

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting

October 17, 2005

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair, Cindy Klotz.

Ed Hooker, MHDC Architectural Engineer, called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Tilmon Brown, Douglas Kearley, Cindy Klotz, Michael Mayberry, Harris Oswalt, Bunky Ralph, Joe Sackett.

Members Absent: Robert Brown, Cameron Pfeiffer, David Tharp.

Staff Members Present: Ed Hooker, Anne Crutcher, Devereaux Bemis, John Lawler.

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Bradley Sanders	2 N. Royal St.	002-05/06-CA
John Vallas	2308 Ashland Place Ave.	003-05/06-CA
Tuan and Marian Titlestad	1569 Fearnway	004-05/06-CA
Jamie Brown	13 N. Dearborn St.	001-05/06-CA
Harvey Gandler	256 Wacker Ln. 36608	008-05/06-CA
Hubert Stokes	2201 O'Connor St. 36617	072-04/04-CA
Emanuel Roberts	244 S. Warren St.	005-05/06-CA

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the minutes as emailed. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Bunky Ralph moved to approve the Mid-Month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Charles Bowen
Property Address: 1414 Brown Street
Date of Approval: 9/12/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, gray in color.
2. Applicant's Name: Monica Visser
Property Address: 1210 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 9/16/05 jss
Work Approved: Repaint house the following Sherwin Williams colors:
Body – SW2835 Craftsman Brown or SW2840 Hammered Silver
Trim – Sourdough 8014
Door – Roycroft Copper Red
Porch floor and ceiling colors to be called in Foundation infill painted surfaces color to be Bellingrath Green or black.

Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile, material and dimension. Repair storm damaged fence to match existing.

3. Applicant's Name: Floyd C. Hendricks, Jr.
Property Address: 1118 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 9/16/05 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with new materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
4. Applicant's Name: Barry Miller
Property Address: 100 North Ann Street
Date of Approval: 9/19/05 weh
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with new materials to match existing in profile, material and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
5. Applicant's Name: Jamie and Tilmon Brown
Property Address: 13 North Dearborn Street
Date of Approval: 9/21/05 asc
Work Approved: Hurricane damage repair work to include: restore parapet wall using existing bricks and lime based mortar; re-roof using asphalt shingles to match existing; repair wood windows to match existing.
6. Applicant's Name: James Ellis
Property Address: 205 Rapier Avenue
Date of Approval: 9/21/05 weh
Work Approved: Install metal roof as per submitted sample.
7. Applicant's Name: Lynne Davis
Property Address: 110 Lanier Avenue
Date of Approval: 9/22/05 asc
Work Approved: Paint exterior in the following Benjamin Moore colors:
Body – Sandy Hook Gray
Trim – White Dove
Window sashes, door and porch deck - Bronze
8. Applicant's Name: Virginia Wrecking
Property Address: 109 Government Street
Date of Approval: 9/22/05 weh
Work Approved: Install 600 square foot temporary enclosure for mechanical equipment adjacent to existing chiller and mechanical room as per submitted plans.
9. Applicant's Name: Eric Roberts
Property Address: 1555 Springhill Avenue
Date of Approval: 9/28/05 weh
Work Approved: Install 3' x 5' double faced pole sign as per submitted design. White background with black lettering.

10. Applicant's Name: James Byrd
 Property Address: 456 Conti Street
 Date of Approval: 9/30/05 asc
 Work Approved: Re-roof building with fiberglass 3 tab shingles, weathered wood in color.
11. Applicant's Name: Joseph Sackett
 Property Address: 1059 Savannah Street
 Date of Approval: 9/30/05 asc
 Work Approved: Re-roof building with Owens Corning AR30, driftwood in color. Replace rotten wood as necessary with materials to match existing in profile, material and dimension, Repaint house in existing color scheme.

OLD BUSINESS

1. 011-04/05-CA 1108-1110 Old Shell Road
 Applicant: MHDC/Mobile Revolving Fund
 Nature of Request: Change in plans before construction from a flat roof over the connector to a pitched roof as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

2. 072-04/05-CA 306 Marine Street
 Applicant: Hubert Stokes
 Nature of Request: Demolish existing historic building severely damaged by fire. Landscape vacant lot once structure is removed.

APPLICATION WITHDRAWN

3. 083-04/05-CA 316 North Jackson Street/Lot 10, DeTonti Square
 Applicant - Mr. and Mrs. Leon Raue
 Nature of Request: Construct new one story residence as per submitted plans.

