# MOBILE HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION CITY OF MOBILE

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

## **Minutes of the Meeting**

October 20, 2003

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Cindy Klotz called the Architectural Review Board Meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Anne Crutcher, Assistant MHDC Director, called the roll as follows:

<u>Present</u>: Bunky Ralph, Cindy Klotz, Douglas Kearley, Dennis Carlisle, Karen Carr and Alternates David Barr and Jim Waggoner

Absent: Dan McCleave, Jackie McCracken Nick Holmes III, Bill Christian, Robert Brown

A quorum was declared after the roll was called.

Staff Present: Ed Hooker, Anne Crutcher, Wanda Cochran

In Attendance	Address	Item Number	
Mary Gayle Connor	126 Houston Street	4	
Bill Connor	1259 Lake Circle Drive West	4	
Wade Wright	Wrico Signs	3, 12	
Kim Wilson	1511 Church Street		
Loyd Marston	61 Warwick Road		
Issam El-Farkh	118 Macy Place	6	
Steve Nicholas	166 Government Street		
Susan Milling	308 North Jackson Street	3	
Lana Kershner	10884 Luverne Highway	1	
James Clark	114 North Lafayette	13	
Dirk Trusty	244 Suzanne Circle	3	
James Loris	1358 Dauphin Street	12	

## **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**: August 11, 2003 Meeting

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the minutes as mailed. David Barr seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

## APPROVAL OF THE MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the mid-month certificates as mailed. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

#### B. MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Mr. Jim's Cannon Brewery

Property Address: 225 Dauphin Street Date of Approval: 8/21/03 weh

Work Approved: Install 4'x31/2' resin sign to appear like wood; sign to be double

faced and non-illuminated.

2. Applicant's Name: Charles Perrotta

Property Address: 302 Congress Street

Date of Approval: 8/21/03 weh

Work Approved: Repair damaged wood on main building and garage apartment to

match existing wood in profile and dimension. Paint to match existing color scheme. Re-roof with charcoal gray architectural

shingles.

3. Applicant's Name: Bernhardt Roofing Company

Property Address: 908 Augusta Street Date of Approval: 8/22/03 weh

Work Approved: Re-roof house with black Timberline shingles.

4. Applicant's Name: Jeremy Dorris

Property Address: 70 Bradford Avenue

Date of Approval: 8/22/03 weh

Work Approved: Replace existing deteriorated 3' wood picket fence and continue

wood picket fence around remainder of yard as per submitted site

plan.

5. Applicant's Name: Bernard Roofing

Property Address: 59 LeMoyne Date of Approval: 8/25/03 weh

Work Approved: Re-roof house in the following 3-tab shingles, Desert Tan in color

to match existing.

6. Applicant's Name: Constance Giles

Property Address: 158 South Dearborn Street

Date of Approval: 8/25/03 weh

Work Approved: Re-roof using Timberline roofing material, Charcoal in color.

7. Applicant's Name: William J. Hyde

Property Address: 153 Macy Place Date of Approval: 8/26/03 weh

Work Approved: Re-roof with 3-tab fiberglas shingles, weathered wood in color.

8. Applicant's Name: Scott Gonzalez

Property Address: 4-8 St. Emanuel Date of Approval: 8/26/03 jdb

Work Approved: Repair stucco. Cover openings with plywood to fit the openings

and screw to the building. Paint plywood Rookwood Shutter Green. Paint the building in one of the following colors: Renwick

Beige, Rookwood Jade, Downing Straw, Downing Stone,

Downing Earth, Downing Sand, or Downing Slate.

9. Applicant's Name: Salvation Army

Property Address: 1009 Dauphin Street

Date of Approval: 8/26/03 jdb

Work Approved: Install at grade handicap sidewalk cut. No rails to be installed. To

be located on east side of building.

10. Applicant's Name: David Buchanan

Property Address: 201 Church Street

Date of Approval: 8/27/03 asc

Work Approved: Touch up paint on fence, white in color.

11. Applicant's Name: Downtown Parking Diplomats

Property Address: 300 Dauphin Street

Date of Approval: 9/2/03 asc

Work Approved: Install 12 square foot projecting sign under balcony, sign to be

painted metal, either black background with white lettering or white background with black lettering. Sign to have painted

border.

