

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

May 7, 2008 – 3:00 P.M. – Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER – Chair

Chair Tilmon Brown called the meeting to order at 3:15. Aileen de la Torre read the Introductory Statement. The members present were Tom Karwinski, Tilmon Brown, Bunky Ralph, Jim Wagoner, Craig Roberts, Cameron Pfeiffer and Barja Wilson. The Minutes of the previous meeting were unanimously approved per a motion of Bunky Ralph and second of Tom Karwinski. The Mid-Month Requests were approved as submitted per a motion of Bunky Ralph and a second of Jim Wagoner. Tom Karwinski recused himself from voting on the mid-month requests.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

- 1. Applicant's Name:** Tom Karwinski
Property Address: 17 South Lafayette Street
Date of Approval: April 8, 2008
Continue the existing picket fence to the sidewalk.
- 2. Applicant's Name:** Celia and Mack Lewis
Property Address: 158 South Jefferson Street
Date of Approval: April 9, 2008
Paint the exterior as needed in the existing color scheme.
- 3. Applicant's Name:** Helen Sylvester
Property Address: 56 North Georgia Avenue
Date of Approval: April 10, 2008
Paint residence in the following BLP color scheme: Body – Golden Pastel, 8532, Trim – Rocio, 8553, Accents – Wine Country, 8709.
- 4. Applicant's Name:** Jennifer Dominick
Property Address: 100 Bradford Avenue
Date of Approval: April 11, 2008
Paint in the following color scheme: Body – Smoky Ash (brick has already been painted), Trim – The Master Palette Paints Emily's Expression, 45YY, Door – Deep Red.
- 5. Applicant's Name:** Celia and Mack Lewis
Property Address: 158 South Jefferson Street
Date of Approval: April 14, 2008
Renewal of COA dated 03/14/07. Replace missing gingerbread on east façade to match existing; add stair rail to front steps matching the design of the existing balustrade; replace non-original 2'-0" by 2'-0" window on the south side with wood double sash window to match other windows on house; repaint balustrade on north end of porch and all new materials in existing color scheme.
- 6. Applicant's Name:** Fred South Construction
Property Address: 504 Church Street
Date of Approval: April 14, 2008
Install a new architectural shingle roof in Georgetown Grey. Repair rotten wood throughout the exterior – including the fascia, soffit and decking of the second floor front porch – with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint new materials in the existing color scheme.
- 7. Applicant's Name:** Jaime Betbeze
Property Address: 1210 Selma Street
Date of Approval: April 18, 2008
Install copper flashing around chimney and replace removed shingles to match existing.
- 8. Applicant's Name:** Wilma Lott
Property Address: 960 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: April 21, 2008
Install a rear wood deck with a wood wheelchair ramp leading to the driveway. Stock MHDC railing will be used and it will not be seen from the street.

9. **Applicant's Name:** Salvation Army
Property Address: 1009 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: April 21, 2008
 Repair existing fence with materials to match existing. Paint new materials to match existing.

10. **Applicant's Name:** Linda Wert Olen & Micheleala Lee
Property Address: 1758 New Hamilton Street
Date of Approval: April 22, 2008
 Replacement of COA dated 03/31/08. Construct 16x16 wood tool shed as per submitted plans. Exterior walls will be board & batten. Gabled roof will have shingles to match the main house. Paint scheme to match the main house.

11. **Applicant's Name:** Sims Property
Property Address: 363 Michigan Avenue
Date of Approval: April 24, 2008
 Replace rotten wood per original in profile/dimension. Repaint off Sherwin Williams Arts/Crafts chart: Body – Birdseye Maple, Trim – Weathered Shingle.

12. **Applicant's Name:** Steve May
Property Address: 1104 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: April 24, 2008
 Replace rotten wood throughout exterior with new wood to match in material, dimension and profile. Level foundation with blocks and brick veneer. Install a new shingle roof.

13. **Applicant's Name:** Roberts Brothers/A1 Roofing
Property Address: 1215 Church Street
Date of Approval: April 24, 2008
 Reroof with black, 3tab, 25-year Owings Corning Onyx shingles.

14. **Applicant's Name:** Ruth Harris
Property Address: 503 Monroe Street
Date of Approval: April 25, 2008
 Reroof with 30-year architectural shingles in dark grey. Replace rotten wood throughout the exterior with wood to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint trim in grey.

15. **Applicant's Name:** Doty Graham
Property Address: 263 Stocking Street
Date of Approval: April 28, 2008
 Repaint building in the existing color scheme.