DENIED Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS

1. 001-05/06-CA: 412 Dauphin Street
 Applicant: Joseph Cleveland Architects
 Nature of Request: Renovation of existing commercial building for multiple residential use. Provide new double iron balconies on street facades, new parking, new doors and windows, patch, repair, replace and paint historic façade elements.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

2. 002-05/06-CA 5 North Claiborne Street
 Applicant: LPC Properties, LLC
 Nature of Request: Remove porch infill and reconstruct porch railing as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

3. 003-05/06-CA 2308 Ashland Place Avenue
Applicant: John and Lesley Vallas
Nature of Request: Install 6' wood picket fence along west property line as per submitted site plan.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

4. 004-05/06-CA 1569 Fearnway
Applicant: Tuan and Marian Titlestad
Nature of Request: Add porch to west side, extend kitchen and back porch; add master bath in existing sunroom and re-side to match existing. Install pool and 6'-0" wood fence. Install new concrete drive and rework front steps and sidewalk, all as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

5. 005-05/06-CA 244 South Warren Street
Applicant: Emanuel and Belinda Roberts
Nature of Request: Install stucco-covered masonry wall along south property line as per submitted design.

APPROVED CONDITIONED ON RECEIVING A VARIANCE. Certified Record attached.

6. 006-05/06-CA 1107 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Stella and Ray Hester
Nature of Request: Extend back porch; build a 12'x 12'garconinnere for back yard; construct gate at rear of driveway; construct handrail for front steps, all as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

7. 007-05/06-CA 1307 Springhill Avenue
Applicant: Ezra Kennedy
Nature of Request: Retain signage installed without sign permit or Certificate of Appropriateness.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

8. 008-05/06-CA 1717 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Harvey Gandler, AIA for the Senior Citizens Center
Nature of Request: Construct addition to rear of building consisting of a gymnasium, activities room, exercise room, toilet facilities, covered drive thru and entrance lobby. Expand parking lot as shown on site plan.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

9. 009-05/06-CA 805 Church Street
Applicant: John Peebles
Nature of Request: Renovate existing warehouse/office into warehouse/2
apartments. Construct new balcony on Church Street
elevation; replace windows, construct wall, construct
new garage, re-skin warehouse with new pre-finished
metal panels. Install metal fence matching that used at
the Mobile Cruise Ship Terminal.

TABLED FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.
Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Election of Chair and Co-Chair
The election will take place the first Monday in January.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

011-04/05-CA 1108-1110 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Mobile Historic Development Commission/Mobile Revolving Fund
Received: 11/18/04 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 1/22/05 1) 12/13/04 2) 10/13/05 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: Devereaux Bemis recused himself from discussion on the application.
Nature of Project: Change in plans before construction from a flat roof over the connector to a pitched roof as per submitted plans.

Additional Information:

The Mobile Revolving Fund acquired these two abandoned and derelict historic properties for the purpose of rehabilitating the structures and selling them to preserve the streetscape along Old Shell Road. Currently 1108 OSR is situated at the rear of the lot. Plans call for the structure to be moved forward 30’ and for the two structures to be connected and restored as one single family residence. Their proposal was approved by the Board. This request is to change the approved flat roof over the connector to a pitched roof, tying into the roofs of the existing structures.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES AND DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	General	Rehabilitate two historic structures

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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

Based on the information contained in the application, in Staff’s judgment, the proposed restoration will not impair the historic integrity of the structures or the district.

- A. The following is a list of proposed changes to the structures:
 - 1. move 1108 OSR forward 30’
 - 2. construct a connector between 1108 and 1110 OSR
 - a. connector to resemble glassed-in porch
 - 3. rehabilitate the structures as follows:
 - a. stabilize foundations and repair any structural damage
 - b. repair/replace rotten siding as necessary
 - c. repair/replace deteriorated windows

- d. repair/replace deteriorated exterior doors
- e. repair/replace deteriorated soffit, cornice and fascia
- f. repair/replace deteriorated or missing porch details
- g. re-roof entire structure
- h. install new concrete ribbon drive and gravel parking as per site plan
- i. landscape property to meet City of Mobile's Landscape Ordinance

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff explained that there was also a request to alter the full glass connector to a connector with a wood paneled bulkhead, however, no elevation was submitted for review.

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Lacking a revised elevation, the Board did not feel it could adequately review the request to alter the connector elevation.

FINDING OF FACT

There was no finding of fact.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts adopted when the project was originally reviewed, that the Board approve the roof change request and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/17/06.

- C. Ability to Reproduce Historic Structures
 - 1. The type and quality of the materials used in the construction of 306 Marine Street are no longer readily available.
 - 2. The structure dates from the first quarter of the 20th century, before the introduction of nominal dimension lumber. Components include old growth pine structural members and siding, historic windows, doors and interior decoration, etc. Replacement material would have to be garnered from salvage yards or specially milled.
 - 3. Though the removal of any historic building impairs the integrity of the district, it is the opinion of the staff that restoration of this building would result in the creation of a substantially new structure. Also this attempt to construct this new structure would not be economically feasible. Therefore, in the event that reconstruction was attempted, the cost to reproduce 306 Marine Street would be prohibitively expensive.

