008  
Replace rotted decking, ceiling joists, posts and rafters with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Reroof porch with 3-tab shingles to match existing.
6. **Applicant's Name:** Boo Radley's  
**Property Address:** 276 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** January 24, 2008  
Install a steel fire-rated rear exit door. It will exit into a gated alley and will not be seen from the street.
7. **Applicant's Name:** Dobson Sheet Metal and Roofing  
**Property Address:** 1507 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** January 28, 2008  
Reroof building with slate-blend Timberline architectural shingles.
8. **Applicant's Name:** Dauphin Realty  
**Property Address:** 412 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** January 29, 2008  
Install one 12SF unlit steel, sandblasted foam and paint wall sign on the building.

**C. NEW BUSINESS**

1. **002-08-CA:** 167 South Georgia Avenue  
**Applicant:** Hali Whetstone  
**Request:** Replace the wood privacy fence/gate with a brick and metal fence/gate.  
**APPROVED**

2. **003-08-CA:** 121 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Kevin Hannon of Trimmer Smith Awnings  
**Request:** Install an awning with sign.  
**TABLED**
3. **004-08-CA:** 1950 Government Street  
**Applicant:** MH3 Printing/Woodlands Bank  
**Request:** Install a new sign.  
**APPROVED:** Variance Required
4. **005-08-CA:** 1705 Conti Street  
**Applicant:** Marion C. Forrest/Volkert & Associates  
**Request:** Construct a pumping station for Mobile Area Water and Sewer System (MAWSS).  
**APPROVED**
5. **006-08-CA:** 503 Aurelia Street  
**Applicant:** Mikal Raheem  
**Request:** Build a 17'-0" x 27'-0" rear addition.  
**APPROVED**
6. **007-08-CA:** 1058 Old Shell Road  
**Applicant:** James Ruona  
**Request:** Install a rear privacy fence, install a front picket fence and paint.  
**APPROVED:** Setbacks must be cleared with appropriate departments
7. **008-08-CA:** 5 North Pine Street  
**Applicant:** Andre Baskin  
**Request:** Partially rebuild the removed front porch.  
**APPROVED**
8. **009-08-CA:** 254-256 Congress Street  
**Applicant:** Cummings Architecture  
**Request:** Construct a two-story condominium with covered parking.  
**APPROVED:** Further submission required
9. **010-08-CA:** 54-56 St. Emanuel Street  
**Applicant:** Steve Stone/TAG Architects  
**Request:** Renovate front and rear façades.  
**APPROVED**
10. **011-08-CA:** 510 South Jefferson Street  
**Applicant:** Steve May  
**Request:** Replace chain link fence with a privacy fence.  
**APPROVED**

#### **D. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. The Board will have their comments to staff on the Guidelines by February 20 and staff will make corrections and send them back by March 1.
2. Several people announced they would attend the NAPC conference in New Orleans: Carlos Gant; Harris Oswalt; Tilmon Brown; Craig Roberts and Jim Wagoner.
3. Devereaux Bemis explained that the most recent leader head on his house was a plain pipe connecting into the downspout. The twin house next door has a rectangular scupper so Bemis would order one similar, though not a copy. There were no objections from the Board.
4. Carlos Gant noted a complaint had been lodged that the Board did not treat all applicants equally. It was pointed out that in the examples given one person had sought and received ARB approval and purchased a building permit. The other person had not gotten ARB approval and had not purchased a building permit.