16. **Applicant's Name:** Russell E. Evens, Jr
Property Address: 36 Lee Street
Date of Approval: April 28, 2008
 Replace rotten wood as necessary on front of building with materials to match existing. Paint in existing colors.

B. OLD BUSINESS

1. **052-04-CA:** 223 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Bill and Mary Monahan
Request: Reconfigure the current storefront.
Approved: Certified Record attached.

2. **035-08-CA:** 1110-1112 Government Street/Montauk Avenue
Applicant: Michael Lee/Central Park Condominiums
Request: Install a fence.
Tabled: Referred to Design Review Committee.

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. **042-08-CA:** 309 West Street
Applicant: Tim Gibson
Request: Enclose the back door and replace a window with French doors.
Approved: Certified Record attached.

2. **043-08-CA:** 1113 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Cristina Rodgers
Request: Construct an addition and detached garage.
Approved: Certified Record attached.
3. **044-08-CA:** 10 Houston Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Request: Remove inappropriate alterations to renovate building exterior.
Approved: Certified Record attached.
4. **045-08-CA:** 101 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Request: Add on to the garage and extend fence.
Approved: Certified Record attached.
5. **046-08-CA:** 7-9 North Conception Street
Applicant: Ronald Nance
Request: Rehabilitate the façade and add a balcony.
Approved: Certified Record attached.
6. **047-08-CA:** 154 South Cedar Street
Applicant: Jerry Arnold
Request: Construct an addition.
Approved: Certified Record attached.
7. **048-08-CA:** 1057 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Chris Bowen
Request: Permit the parking area.
Approved: Certified Record attached.
8. **049-08-CA:** 1407 Monroe Street
Applicant: Robert Payne
Request: Replace three windows and remove a door.
Approved: Certified Record attached.
9. **050-08-CA:** 68 St. Francis Street
Applicant: Donald Humphries with Morrison Hershfield
Request: Install back-up generator and fuel tank.
Approved as modified: Certified Record attached.
10. **051-08-CA:** 1104 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Steve May
Request: Install a 5V crimp metal roof.
Approved: Certified Record attached.
11. **052-08-CA:** 165 St. Emanuel Street
Applicant: Holmes and Holmes, Architects
Request: Build a brick wall.
Approved with conditions: Certified Record attached.

D. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

The meeting began late following a two-hour training session by Toni Cherry of the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions. In the training session, Ms. Cherry covered a number of topics including designation; enforcement; appropriateness and stakeholders. In addition to ARB members present, several Commission members, members of the public and representatives of Foley and Baldwin County attended the session.

351 Conti, Catholic Archdiocese of Mobile: The Board had expected a color sample for the building to be presented. Marie Dismukes and Dave Wilton were present to explain the colors. They did note that option 4 was the Archbishop's choice. Bunky Ralph moved that the colors did not impair the historic integrity of the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued in accordance with Option 4. The motion was seconded by Tom Karwinski and passed.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

052-04/05-CA: 223 Dauphin Street

Applicant: Mary and Bill Monahan

Received: 05/09/05

Resubmitted: 07/30/07

Resubmitted: 04/07/08

Meeting: 05/23/05

Meeting: 08/13/07

Meeting: 05/07/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: B-4

Project: Reconfigure the current storefront.

BUILDING HISTORY

Architect W.H. Hammond designed this three-story masonry commercial building circa 1899. The first floor façade was significantly altered in the late 1920s/early 1930s with the addition of Carrara glass.