12. Applicant's Name: Salvation Army

Property Address: 1009 Dauphin Street

Date of Approval: 9/3/03 asc

Work Approved: Repair 3 ft. high picket fence; length of fence to be repaired is 17

running feet.

13. Applicant's Name: Laurie and Baron Benjamin

Property Address: 118 Providence Street

Date of Approval: 9/3/03 asc

Work Approved: Repair rotten wood to match existing in dimension and profile.

Paint the exterior using the following Benjamin Moore colors: body-Woodlawn Colonial Gray; trim-Montpellier Madison White;

porch deck-gray.

14. Applicant's Name: Virginia Andreades

Property Address: 506 Monroe Street

Date of Approval: 9/3/03 asc

Work Approved: Repair to rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match

existing in profile and dimension; replace rear French doors to match existing; paint new materials in the existing color scheme.

15. Applicant's Name: Matt McDonald

Property Address: 1260 Selma Street

Date of Approval: 9/2/03 weh

Work Approved: Remove existing exterior staircase. Repair existing siding with materials

matching existing in profile and dimension. Repair existing windows or replace with new windows matching existing in profile and dimension. Remove existing infill on first floor porch to restore porch to its original

use. Remove existing exterior cast iron pipes.

16. Applicant's Name: Katherine Morrissette or Dennis Overton

Property Address: 12 Common Street

Date of Approval: 9/08/03 weh

Work Approved: Repair existing eaves, soffit and fascia with materials matching

existing in profile and dimension. Reside house using lap siding.

Repaint in existing color scheme.

17. Applicant's Name: John Broadus

Property Address: 960 Augusta Street

Date of Approval: 9/08/03 asc

Work Approved: Repaint house in the following Benjamin Moore color scheme:

Body: Great Barrington Green HC-122

Trim: Lancaster Whitewash HC-174

Porch floor: Battleship Grey

18. Applicant's Name: Sam David Knight/Dennis Langan Construction

Property Address: 101 Ryan Avenue

Date of Approval: 9/09/03 asc

Work Approved: Emergency repairs to residence. Repair all wood features to match

existing to include porch decking, porch ceiling, front entrance door and windows. House to be repainted in existing color

scheme.

19. Applicant's Name: M & A Stamp & Sign

Property Address: 169 Dauphin Street

Date of Approval: 9/10/03 weh

Work Approved: Install 10" x 18" cast bronze sign on face of building as per

submitted plans.

20. Applicant's Name: Lipford Construction Company

Property Address: 203 S. Warren Date of Approval: 9/11/03 weh

Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with new matching existing in profile and

dimension as necessary on house and carport. Remove front gable vent, feather wood to match existing. Paint to match existing color scheme. Re-roof house with dimensional shingles, Charcoal in

color, install ridge vent along main ridge of roof.

21. Applicant's Name: Dobson Sheet Metal Roofing

Property Address: 200 S. Broad Street

Date of Approval: 9/11/03 asc

Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary on fascia with new wood

matching existing in profile and dimension. Patch roof as

necessary using matching shingles. Paint house in existing color

scheme

22. Applicant's Name: Dobson Sheet Metal Roofing

Property Address: 252 S. Georgia Street

Date of Approval: 9/11/03 asc

Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary on fascia with new wood

matching existing in profile and dimension. Patch roof as

necessary using matching shingles. Paint house in existing color

scheme.

23. Applicant's Name: Lee Ross, Inc.

Property Address: 1110 Selma Street

Date of Approval: 9/11/03 asc

Work Approved: Repaint house in the following BLP color scheme:

Body: Chinchilla Fur 2948P Trim: Off White RC8

Porch Ceiling: Light Blue 2408P Porch Deck: Dark Gray RC6

24. Applicant's Name: Vernon Moore

Property Address: 210 Dexter Avenue

Date of Approval: 9/11/03 asc

Work Approved: Repaint house in the existing color Sherwin Williams color

scheme:

Body: Heritage Renwick Rose Beige

Porch, steps, trim and latticework: Roycroft Copper Red Porch columns, balustrades and step facing boards: white

Repair rotten wood as necessary with matching existing in profile and dimension. Install 4 (4"x24") soffit vents, painted white.