#### **E. ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 4:50.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**002-08-CA:** 167 South Georgia Avenue  
**Applicant:** Hali Whetstone  
**Received:** 01/07/08 (+45 Days: 02/21/08)  
**Meeting:** 02/06/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Replace the wood privacy fence/gate with a brick and metal fence/gate.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story frame residence was built circa 1914.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states, “the Board shall not approve an application proposing Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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. There is currently a wood privacy fence/gate at the driveway of the residence that stretches 20’-0” to the south from the corner of the house to the property line.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that 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.”
- C. Mrs. Whetstone is proposing to replace the wood privacy fence/gate with a brick and metal fence/gate.
  1. The wall will be 5’-0” tall and made of staggered Old Mobile Brick
  2. It will extend 20’-0” to the south from the corner of the house to the property line.
  3. It will have 5’-0” tall Old Mobile Brick columns measuring 15” by 15” at the ends.
  4. It will have 6’-0” tall Old Mobile Brick columns measuring 2’-0” by 2’-0” at the gate.
  5. There will be a 6’-0” wide steel pointed gate with vertical bars and a gas lantern on either side.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The proposed fence does not impair the historic integrity of the building or district and staff recommends approving the application.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

No one was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no further Board discussion.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/07/09.**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**003-08-CA:** 121 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Kevin Hannon of Trimmer Smith Awnings  
**Received:** 01/15/08 (+45 Days: 02/28/08)  
**Meeting:** 02/06/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin Street Commercial  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-4  
**Project:** Install an awning with sign.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous research, this three-story brick commercial building with stone veneer was constructed circa 1940. With the exception of a glass and aluminum storefront installed circa 1965 and rehabbed in 2007, the façade remains intact.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Ordinance states, “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the proposed 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 building has 42.6 linear feet of frontage. There is a metal band along the front that originally housed a fabric awning and a 2SF neon open sign on the storefront.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile state that signs shall “not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building...shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property...shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs...should match the historic materials of the building...[and] shall use focused, low intensity illumination.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  - 1. Install a 3’-4” d by 4’-2” t by 42’-6” w Forest Green Sunbrella canvas awning over the storefront.
  - 2. Paint a 20SF Subway logo onto the canvas per the submitted specifications.
  - 3. The total amount of existing and proposed signage is 22SF; the total amount allowed for this building is 64SF.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff feels that an awning and sign will not impair the historic integrity of the building or district. As mentioned above, this building had an awning in the past and the proposed unlit sign brings the sign total to well below the allowable limit. However, Staff feels that the awning appears too tall, thus obscuring – and possibly damaging – some of the building’s architectural features. Staff recommends the awning either be lowered or installed so that the stone blocks and vertical banding underneath the windows is not harmed.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Kevin Hannon of Trimmer Smith Awnings and the owner were present. The applicant brought a sample of the material and stated the sign would be hand painted on the material. The Board questioned how the awning would be installed. There was concern that the installation would result in damage to the building. Craig Roberts pointed out the building was art moderne in style and a better design could be developed. The applicants agreed to look for a better solution and return.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no further Board discussion.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Craig Roberts moved to table the application. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**004-07-CA:** 1950 Government Street  
**Applicant:** MH3 Printing/Woodlands Bank  
**Received:** 01/16/08 (+45 Days: 02/29/08)  
**Meeting:** 02/06/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Facing Government (Sign Review Only)  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-3  
**Project:** New Signage.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This contemporary masonry commercial building was built in the latter half of the twentieth century.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This building is currently a bank. It has 63SF of existing signage.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and along Government Street state that signs shall “not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building...shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property...shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs...should match the historic materials of the building...[and] shall use focused, low intensity illumination.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to install one 28SF unlit lexan panel with vinyl wrap around the ATM per the submitted drawing.
- D. The total sign package is approximately 28SF, which will bring the building total to 91SF; the Board cannot approve more than 64SF.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the district. Staff recommends the Board support a variance to allow the additional sign.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

No one was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the amount of signage and generally felt the request was not excessive considering the size of the building, its location and size of the parcel. However, a variance will be needed since it is in excess of 64 square feet.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/07/09.**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**005-08-CA:** 1705 Conti Street  
**Applicant:** Marion C. Forrest/Volkert & Associates  
**Received:** 01/16/08 (+45 Days: 02/29/08)  
**Meeting:** 02/06/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Construct a pumping station for Mobile Area Water and Sewer System (MAWSS).