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. As mentioned above, the first floor of this building was significantly altered circa 1930 with the addition of Carrara glass. The Board approved a plan in 2005 and 2007 on the condition that the Carrara glass and tile in the vestibule remain; however, the work was never begun. Mr. Monahan recently received an MOT regarding the condition of the Carrara glass in 2007 and has since been looking for replacement glass.
- B. The Lower Dauphin Street Guidelines state, “for a situation in which the original [building] detail has been hidden by a covering, the guidelines encourage removal of the covering and restoration of the original design. Where detailing has been removed, a new design compatible with older adjacent buildings or a façade reconstruction based on photo evidence is encouraged. If removal of an applied modern storefront will damage the underlying historic fabric of the façade, or the newer façade has achieved historic status, then removal is discouraged.”
- C. The plan is to proceed with the work approved on 05/23/05. Due to the difficulty and expense of finding replacement glass, Mr. Monahan is asking the Board amend their decision to keep the Carrara glass on the street level. He will maintain the glass on the transom. The work includes the following:
 1. Replace the Carrara glass with scored stucco to match the existing stucco on the upper floors and wood fixed windows per the submitted plans.
 2. Replace the glass retail display area with a pair of 42” high eating counters constructed on a 6” thick stucco bulkhead separated by a 5’-0” wide ingress/egress opening per the submitted plan. The bulkhead will have operable wood and glass shutters.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that at least some of the Carrara glass should be retained, which is what Mr. Monahan is proposing in the transom. Staff also feels that the tile floor in the vestibule should be retained and repaired and recommends approving the application with the aforementioned conditions. The Board has in the past allowed later changes that have achieved historic status to be removed.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Bill Monahan was present to answer questions. Mr. Monahan explained that he would keep the Carrara Glass in transom area and use scored stucco along the sides. He also said the original tile would be retained and a stamped concrete would be used where there was no tile.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the historical value of the Carrara Glass as opposed to the recreation of an earlier storefront. It was pointed out that later intact historical storefront should be preserved over the recreation of a speculative, earlier one.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/7/09.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

035-08-CA: 1110-1112 Government Street/Montauk Avenue
Applicant: Michael Lee/Central Park Condominiums
Received: 03/25/08 **Resubmitted:** 04/17/08
Meeting: 04/16/08 **Meeting:** 05/07/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-3
Project: Install a fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This townhouse complex was constructed in 2006.

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 Central Park Condominiums face Government Street with rear access facing Montauk Avenue, which Urban Development requires be blocked. Staff has received several phone calls and letters from residents of Montauk opposing the plan as presented. A letter is included in the supplemental material.
- B. The 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.” Also, “the height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.”
- C. Mr. Lee is proposing to install an 8’-0” wood privacy fence per the submitted site plan.
 1. The finished side will face the exterior.
 2. The fence line will be within 12’-0” of Montauk Avenue.
 3. 1111 Montauk will be enclosed on three sides by the fence, which will extend approximately 20’-0” to 30’-0” from the front of the house.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels the fence as proposed will create a visual impairment on Montauk, which will impair the historic character of the district as well as the neighboring houses. Although the Board can allow an 8’-0” fence in areas affected by commercial or multi-family buildings, staff believes the reasons for granting an exception in this case do not exist. Also, though Montauk is the rear of the Government Street building, it is generally considered the front for many other buildings. It is not the policy of the Board to allow a 6’-0” or 8’-0” fence to generally come so close to the sidewalk in the middle of the block. Ordinarily, any fence above 3’-0” is not allowed within 25’-0” of the street or closer than the front of the building. Therefore, staff recommends approval of a 6’-0” fence to be no closer to Montauk than 25’-0” feet or the front of the nearest adjacent house, whichever is further.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mike Lee was present to discuss the application. He stated that he was trying to solve the problem of people cutting through his property and parking on it. He understood there were problems with his application and asked the Board for guidance.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request. There were a number of suggestions made by the Board and staff that might solve the problem of the owner.

FINDING OF FACT

There was no Finding of Fact.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that the matter be assigned to a Design Review Committee. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

042-08-CA: 309 West Street
Applicant: Tim Gibson
Received: 04/14/08 (+45 Days: 05/29/08)
Meeting: 05/07/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Enclose the back door and replace a window with French doors.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story Mediterranean-style residence was built circa 1917. The rear elevation has been altered a number of times, including having the rear porch enclosed.

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. As mentioned above, the rear porch had been enclosed previously.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of buildings.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Enclose the existing back door.
 - 2. Replace the casement window with wood, 10-lite, double French doors with transoms.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the changes will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The work on the rear elevation, which had been previously altered, is sympathetic to the age and style of the building. Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tim Gibson was present to discuss the application. He said this was a change to the previously approved plan but used the previously approved materials.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of 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: 5/7/09.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

043-08-CA: 1113 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Cristina Rodgers
Received: 04/14/08 (+45 Days: 05/29/08)
Meeting: 05/07/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct an addition and detached garage.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame residence was a Chickasaw house built circa 1918 and moved to this lot in 1929. It had a later rear addition that was removed in 1995. The Historic Mobile Preservation Society owned it previously.