25. Applicant's Name: Jim Hood

Property Address: 1206 Selma Street

Date of Approval: 9/11/03 asc

Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary on front porch to match existing

in profile and dimension.

26 Applicant's Name: Chris Conlon/Guido's in Oakleigh

Property Address: 351 George Street Date of Approval: 9/11/03 weh

Work Approved: Paint restaurant the following colors:

Body: Precious Jasper, 10GY 40/296 Trim: Behr Navajo White, 1822u

Replace existing awnings with new awnings matching original in

profile and dimension, color Artcraft Burgundy.

Install wall signage, as per submitted design. Two wall signs, one on either side of plate glass windows. Signage not to exceed 20 sf.

27. Applicant's Name: Mike and Roxanne Windom

Property Address: 208 LeVert Avenue

Date of Approval: 9/12/03 jss

Work Approved: (THIS COA REPLACES COA DATED APRIL 2, 2002)

Construct an addition measuring 18' -6"x13'-6" as per the submitted Scheme B. The plan uses a shed roof with a parapet wall on the front, and retains the existing gate as a design element, which is incorporated into the new bathroom. A fixed wood French door with opaque glazing is to be placed behind the existing gate. The Board noted that there may have to be a guttering system on the side to retain the water from the neighbor.

28. Applicant's Name: Bernhardt Roofing

Property Address: 111 S. Catherine St.

Date of Approval: 9/16/03 asc

Work Approved: Re-roof using 3 tab shingles, Weathered Gray in color; re-roof flat

portion of roof using hot tar to match existing.

29. Applicant's Name: Presley Roofing Co.Property Address: 18 N. Ann Street

Date of Approval: 9/17/03 jdb

Work Approved: Re-roof with architectural Timberline shingles, dark grey in color.

30. Applicant's Name: Presley Roofing Company

Property Address: 256 State Street Date of Approval: 9/17/03 weh

Work Approved: Resurface built up flat roof to match existing in profile and

dimension.

31. Applicant's Name: Dorothy Rose

Property Address: 16 Lemoyne Date of Approval: 9/17/03 asc

Work Approved: Repair to rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile and

dimension. Paint white with white trim.

32. Applicant's Name: Mark Burks

Property Address: 1559 Dauphin Street

Date of Approval: 9/18/03 jdb

Work Approved: Repaint house in the following Behr paint scheme:

Body: Cedar Grove ECC-26-1 Trim: Nature Trail ECC-26-2 Porch Floor: Cactus Hill ECC-26-3

Replace wood on porch floor using 5/4" tongue and groove.

33. Applicant's Name: Jarrod White

Property Address: 1200 Dauphin Street

Date of Approval: 9/19/03 jss

Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile and

dimension.

Repaint house in the following Behr paint scheme:

Body: Scenic Path, ECC-14-1 Trim: Great Frontier, ECC-14-2

Accents: Red Pines ECC-27-1 and Laurel Oak ECC-41-3

34. Applicant's Name: Llana Kershner

Property Address: 264 Roper Street
Date of Approval: 9/19/03 km per weh

Work Approved: Demolish deteriorated lean-to carport w/utility. Replace rotten

wood as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension and

paint white.

35. Applicant's Name: Tom Townsend

Property Address: 459 Dauphin Street

Date of Approval: 9/22/03 weh

Work Approved: Emergency repairs to existing masonry historic structure.

Reconstruct masonry walls at rear of property. Reconstruct roof

structure on rear of property.

36. Applicant's Name: Helen Savage/Savage-Olsen Design Engineering/Centre for

the Living Arts, Carlos Parkman.

Property Address: 250 Conti/304 Government Street

Date of Approval: 9/23/03 weh

Work Approved: Install Signage, measuring 66" x 33" as per submitted design.

37. Applicant's Name: Dick and Johnna Rogers Property Address: 250 St. Anthony Street

Date of Approval: 9/23/03 weh

Work Approved: Repoint existing concrete block structure. Apply stucco finish,

leave gray to weather. Install fixed wood blinds over existing

window openings.

38. Applicant's Name: Shirley Orr

Property Address: 1163 Elmira Street

Date of Approval: 9/24/03 asc

Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile and

dimension – window casings; 1x4 tongue & groove porch decking and other rotten wood as necessary. Paint to match existing color scheme. Repair roof at the rear to match existing shingles in

profile, dimension and color.