- D. Ensemble of Historic Buildings Creating a Neighborhood
 - 1. The subject property is one of numerous shotgun residences in the district.
 - 2. Removal of this residence would erode the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

- E. Proposed Redevelopment Plans for the Site
 - 1. The application states that the site will be cleared of building debris and grassed.

- F. Effect of Proposed Project on the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
 - 1. The removal of 306 Marine Street would degrade the streetscape along this relatively intact section of Marine Street.
 - 2. The removal of 306 Marine Street would impair the architectural, cultural, historical, social, aesthetic and environmental character of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

- G. Content of Application
 - 1. Property information:
 - a. 306 Marine Street was acquired by the applicant in 1985 for \$15,000.
 - b. The applicant states that the property was in good condition prior to the fire.
 - c. The property is currently unoccupied.
 - 2. Alternatives Considered
 - a. The applicant states that no alternatives have been considered to retain the residence.
 - 3. Sale of Property by Current Owner
 - a. Information presented in the application notes that 306 Marine Street has been listed for sale for \$30,000.
 - b. Applicant states that there have been 2 offers made on the property.
 - 4. Financial Proof
 - a. No financial proof was included with the application.

Based on the above facts, Staff recommends denial of the request to demolish.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Hubert Stokes was present to announce to the Board that he was no longer the owner of 306 Marine Street. He had sold the property to a relative in Texas--Sim Stokes, 1011 Windridge Circle, Duncanville, TX 75137--whose intention it is to restore the building. Since he no longer owns the property, he wished to withdraw the application.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION **APPLICATION WITHDRAWN**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

083-04/05 – CA 316 North Jackson Street
Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Leon Raue
Received: 8/8/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 9/23/05 1) 8/22/05 2) 10/17/05 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (vacant lot/new construction)
Zoning: R-B, Residential Business
Nature of Project: Construct a wood frame with brick veneer, one story residence on a raised concrete slab.
History of the Project: At the September 22 meeting of the ARB, this project was referred to the Design Review Committee. Architect Michael Mayberry developed four elevations. These were sent to the applicant for review. Of the four, the applicant picked the one that was then developed into the other 3 elevations. The revised elevations were distributed to the Design Review Committee, who determined that the proposed revised design would not impair the historic integrity of the neighborhood.

Project Synopsis:
The building site is located one lot south from the southeast corner of Adams and Jackson Streets. This parcel was recently purchased from the City of Mobile's Real Estate Department. The lot measures approximately 47'-7" wide by 120' deep. The building measures approximately 33' wide with a 9' wide recessed front porch, by approximately 67' long. The north setback is approximately 11' and the south setback is approximately 4'. The house faces west towards Jackson Street. The front wall of the main house is located at a distance of 20' from the sidewalk. The proposed construction is a one story brick veneer residence raised on a floating slab. The ground plan is rectangular in design. The proposed building has a 3' finished floor height above grade, and a first floor finished floor height of 10'. Overall ground to parapet height is 19'-9". The proposed roof is hipped. The proposed pitch of the main roof is 7/12. Proposed roofing material is asphalt/fiberglass shingles.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation –
 front porch - brick veneer
 main residence –brick veneer over wood frame with a soldier course water table
- b. façade – brick veneer with hardiboard trim;
- c. doors – wood & glass
- d. windows – wood casement, wood fixed, wood double hung
- e. porch details –
 front porch: Built-up wood columns
- f. roof – architectural grade shingles

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Guidelines for New Commercial and Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Design Standards for New Construction	Construct new residence
3,I	Placement and Orientation	
3,II	Massing and Scale	
3,III	Façade Elements	
3,IV	Materials and Ornamentation	
3, IV, A	Appropriate Materials for New Residential Construction	

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “ In the case of a proposed new building, that such building will not, in itself, or by reason of its location on the site, materially impair the architectural or historical value of the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity and that such building will not be injurious to the general visual character of the Historic District in which it is to be located.”

STAFF REPORT

In Staff's judgment, the proposed new construction is in compliance with the Design Review Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction and will not impair the historic integrity of the Historic District.

3,I

I. Placement and Orientation:

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. Setbacks in the DeTonti Square Historic District range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with a 5’-15’ setback.
 - 2. The proposed front setback for this building is approximately 20’ from the sidewalk/property line.
 - 3. The proposed front setback for this building is in line with the houses to on lots to the immediate south of the subject property.

3,II

II. Massing and Scale:

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. This area of DeTonti Square has a high concentration of new construction and one moved structure on an adjacent lot.
 - 2. 1 – 3 story masonry structures are found in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
 - 3. The proposed building is a 1story brick veneer structure.
- B. The Guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. Historic buildings in the DeTonti Square Historic District are constructed on piers, or are elevated above grade by a continuous foundation wall at a height of 2’-5’.
 - 2. The proposed foundation is designed using a floating slab, at a height 2’ above grade.
- C. The Guidelines state that new construction should consider roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings.