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. As mentioned above, a small previous addition was removed in 1995 during the residence’s incarnation as an interpretive space for HMPS. A previous design with an attached garage was denied 04/02/08.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that new additions should respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 1. Construct a 26’-8” by 20’-2” L-shaped addition to the back per the submitted plans.
 - a. It will create an interior courtyard.
 - b. It will have a 30-year architectural shingle roof in a dark blend (the asbestos roof on the existing residence will be replaced with the same architectural shingles).
 - c. Materials and details will match existing materials to include the wood lap siding, trim and corner boards, overhanging eaves with rafter tails, 3/1 wood sash windows, paint color scheme and brick piers with lattice.
 2. Construct a 12’-0” by 22’-0” garage
 - a. It will have a concrete slab foundation.
 - b. Materials and details will match existing materials to include the wood lap siding, trim and corner boards, overhanging eaves with rafter tails, architectural shingle roof, 3/1 wood sash windows and paint colors.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work that will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request and asked about the garage door. The door design will be submitted at a later time.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Tom Karwinski and unanimously approved. The garage door design will be submitted to staff at a later time. **Certificate of Appropriateness**

Expiration Date: 5/7/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

044-08-CA: 10 Houston Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Received: 04/15/08 (+45 Days: 05/30/08)
Meeting: 05/07/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Remove inappropriate alterations to renovate building exterior.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame residence was built circa 1925. However, subsequent inappropriate renovations and additions – including being covered in brick circa 1960 – have altered the building to a point that it is currently not contributing.

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. As mentioned above, this building has undergone such inappropriate renovations and additions that its status as contributing to the district was compromised.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “the exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. Original [material] should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
- C. The work proposed includes the following per the submitted plans:
 - 1. Remove the brick veneer along the front and partially down the sides.
 - 2. Reinstall the 2/2 wood sash windows to their original locations.
 - 3. Install new paired fiberglass Tuscan columns, 12” bottom diameter and 10” top diameter.
 - 4. Install new brick skirt and cheek walls.
 - 5. Repair and repaint all existing elements to include the roof, siding, decking and masonry.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that the changes will not impair the historic integrity of the district. The proposed work falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines and staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. The original window and porch are present but hidden by the later alterations. These will be made visible in the renovation process. There was no evidence for any particular columns so the architect chose columns that would be appropriate. The piers will be rebuilt and there will be corner boards.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/7/09.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

045-08-CA: 101 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: Winchester and Fran Thurber/Douglas Kearley
Received: 04/15/0 (+45 Days: 05/30/08)
Meeting: 05/07/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Add on to the garage and extend fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

The 1923 Crawford House is a one-story frame residence constructed in the Craftsman style.

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 an existing garage in the backyard and the property is partially fenced-in.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that accessory structures “should complement the design and scale of the main building.” They also state 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 work proposed includes the following:
 1. Add onto the existing garage.
 - a. A new concrete slab will be poured.
 - b. Removed windows will be relocated.
 - c. Materials and details will match the materials and design of the existing garage and main residence to include the wood lap siding, trim and corner boards, overhanging eaves with rafter tails, 6/6 wood sash windows, columns and paint color scheme.
 2. Extend the existing fence along Old Shell to the corner of Levert, turning north toward the gates to match the fence at the east side.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels the garage addition will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. Nonetheless, staff is guarded about the proposed fence. The 6’-0” fence along the front is already a visual impairment and the residence would be further impaired by the extension. On the other hand, there are a number of existing fences along Old Shell Road in the Ashland district that enclose one side of the front yard much like this one will. This property has an easement and the Properties Committee must approve the work by before it commences.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He brought photos of comparable fences.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request. It noted that though fences along sidewalks were not generally allowed but that there was a strong tradition of them along this section of Old Shell Road.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Tom Karwinski and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/7/09.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

046-08-CA: 7-9 North Conception Street
Applicant: Ronald Nance
Received: 04/21/08 (+45 Days: 06/05/08)
Meeting: 05/07/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Rehabilitate the façade and add a balcony.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story masonry commercial building was constructed circa 1907. As with many older commercial buildings, the exterior has been altered a number of times, including having the storefront updated and the windows at the mezzanine level enclosed.