**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 proposed 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 historic district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. The Board recently approved the demolition of the residence on this lot. The Board also approved the construction of a wastewater pumping station at 1703 Conti; however, MAWSS would like to move the proposed station to 1705 Conti.
- B. The proposed work is to construct a pumping station:
1. It will be located toward the rear of the lot.
  2. A 6'-0" high wood privacy fence with gates will be constructed to obscure the station.
  3. The station will not exceed the height of the fence.
  4. There are trees located on the site and a moderate amount of additional landscaping will be added to the site to help the facility blend with adjacent properties.
  5. A gravel drive will be installed on the eastern portion of the lot that will blend with the residential character of the adjacent properties.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. According to the 11/19/07 minutes, the Board approved the demolition of this residence with the understanding that MAWSS may lease the lot for a wastewater pumping station. Staff recommends approving the application.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Harold Baker and Sean Shay of Volkert & Associates were present to discuss the application. The Board asked if the property were being leased by MAWSS. They were told MAWSS would either purchase the property or purchase an easement. A member of the public stated there was a large generator across the street from the property that ran continuously and loudly and the property was unbuildable because of it.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the previous two applications that resulted in approving the generator for the adjacent property and the demolition of the house on this parcel.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Tom Karwinski and approved by a majority with Bunky Ralph and Tilmon Brown in opposition. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/07/09.**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**006-08-CA:** 503 Aurelia Street  
**Applicant:** Mikal Raheem  
**Received:** 01/18/08 (+45 Days: 03/02/08)  
**Meeting:** 02/06/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Build a 17'-0" x 27'-0" rear addition.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This one-story frame residence was built circa 1935.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that "the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district..."

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This residence is part of a small religious community located along Aurelia Street. It was recently incorporated into the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
- B. The Guidelines state that new additions should respect the age and style of the residence.
- C. Mr. Raheem is proposing to add two bedrooms onto the rear of the residence per the submitted plans:
  - 1. It will be a 17'-0" x 27'-0" enclosure resting on a brick pier foundation to match existing.
  - 2. It will have a gable roof that extends from the rear.
  - 3. All details and materials will match existing to include the roof shingles, wood 105 siding, 6/6 wood sash windows and trim.
  - 4. There will be a wood door with decorative panels on the south side.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted, the proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the district. The new addition matches the existing style and materials of the residence. Staff recommends approving the addition. Staff is requesting that Mr. Raheem reuse any removed windows in the new addition.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mikal Raheem was present to discuss the application. Mr. Raheem agreed that the roofline of the addition would follow the present roofline of the house in height and slope. He also stated that all materials would match the original materials on the house and that he would reuse any windows salvaged from the original house.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board clarified that the new piers would match the original piers.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Carlos Gant and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Carlos Gant and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/07/09.**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**007-08-CA:** 1058 Old Shell Road  
**Applicant:** James Ruona  
**Received:** 01/18/08 (+45 Days: 03/02/08)  
**Meeting:** 02/06/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Install a rear privacy fence, install a front picket fence and paint.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story frame residence with Victorian and Neo-Classical elements was built in 1886.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states, “the Board shall not approve an application proposing Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 residence sits on a corner lot. There is currently no fence.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that 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.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  - 1. Install a 6’-0” wood privacy fence/gate around the back yard per the submitted site plan.
  - 2. Install a 3’-0” wood picket fence/gate around the front yard per the submitted site plan.
  - 3. Paint the residence in the following BLP color scheme:
    - a. Body – Georgia Avenue Yellow
    - b. Trim – White
    - c. Accents – Monterrey Dark Blue

**RECOMMENDATION**

The proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the building or district and staff recommends approving the application.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

No one was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board noted that a variance may be required for the six foot portion of the fence on the west and north sides.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Cameron Pfeiffer moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/07/09.**