1. A variety of roof shapes exist in the DeTonti Square Historic District, but the most common are simple end gables and hips.
2. Parapet walls are common within the DeTonti Square Historic District.
3. The proposed design features a front parapet wall.

3, III

III. Façade Elements:

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.
 1. The use of wood windows is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
 2. The use of wood French doors with transoms, is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
 3. Wood windows and wood French doors are proposed for use in this structure.

3, IV

IV. Materials and Ornamentation:

- A. The Guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
 1. There are number of brick veneer and solid masonry structures remaining in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
- B. The Guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found in the design of nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
 1. Examples of historic ornamentation include the use of a parapet wall.
 2. The use of hardiplank trim is a modern interpretation of a traditional building material and is allowed on new construction.
 3. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Staff explained that, in this instance, the design committee consisted of Michael Mayberry, Tilmon Brown and David Tharp.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board added numerous facts to the staff report:

- A.4. The City will require a sidewalk to be installed;
- B.3. There are no indications of venting in the foundation as per historic precedent;
- C.4. Roof slope is steeper than the surrounding historic properties;
5. Roof is out of scale with main body of residence;
- III.A. 1. The use of wood windows with transoms is not historically appropriate;
2. Jack arches are common in the area, but without keystones.

The Board discussed the design in depth and felt that its massing and details were inappropriate to the historic districts—only some window sills are sloped row locks; shutters are not appropriately scaled; and the proposed chimney cap is not clarified.

FINDING OF FACT AND DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved that, based upon the facts presented in the application and at the meeting, that the request be denied. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

001-05/06 – CA 412 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Joseph Cleveland Architects
Received: 9/19/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/4/05 1) 10/17/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Nature of the Project: Renovation of existing commercial building for multiple residential use. Provide new double iron balconies on street facades, new parking, new doors and windows, patch, repair, replace and paint historic façade elements.

STAFF REPORT

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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. . .

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work is in compliance with the *Design Review Guidelines* and the *Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Design Guidelines*.

- A. FAÇADE ALTERATIONS – Windows** - The *Design Review Guidelines* state that “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. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.
 - 1. The majority of the original window openings have been bricked up.
 - 2. Plans call for the removal of the brick in-fill and the installation of casement windows and doors on the front elevation, matching those existing on the west elevation.
 - 3. Plans call for the installation of double hung windows on the east elevation, matching those on the rear elevation.
- B. FAÇADE ALTERATIONS – Doors** – The *Design Review Guidelines* state that “Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms, and sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building.”
 - 1. The existing building storefront has been altered over time and is not historic.
 - 2. The proposed storefront design respects the age and style of the building.
- C. FAÇADE ALTERATIONS – Balconies** – The current *Design Review Guidelines* do not address balconies such as the ones proposed for the south/front and west side of the structure. However, the *Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Design Guidelines* state that “Should documentation exist that a balcony or gallery was originally part of a building façade, the appropriate type of

balcony or gallery may be added. Should there be no documentation that a balcony or gallery existed, a balcony or gallery appropriate to the age and character of the building may be added.”

1. There is no evidence that a balcony ever existed on this structure.
2. The proposed balcony design is appropriate to the age and character of the structure.

D. SITE IMPROVEMENTS – Fencing - The *Design Review Guidelines* state that fences “should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”

1. A 6’ capped wood fence is proposed for the northern property line, screening the parking lot from the adjoining parcels.
2. A 6’ iron fence with brick piers is proposed for the east, west and south property lines.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Jamie Brown was present to answer any Board questions. She explained that the canopy on the west side would be a brown canvas awning without posts.

The Board noted that there are no expansion joints indicated on the east elevation.

Staff suggested the use of a slope on the fence cap to help prevent wood rot.

There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board adopt the facts in the staff report and added the following fact: B.3 the awning will be self supporting and be dark brown canvas. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/17/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

002-05/06-CA 5 North Claiborne Street
Applicant: LPC Properties, LLC
Received: 9/21/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/6/05 1) 10/17/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Conflicts of Interest: Cindy Klotz recused herself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Open enclosed rear porch as per submitted plans

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Porches	Restore rear porch

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

- A. The Guidelines state that “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture…Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
1. The Meaher House, ca. 1901, is a two story masonry residence.
 2. Originally there was a two story service balcony at the rear of the residence.
 3. The service balcony has been enclosed on each level.
 4. The first floor balcony was more substantially enclosed than the second floor balcony.
 5. The applicant is proposing to restore the original second floor balcony as an open porch.
 6. Two proposals were submitted; one proposing cast iron railing matching that on the front porch, and a simpler wood design using a stock MHDC rail design.
 7. Proposal number two is more in keeping with the design of a service porch on the rear of a residential structure.
 8. The MHDC holds a façade easement on this property, however, in staff’s judgment, the proposed change is not significant enough to warrant a review by the MHDC Properties Committee.