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 building currently houses a florist and office space. As mentioned above, as with many older commercial buildings, the exterior has been altered a number of times, including having the storefront updated and the windows at the mezzanine level enclosed.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[t]he porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture...attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.” The Guidelines also state, “new windows...should be compatible with the general character of the building.” Rehabilitations must respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
1. Repair and paint existing elements, including the cornice, shutters, windows and stucco.
 2. Reopen the enclosed window openings at the mezzanine level.
 3. Install aluminum windows with impact resistant glass at the mezzanine level per the submitted design.
 4. Install a new metal balcony with 42” plain spindles and round pipe columns per the submitted design.
 5. Paint the balcony with Sherwin-Williams Sundried Tomato, SW4585.
 6. Install a new stucco band per the submitted design.
 7. Install aluminum windows with impact resistant glass at the storefront level per the submitted design.
 8. Install a 16SF single-faced acrylic wall sign at the left side of the façade.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that the majority of the proposed alterations are acceptable alterations for this building, which has been modified a number of times, including having all of the mezzanine-level openings stuccoed over. However, staff feels that the rounded windows are not appropriate for this building.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ronald Nance, the architect, was present to discuss the application. Also present in the audience were several owners of the business. Mr. Nance brought a color presentation board. He explained that the curved sections of the storefront would be an embossed metal and that the 2nd story windows were currently a powder coated aluminum. The balcony railing would match the railing to the south.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request. There was considerable discussion on the way the storefront would work. Clarification of the application revealed that the 2nd story windows would not have the originally proposed curves but would be squared off. It was noted that there was no sign design, but that a 16SF design could be approved at the staff level.

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 amending fact 3 to read: "Install aluminum windows with impact resistant glass at the mezzanine level squared off," and deleting fact 8 altogether. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of 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: 5/7/09.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

047-08-CA: 154 South Cedar Street
Applicant: Jerry Arnold
Received: 04/17/08 (+45 Days: 06/01/08)
Meeting: 05/07/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct an addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame Shotgun was built circa 1888. It was originally located at 152 South Cedar, but was moved one lot over in 1981 to provide parking for 551 Church Street. A rear wing similar to the one proposed was removed in the 1970s.

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. As mentioned above, a rear wing similar to the one proposed was removed in the 1970s.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that new additions should respect the age and style of the building.
- C. Mr. Arnold is proposing to construct a 24’-0” by 33’-0” square addition to the back per the submitted plans.
 - 1. It will feature a covered porch on the north side.
 - 2. Materials and details will match existing materials to include the wood lap siding, trim and corner boards, 6/6 or 6/9 wood sash windows, foundation, columns and balustrade.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work that will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The work seeks to reconstruct and enlarge a removed wing. This type of addition is a common way to create more living space in a shotgun residence. Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Jerry Arnold was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Tom Karwinski and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/7/09.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

048-08-CA: 1057 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Chris Bowen
Received: 04/17/08 (+45 Days: 06/01/08)
Meeting: 05/07/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-1
Project: Permit the parking area.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame Victorian-era building was constructed circa 1872. The parking area for this building has existed for at least 10 years.

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. As mentioned above, this parking area has existed for at least 10 years; however, because it was never permitted, prospective tenants of the building have never been able to obtain business licenses.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[m]odern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property...[g]ravel and shell are preferred paving material, however...hard surface materials may also be acceptable.”
- C. Mr. Bowen is requesting that the parking area be properly permitted in order to allow tenants to move in.

RECOMMENDATION

Although this is an existing parking lot, there is no indication a Review Board ever approved it. Generally, the Board requires some landscaping in parking areas. This building has had constant occupancy problems because of the parking situation. Urban Development has agreed to grant a CO if the ARB approves the parking plan. Since the new owner has limited parking available on the site, landscaping can be installed on the periphery and current parking can be retained.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Chris Bowen was present to discuss the application. He explained that the current parking area was present when he bought the property five years. He stated that there was very little area to plant anything but that a crepe myrtle with ground plants could go in the SE and SW corners of the property. He believes this approval will meet Urban Development requirements to issue a Certificate of Occupancy. He also expects any tenants to get business licenses with this matter settled.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request. Staff explained that someone who could not get UDD to approve the parking redid the property. This has been a contentious lot for years as people tried to get business licenses but had inadequate parking.

FINDING OF FACT

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that the Board amends the facts in the Staff report to include the addition of landscaping. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application as amended does not impair the historic integrity of 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: 5/7/09.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

049-08-CA: 1407 Monroe Street
Applicant: Robert Payne
Received: 04/23/08 (+45 Days: 06/07/08)
Meeting: 05/07/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace three windows and remove a door.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame Bungalow was built circa 1921. The front porch was enclosed previously and a second door added at some point in time. The residence has also been covered in vinyl siding.