**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**008-08-CA:** 5 North Pine Street  
**Applicant:** Andre Baskin  
**Received:** 01/20/08 (+45 Days: 03/04/08)  
**Meeting:** 02/06/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Partially rebuild the removed front porch.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story frame residence with Victorian elements was built circa 1900. It was a twin of the residence located next door at 7 North Pine; however, by 1977 the original two-story full-width verandah had been replaced with the partial-width shed-roof porch currently on the residence.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states, “the Board shall not approve an application proposing Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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. As mentioned above, this residence had a two-story verandah similar to the one next door at 7 North Pine that was removed before 1977. It now has a partial-width one-story porch.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that porches are “an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture [and] should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period...[t]he form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with the style of the building.”
- C. Mr. Baskin is proposing to partially rebuild the removed front porch.
  - 1. It will be 10’-0” x 30’-0” x 8’-3” and sit on brick piers with wood lattice to match existing.
  - 2. It will have turned wood posts, wood balusters, tongue and groove decking and wood steps leading to the ground.
  - 3. It will have a 5/12 pitch shed roof with metal panels.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff feels that the porch would be more appropriate with a shallower roof and recommends Mr. Baskin use a 1/12 pitch. Staff also feels that the proportions of the proposed balusters are inappropriate.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Andre Baskin and his wife were present to discuss the application. Mr. Baskin stated they had met with staff and been unable to find a post matching the house next door. His attempt to find matching posts after the meeting had failed. He also stated that the baluster he proposed exactly matched those next door. He agreed that the roof pitch would be altered to 1/12 slope.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the difference in porches between this and that next door. The possibility of a balustraded deck was considered. However, the Board agreed with the alteration of the pitch of the porch roof.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report altering fact C.3. to read, “It will have a 1/12 pitch shed roof with metal panels.” The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/07/09.**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**009-08-CA:** 254-256 Congress Street  
**Applicant:** Cummings Architecture/Etsie Foreman  
**Received:** 01/22/08 (+45 Days: 03/06/08)  
**Meeting:** 02/06/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** DeTonti Square  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-B  
**Project:** Construct a two-story condominium with covered parking.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This is currently an empty lot that once held residential buildings.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This empty lot on the north side of Congress is approximately 78’-0” x 105’-0” with a small portion that extends to North Joachim.
- B. The Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction state “the goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history.”
- C. The proposed plan includes the following:
  1. Construct a two-story multi-family residence per the submitted plans on an empty lot that will resemble the typical masonry buildings of the area.
    - a. The building will have four units, face Congress and have a 5’-0” setback.
    - b. The house will rest on a 2’-0” continuous masonry foundation with a course delineating the foundation from the building.
    - c. The siding will be stucco and there will be metal leader heads and downspouts.
    - d. The roof, which will be a side gable with parapets at either end, will have shingles.
    - e. The windows will be 6/6 wood sashes with stucco headers, sills and operable wood shutters.
    - f. The south (front) elevation will have wood entry doors with four decorative panels, a rectangular transom and sidelights; brick steps with an iron rail will lead from the doors to the ground.
    - g. The south (front) elevation will also have jib doors above each main door leading to cantilevered balconies with iron rails.
    - h. The side elevations will have parapets with metal caps, windows and wood louvered arches.
      - i. The north (rear) elevation will have wood doors with four decorative panels and transom on the first floor and French doors with transoms on the second floor leading to the porch.
      - j. The full-width rear porch will be two-stories with a shingle roof, 8x8 wood box columns, trim, posts, rails, walls between each unit and brick steps leading to a small courtyard surrounded by a 7’-0” stucco wall and metal gates.
  2. Construct an open covered parking structure per the submitted plans.
    - a. The structure will sit at the northwest corner of the lot; the north and west sides will be flush with the existing stucco wall.
    - b. It will have steel pipe columns supporting beams, wood trim and framing for the built-up roof.
  3. Repave the rear parking area with asphalt, installing two new 12’-0” wide drives at the North Joachim side of the property per the submitted plans.
  4. Replace the stucco and metal wall along Congress with a new metal fence.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff feels that the rear parking area as submitted would impair the integrity of the district and recommends an alternative paving material, more landscaping and fewer and/or smaller parking spaces if possible. Staff also feels the covered parking structure could be lowered.