Staff recommends approval of proposal number two as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Bradley Sanders appeared before the Board on behalf of the owner. He explained that, of the two designs submitted for Board review, the preferred option was the wood rail design. Staff explained that the stock MHDC rail design was supplied to the applicant and that the wood railing is more appropriate to the age and style of the building.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Douglas Kearley moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board adopt the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Joe Sackett and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/17/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

003-05/06 – CA 2308 Ashland Place Avenue
Applicant: John and Lesley Vallas
Received: 9/22/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/6/05 1) 10/17/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of the Project: Construct 6’ wood picket privacy fence along property lines as per submitted plans.

STAFF REPORT

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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. . .

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the fence is in compliance with the Design Review Guidelines.

- A. The Design Review Guidelines state that fences “should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
 - 1. The Dr. William Oates House, ca. 1921, was designed by C.L. Hutchisson, Sr.
 - 2. The residence is a 1 ½ story frame residence.
 - 3. The proposed 6’ high wood picket fence will begin at the south wall of the house, run to the west property line and stop at the north property line where a previously-approved powder-coated chain link fence exists.
 - 4. It is unclear from the application how the fence will be finished – whether to be left natural to weather or be painted.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

John Vallas was present to answer any Board questions regarding the application. Mr. Vallas explained that the fence will be painted white and that it will be 6 ft. picket rather than a privacy fence. The fence will terminate to the inside of the existing brick wall. He explained that David Roberts of Traffic Engineering signed off on the location of the fence stating that the fence will not impair traffic site lines.

Staff explained that there must be a 20ft. side setback for the fence. Mr. Vallas responded that he will measure the side dimension in order to site the fence correctly.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and at the public hearing, that the Board adopt the facts in the staff report with the following corrections and additions: 4. the fence will be painted white; 5. Dave Roberts of Traffic Engineering did not view the fence as an impediment to site lines.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Michael Mayberry and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/17/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

004-05/06-CA 1569 Fearnway
Applicant: Tuan and Marian Titlestad
Received: 9/21/05 Meeting Date (s):
 Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/6/05 1) 10/17/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Add porch to west side, extend kitchen and back porch;
 add master bath in existing sunroom and re-side to match existing. Install pool
 and 6’-0” wood fence. Install new concrete drive and rework front steps and
 sidewalk, all as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Porches	Extend rear porch
3	Fences, Walls and Gates	Construct driveway gate

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

- A. REAR PORCH ENCLOSURE** - The Guidelines state that “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture...Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
 1. 1569 Fearnway is a one story frame residence constructed in the Bungalow style.
 2. Currently there is an existing rear porch, measuring approximately 9’-6” deep x 14’-6” wide.
 3. The proposed porch infill would increase the size of the existing kitchen.
 4. This change would not be visible from the street.
- B. CONSTRUCTION OF NEW SIDE PORCH** - The Guidelines state that “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture...Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”

1. The proposed porch is to be constructed on the west property line adjacent to the side yard.
2. The front porch is supported by pairs of columns, one brick column on the perimeter and one wood column on the interior.
3. The proposed porch columns are wood approximating the size of the brick columns and wood columns matching those existing.
4. The porch railing matches that of the front porch.
5. The gable details match that of the front porch.
6. The majority of the porch will be screened in 2x2 wood framing.

C. SUNROOM ENCLOSURE -

1. The existing sunroom appears to be a later addition, as it does not show up on the 1925 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map.
2. The proposed plan is to remove existing windows and install siding matching that of the main house.
3. Two windows will be reused, one on the north wall and one on the west wall.

D. POOL FENCE - The Design Review Guidelines state that fences “should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”

1. 1569 Fearnway is a one story frame residence constructed in the Bungalow style.
2. The proposed fence is a 6’ wood privacy fence with a cap.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tuan and Marian Titlestad were present to answer Board questions. They amended their application to include adding 10 ft. to the front of the porch addition and moving the fence 10 ft. forward to align with the porch. The newly constructed porch will be set back 5 ft. from the original line of the house according to the architect.

Staff explained that the roof over this porch will mirror the shed on the south elevation.

There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and at the public hearing, that the Board adopt the facts in the staff report adding A.7: The porch will be extended 10 ft. to the north and the fence will be moved 10 ft. to the north. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/17/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

005-05/06 – CA 244 South Warren Street
Applicant: Emanuel and Belinda Roberts
Received: 9/27/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/11/05 1) 10/17/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Non - Contributing (new construction)
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential with R-B Provisions
Nature of the Project: Construct 6’ stucco-covered wall along property lines as per submitted plans.

STAFF REPORT

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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.…”

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the fence is in compliance with the Design Review Guidelines.