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. As mentioned above, the front porch was enclosed previously and the residence has been covered in vinyl siding. A second door was added when the porch was enclosed. The windows in the enclosure are metal.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “the exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. Original [material] should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
- C. The work proposed include the following:
 - 1. Replace the existing inappropriate windows on the porch enclosure with the original 2/2 wood sash windows.
 - 2. Remove the second door leading into the porch enclosure.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that the changes will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The proposed work falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines and staff recommends approving the application. The owner is hoping to remove the siding at a later date.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Robert Payne was present to discuss the application. The door will be walled in with vinyl siding.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that 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, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of 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: 5/7/09.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

050-08-CA: 68 St. Francis Street
Applicant: Donald Humphries with Morrison Hershfield
Received: 04/23/08 (+45 Days: 06/07/08)
Meeting: 05/07/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install back-up generator and fuel tank.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is the First National Bank building, Neo-Classical structure constructed in 1906.

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 area where the generator and fuel tank is proposed is a parking lot for the building. It will be elevated above grade to maintain as much parking as possible and be above flood levels. The work will allow adequate emergency power back up in case of power outages.
- B. The Architectural Review Board examines applications for situations such as these on a case-by-case basis.
- C. Mr. Humphries is proposing to install a back-up generator and fuel tank in the parking area for the building.
 1. They will sit on a steel platform elevated 8’-0” above the ground.
 2. There will be a metal screen wall on two sides painted either DuraTech Surf White or Light Stone for reduced visual impact.
 3. The total structure will be 20’-0” tall; it is approximately 19’-0” to the bottom of the existing windows.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels the equipment would be better closer to the ground, because the raised platform will create a large visual impact. However, if parking and flood plain concerns prevent Mr. Humphries from lowering it, staff feels this plan is acceptable. As it is, he has made an effort to minimize the impact as much as possible, although the platform and/or screen should be lowered so that no part of the existing windows is covered.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Robert Dick was present to discuss the application. He stated that the Fire Marshall would not allow the tank on the roof. He also noted that there was limited parking on sight and they did not wish to lose any parking if possible.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request. The Board noted that portions the walls of the raised enclosure obscured the building’s windows. Mr. Dick said they could be lowered.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report adding a fourth fact: “The wall panels will be lowered below the windows.” 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, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and approved. Tom Karwinski voting in opposition. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/7/09.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

051-08-CA: 1104 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Steve May
Received: 04/23/08 (+45 Days: 06/07/08)
Meeting: 05/07/08
Disclosures: Tilmon Brown and Jim Wagoner recused themselves and left the room before the discussion. Devereaux Bemis and Aileen de la Torre disclosed that they were on the Board of the Mobile Revolving Fund, which sold the property to the applicant. Neither took an active roll in the discussions.

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install a 5V crimp metal roof.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame cottage was built circa 1910.

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 residence has been vacant for many years and the roof is in very poor condition. It is a former Revolving Fund property that was recently sold to Mr. May.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that a roof “is one of the most dominant features of a building [and] materials should be appropriate.”
- C. Mr. May is proposing to install 5V-crimp galvanized metal panel roof.

RECOMMENDATION

According to the Design Review Guidelines, metal is an appropriate roof material in historic districts. While some architectural styles lend themselves to variety, others do not. Metal panels are acceptable for this one-story cottage and staff recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request noting the building would have been demolished if not for the Mobile Revolving Fund for Historic Properties.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that 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, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Barja Wilson and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/7/09.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

052-08-CA: 165 St. Emanuel Street
Applicant: Holmes and Holmes, Architects
Received: 04/17/08 (+45 Days: 06/01/08)
Meeting: 05/07/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: H-B
Project: Build a brick wall.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, the Hall-Ford House is a two and a half story Creole Cottage with Neo-Classical influences built circa 1836.

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 property contains several vacant buildings that will be renovated into a bed and breakfast. The power company has an easement at the side where the brick wall will be located.
- B. The 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.” Also, “the height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.”
- C. Mr. Holmes III is proposing to construct an 8’-0” high brick wall along the east boundary between the Spear-Barter and Hall-Ford houses, which backs up to land owned by the power company.
 1. The brick will match and/or complement the buildings.
 2. There will be a 3’-6” iron gate and fence.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that the work will not impair the integrity of the building or the district. Staff will need to see the design for the gate before installation.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request noting that there was no design for the iron gate.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that 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 that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved. The gate can be submitted to staff. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/7/09.**