Staff feels that the proposed building construction will not impair the historic integrity of the district. The new building follows the setback and orientation pattern of residences in the vicinity. Its massing and scale, including the raised foundation and simple footprint, are proportional to buildings typical of the district. It has a rear porch, an “important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture,” and other details that are in sympathy to the district. Ornamentation such as the window lintels, iron balconies and porch columns are similar to the nearby residences. As such, it “relates to the historic context” of the district.

Staff will need more information regarding the proposed metal wall along Congress. The applicant will also need to contact Urban Forestry regarding the removal of any trees and Traffic Engineering and Right-of-Way regarding the new curb cut on North Joachim.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Ben Cummings and Etsie Foreman were present to discuss the application. The Board suggested that the parking roof should be lowered to allow 8 feet of clear space and the applicants agreed. Staff clarified with the owners that the details of the front and rear porches would match the details on the Barnes Double House adjacent to this property. The architect agreed to submit a full design for the fence.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed for some time the parking on the property and the lack of landscaping along with the surface material. They asked for a redesign to soften the amount and appearance of the parking. They understood that the details of the new building would be based on and match the details of the Barnes House. It was reiterated that a fence plan needed to be submitted with a new paving plan. Tom Karwinski asked if the plans were being approved as final plans or as schematics that needed to come back to the Board. He was told these were the final plans.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report with the following changes:

C.2.c. The height of the structure will be 8 foot of clear space instead of the 14 feet shown on the plans.

C.4. was deleted. A new plan for the fence will be submitted.

The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for the building with the requirement that a new parking plan and new fence plan be submitted. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and approved by a majority with Tom Karwinski voting in opposition. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/07/09.**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**010-08-CA:** 54-56 St. Emanuel Street  
**Applicant:** Steve Stone/TAG Architects  
**Received:** 01/20/08 (+45 Days: 03/04/08)  
**Meeting:** 02/06/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-4  
**Project:** Renovate front and rear façades.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story masonry building with terra cotta detail was built in 1904. As with many commercial structures, the first floor has been significantly altered.

**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 proposed 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 historic district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. An application for this project was made and approved in July 2006. However, the plan was never completed. The work is slated to begin again, but this application is sufficiently changed from the original design to merit a new review. Supplemental materials from the previous application are included in this packet for comparison.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that new additions should respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The changes to the approved work includes the following:
  - 1. The west side balconies will be hanging as opposed to two-story galleries as originally proposed.
  - 2. There will be a new metal canopy held up with wall brackets and tension rods instead of a two-story gallery on the east (front) elevation.
  - 3. No work will be done to the building facing Conception.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. This is a scaled-back version of a plan approved by the Board in 2006 and falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines. Staff recommends approving the application.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

The architect was present to discuss the application. He explained that the decorative details on the front of the building would not be touched. The balcony rods would be fastened through a surface mounted plate but the connection had not yet been designed.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was concern expressed that the rear balconies would overhang adjacent property. The Board suggested that this be investigated before construction began.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/07/09.**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**011-08-CA:** 510 South Jefferson Street  
**Applicant:** Steve May  
**Received:** 01/20/08 (+45 Days: 03/04/08)  
**Meeting:** 02/06/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Replace chain link fence with a privacy fence.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This one-story frame residence with Victorian was built circa 1895.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states, “the Board shall not approve an application proposing Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 residence abuts the Church’s Chicken on Broad. There is currently a chain link fence around it.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that 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.”
- C. Mr. May is proposing to replace the chain link fence with a wood privacy fence/gate around the back yard per the submitted site plan.
  - 1. The fence will be 8’-0” along the west boundary, which abuts the Church’s.
  - 2. The fence will be 6’-0” along the north and south boundaries.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the building or district and staff recommends approving the application.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

No one was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the location of the property in the expanded Oakleigh District and its relationship to its neighbors and to Church’s Fried Chicken. The Board noted that the 8-foot section was being allowed since the property abutted a commercial enterprise.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/07/09.**