- A. The Design Review Guidelines state that fences “should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
 - 1. 244 South Warren Street is a non-contributing structure constructed ca. 1997.
 - 2. The residence is a 2 story masonry structure with a hipped roof.
 - 3. The proposed 6’ high masonry-covered stucco wall will begin at the south wall of the house, run to the west property line and tie into the wall proposed for 221 South Dearborn Street, along Canal Street Service Road.
 - 4. The proposed masonry-covered stucco wall will have columns spaced 12’ apart with pre-cast pyramidal caps.
 - 5. The wall itself will have a flat cap as shown on the elevation drawing.
 - 6. While this site is zoned R-1, R-B setbacks are applicable.
 - 7. Zoning requires that the fence be set back from the property line 5’.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted with the condition that the wall be set back 5’ from the property line.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Emanuel Roberts was present to discuss his application. He expressed surprise regarding the setback requirement for his wall, in part because his existing wood privacy fence is on the property line with no setback. He inquired whether his neighbors would be required to relocate their masonry wall.

Staff explained that it was our belief that RB setbacks required fences to be placed on the property line or 5 ft. from the property line. The current interpretation of Urban Development is that the setback is 5 ft. It is possible to file for a variance from the existing setback. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and at the public hearing, that the Board adopt the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued once a setback variance has been obtained by the applicant.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/17/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

006-05/06-CA 1107 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Stella and Ray Hester
Received: 9/21/05 Meeting Date (s):
 Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/6/05 1) 10/17/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Extend back porch; build a 12’x 12’garconierre for
 back yard; construct gate at rear of driveway; construct
 handrail for front steps, all as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Porches	Extend rear porch
3	Accessory Structures	Construct garconierre
3	Fences, Walls and Gates	Construct driveway gate

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

- A. The Guidelines state that “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture...Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
 - 1. The ca. 1866 Cox-Hester House, is a one story frame residence.
 - 2. Currently there is an existing rear porch, measuring approximately 6’ deep x 27’ wide.
 - 3. The proposed porch addition would increase the depth by 10’.
 - 4. The proposed addition will copy existing porch elements such as columns and handrails.
- B. The Guidelines state that “The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should compliment the design and scale of the main building”
 - 1. The ca. 1866 Cox-Hester House, is a one story frame residence.

2. The proposed garconierre measures 12' x 12', and is to be located in the southeast corner of the rear yard.
3. The proposed garconierre is designed in the Gothic Revival style.
4. While the main residence, constructed ca. 1866 utilizing Greek Revival elements, is not a Gothic Revival-style structure, the Gothic Revival movement spanned a period of 1830-1880, and was stylistically contemporary to that used to construct the main structure.

D. The Design Review Guidelines state that fences “should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”

1. The ca. 1866 Cox-Hester House, is a one story frame residence.
2. The proposed classically-inspired wooden pedestrian and vehicular gate measures approximately 17'-4" across the existing driveway.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. In response to a question regarding the setback of 3 ft. for the outbuilding, Staff stated that the overlay district would handle that issue.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and at the meeting, that the Board adopt the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/17/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

007-05/06-CA 1307 Springhill Avenue
Applicant: Ezra Kennedy
Received: 9/28/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/13/05 1) 10/13/05 2)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Zoning: B-4
Classification: Perimeter Building
Nature of Project: Retain signage installed without sign permit or
Certificate of Appropriateness.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES AND DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Government Street Corridor

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Wall Signs	Retain installed sign

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment:

- A. The proposed construction is not in compliance with Sections D (Materials) and E (Lighting) of the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts.
 - 1. The Guidelines state that “The total allowable square footage for the display area of building signage is 64 square feet.”
 - 2. The proposed signage totals 24 square feet.
 - 3. The building is a non-contributing commercial structure with signage (the letters that spell Factobake) as a major architectural feature.
 - 4. The sign in question was installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness or a City of Mobile Sign Permit.
 - 5. The sign in question was installed on an existing pole sign in an existing frame.
 - 6. Section D, “Materials”, of the Sign Design Guidelines lists plastic as a prohibited material.
 - 7. Section E, “Lighting”, of the Sign Design Guidelines, lists internally lit signs as a prohibited way of lighting signage.

Staff recommends denial of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Staff explained that the sign meets sign guidelines from the standpoint of its size, but that its materials did not meet the Guidelines. The sign is internally lit with plastic faces. Although a new business has located here, the existing pole standard was used.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board adopt the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application does impair the historic district according to the Guidelines and that the application be denied. The motion was seconded by Joe Sackett and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

008-05/06 – CA 1717 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Harvey Gandler, AIA for the Senior Citizens Center
Received: 10/3/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/16/05 1) 10/17/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (vacant lot/new construction)
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Construct addition to rear of building consisting of a
 gymnasium, activities room, exercise room, toilet facilities, covered drive thru
 and entrance lobby. Expand parking lot as shown on site plan.

Project Synopsis:

The existing building, the former Ahavas Chesed Synagogue, is located on the south side of Dauphin Street between Reed Street and Hannon Avenue. An addition was constructed ca. 1990 in front of the original Synagogue. The proposed building addition contains approximately 15,000 square feet. The current building is “U”-shaped in ground plan. A portion of the proposed addition fills in the open area of the “U”, at a distance of 132’ from the front of the main building. The gymnasium addition occurs at a distance of approximately 206’ from the front of the main building.

The proposed building has slab on grade foundation matching that of the existing structure, and a first floor finished floor height of 12’. Overall ground to cornice height is 23’-6”. Currently the highest ridge line is over the former sanctuary, and measures 27’ in height. Overall ground to ridge height of the gymnasium is 37’. The proposed roof is flat on the infill area and hipped on the gymnasium. The proposed pitch of the gymnasium roof is 4/12. Proposed roofing material is metal panel.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation – slab on grade
- b. façade – brick veneer at the first level and EIFS on the second level
- c. doors – metal & glass
- d. windows – metal storefront
- e. porch details –
 porte cochere: fiberglass columns
- f. roof – metal panel and flat built-up roof

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Guidelines for New Commercial and Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Design Standards for New Construction	Construct new gymnasium
3,I	Placement and Orientation	
3,II	Massing and Scale	
3,III	Façade Elements	
3,IV	Materials and Ornamentation	
3, IV, A	Appropriate Materials for New Residential Construction	

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “ In the case of a proposed new building, that such building will not, in itself, or by reason of its location on the site, materially impair the architectural or historical value of the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity and that such building will not be injurious to the general visual character of the Historic District in which it is to be located.”

STAFF REPORT

In Staff’s judgment, the proposed new construction is in compliance with the Design Review Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction and will not impair the historic integrity of the Historic District.

3,I

I. Placement and Orientation:

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. The addition will occur at the rear of the existing building within the confines of the existing setbacks.

3,II

II. Massing and Scale:

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. The massing of the proposed addition is in keeping with the massing of the existing structure.
- B. The Guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. Historic and non-historic commercial buildings and institutional buildings in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District utilize various types of foundation designs, from slab on grade to floating slab.
 - 2. The proposed foundation is designed using slab-on-grade construction.
- C. The Guidelines state that new construction should consider roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings.
 - 1. A variety of roof shapes exist in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District, but the most common are simple end gables and hips.
 - 2. The proposed design features a built-up roof over part of the area to be infilled between existing buildings, and a large hipped roof over the gymnasium.

3, III

V. Façade Elements:

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. The use of metal storefront windows is a common design element found in commercial and institutional structures throughout the Historic Districts.
 - 2. The use of metal and glass doors is a common design element found in commercial and institutional structures throughout the Historic Districts.
 - 3. Metal storefront windows and metal doors with glass are proposed for use in the addition.

3, IV

VI. Materials and Ornamentation:

- A. The Guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
 - 1. There are number of brick veneer and solid masonry structures remaining in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
- B. The Guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found in the design of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
 - 2. Proposed building details match those on the existing building.
 - 3. The use of hardiplank trim is a modern interpretation of a traditional building material and is allowed on new construction.
 - 4. EIFS is called out for use as the synthetic stucco system on the second level of the façade of the gymnasium addition.
 - 5. The Guidelines prohibit the use of EIFS systems in the districts.
 - 6. The architect has agreed to consider a true stucco system.
 - 7. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted with the requirement that a true stucco system is used in place of the EIFS system shown on the plans.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Harvey Gandler was present. He requested that he be able to use EFIS based upon the fact that EFIS was already existing on the building. The Board discussed the use of EFIS in the districts. Harris Oswalt pointed out the portion of the Guidelines that addressed EFIS: “While often an inappropriate material, EFIS may be appropriate in some circumstances and its use will be reviewed on a case by case basis.” Staff stated that EFIS, when approved, had been restricted to decorative elements such as cornice trim

Board members questioned the control of water run-off on adjacent residential properties. In response to Board questioning, Mr. Gandler stated that parking would be extended in the rear and that it was an opportunity to correct problems with standing water at the rear of the lot. Water from the building and parking lot would be taken by pipe underground and routed to the storm drain. Mr. Gandler explained that the parking area would be reconfigured and parking spaces would be added.

Board members suggested the introduction of under story trees into the parking area. Since the existing building is 26,000 sq. ft. and 15,000 sq. ft. will be added, the project will not have to comply with the Landscape Ordinance.

Tilmon Brown suggested impervious surface parking to help with run-off problem.

and that the parking extension had been overlooked in the project analysis. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Board members agreed to modify facts in the staff report and add additional facts made known at the meeting.

VI. 5. The Guidelines allow the use of EIFS systems in special circumstances in the districts.

6. This fact was eliminated.

7. Currently there is EIFS and painted brick on the building.

VII Site Consideration

1. Site has no landscaping

2. There is a request for an additional 47 parking places.

3. Applicant is reconfiguring existing parking.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Michael Mayberry moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application as submitted does not impair the historic district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and approved on a 4 to 2 vote with Klotz and Ralph voting in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/17/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

009-05/06 – CA 805 Church Street
Applicant: John Peebles
Received: 10/3/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/16/05 1) 10/17/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (concrete block warehouse)
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Renovate existing warehouse/office into warehouse/2
apartments. Construct new balcony on Church Street elevation; replace
windows, construct wall, construct new garage, re-skin warehouse with new pre-
finished metal panels. Install metal fence matching that used at the Mobile
Cruise Ship Terminal.
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Project Synopsis:

The existing building, the former Appliance Parts & Supply, is located on the south side of Church Street between South Bayou and South Jefferson Streets. To the east is Church Street Cemetery; across the street is the Big Zion AME Zion Church; to the south is the Crystal Ice warehouse complex; to the west is a vacant parcel. The building is constructed of plain and decorative painted concrete block. Plans call for the replacement of existing aluminum windows and plate glass windows with wood or aluminum clad casements. Existing doors are to be replaced with flush metal doors with glass block sidelights. The existing metal warehouse is to be divided into six separate storage units with roll-up doors and man doors. Plans call for re-sheathing the building with pre-finished metal panels.

The proposed garage has slab on grade foundation matching that of the existing structure. Proposed roofing material is metal panel.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation – slab on grade
- b. façade –
 - garage building – painted concrete block
 - existing warehouse – pre-finished metal panels
- c. doors – metal
- d. windows – wood or clad casement
- e. porch details –
 - 6” cast iron pipe columns
 - horizontal balustrade between columns
- f. roof – metal panel and flat built-up roof

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Guidelines for New Commercial and Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Design Standards for New Construction	Construct new garage
3,I	Placement and Orientation	
3,II	Massing and Scale	
3,III	Façade Elements	
3,IV	Materials and Ornamentation	
3, IV, A	Appropriate Materials for New Residential Construction	

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “ In the case of a proposed new building, that such building will not, in itself, or by reason of its location on the site, materially impair the architectural or historical value of the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity and that such building will not be injurious to the general visual character of the Historic District in which it is to be located.”

STAFF REPORT

In Staff’s judgment, the proposed new construction is in compliance with the Design Review Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction and will not impair the historic integrity of the Historic District.

3,I

I. Placement and Orientation:

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. The garage addition will occur at the right of the existing building in the same plane as the front of the existing building.

3,II

II. Massing and Scale:

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. The massing of the proposed addition is in keeping with the massing of the existing structure.
- B. The Guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. Historic and non-historic commercial buildings and institutional buildings in the Church Street East Historic District utilize various types of foundation designs, from slab on grade to floating slab.
 - 2. The proposed foundation is designed using slab-on-grade construction.
- C. The Guidelines state that new construction should consider roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings.
 - 1. A variety of roof shapes exist in the Church Street East Historic District, but the most common are simple end gables and hips.
 - 2. The proposed garage design features a shed roof running from front to rear concealed behind a parapet.
 - 3. The proposed replacement roof for the warehouse section is a pre-finished metal panel roof.

3, III

III. Façade Elements:

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. The use of casement windows is a common design element found in commercial and institutional structures throughout the Historic Districts.
 - 2. The use of metal and glass doors is a common design element found in commercial and institutional structures throughout the Historic Districts.
 - 3. Glass block is commonly associated with the age and style of the existing building.
 - 3. Casement windows, metal doors and glass block sidelights are proposed.

3, IV

IV. Materials and Ornamentation:

- A. The Guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
 - 1. There are a number of brick veneer and solid masonry structures remaining in the Church Street East Historic District.
 - 2. The existing building is constructed of decorative and plain painted concrete block.
 - 3. The proposed garage is to be constructed of painted concrete block matching that of the existing building.
 - 4. The existing warehouse is to be re-sheathed in pre-finished metal panels.
- B. The Guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found in the design of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
 - 2. Proposed building details match those on the existing building.
 - 3. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

V. Fences, Walks and Gates:

- A. The Design Review Guidelines state that fences “should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
 - 1. The proposed fence is a powder-coated woven wire fence identical to the one constructed around the Mobile Cruise Ship Facility.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. The Board questioned staff in detail trying to understand the application. There were questions concerning the old warehouse and whether it would be rebuilt or refaced. It was explained that the metal would be a 5 v crimp, although no material sample was submitted.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed whether the application was complete enough to make an informed decision.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that based upon the information presented in the application and the public hearing, that the Board table the application until additional information regarding materials, missing building elevations and photos of the existing site and buildings are submitted. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.