39. Applicant's Name: Contractors of Today

Property Address: 253 Charles Street

Date of Approval: 9/25/03 weh

Work Approved: Repaint residence to match existing color scheme.

40. Applicant's Name: Dorinda E. Franklin

Property Address: 1701 Dauphin Street

Date of Approval: 9/25/03 weh

Work Approved: Replace deteriorated wood with new brick-solid recessed

brick.

41. Applicant's Name: William J. Meyer

Property Address: 301 South Ann Street

Date of Approval: 9/29/03 jdb

Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint house in the following BLP color scheme:

mension. Repaint house in the following BLP color sche Body: St. Anthony Street Gray

Trim: DeTonti Square Off -White

Porch Floor: Colonial Red

Porch Ceiling: Robin's Egg Blue

Doors: Colonial Red

42. Applicant's Name: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund

Property Address: 303 Rapier Street Date of Approval: 9/29/03 weh

Work Approved: Remove deteriorated inappropriate rear porch infill.

43. Applicant's Name: Centre for the Living Arts

Property Address: 304 Government Street

Date of Approval: 9/29/03 weh

Work Approved: Install awning over rear entrance as per submitted design. Replace

rear door with new solid glass door with stainless steel kick plate

and stainless steel band at top.

44. Applicant's Name: Sin Au

Property Address: 1702 Government Street

Date of Approval: 9/29/03 weh

Work Approved: Repaint sides and rear of building with SW 2822, Downing Sand.

Also paint sign band above glass storefronts to match.

45. Applicant's Name: Ron Ross & Paul Nix

Property Address: 919 Church Street Date of Approval: 10/01/03 weh

Work Approved: Prep, prime and repaint wood window sash, white in color. Power

wash exterior aluminum siding and repaint white to match existing color scheme. Repaint porch in existing color scheme. Install new

garage door in existing opening, as per submitted brochure.

46. Applicant's Name: Dennis Langan Construction Co.

Property Address: 1254 Selma Street Date of Approval: 10/02/03 jdb

Work Approved: Repair flat built up roof to match existing materials in profile and

dimension.

47. Applicant's Name: Eddie McZeek

Property Address: 908 Texas Street Date of Approval: 10/02/03 weh

Work Approved: Emergency demolition of unsafe and heavily deteriorated structure.

48. Applicant's Name: Melissa Nissen & Leon Van Dyke

Property Address: 63 North Monterey Street

Date of Approval: 10/03/03 weh

Work Approved: Remove deteriorated concrete driveway strips and install new

concrete driveway as per submitted site plan.

49. Applicant's Name: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund

Property Address: 303 Rapier Street Date of Approval: 10/03/03 asc

Work Approved: Repair roof as necessary to match existing shingles in profile,

dimension and color.

Repaint house in the existing color scheme. Remove concrete slab

under demolished rear porch (COA dated 9-29-03).

50. Applicant's Name: Hunter and Lisa Compton Property Address: 21 South Lafayette Street

Date of Approval: 10/03/03 weh

Work Approved: Paint house in the following colors:

Body – Coastal Plain SW 6192 Trim – Shoji White SW6194 Door – Burgundy SW7042 Shutters – Andiron SW6174 Porch Ceiling – Opaline SW6189

51. Applicant's Name: J.M. Clark

Property Address: 114 North Lafayette Street

Date of Approval: 10/03/03 weh

Work Approved: Reroof residence with new metal roof as per submitted material

information.

52. Applicant's Name: Anne Patton

Property Address: 1053 Dauphin Street

Date of Approval: 10/06/03 weh

Work Approved: Repaint in the existing color scheme. (Light grey, white and brick

red.)

#### **OLD BUSINESS:**

1. **091-02/03-CA** 8 St. Joseph Street

Applicant: Mobile Revolving Fund

Nature of Request: Install 6' steel fence across front of lot at sidewalk.

Landscape interior of lot as per submitted landscape plan. Install 8' wood privacy fence at rear of lot as per submitted site plan.

**APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached.

2. **064-02/03 – CA** 651 Dauphin Street

Applicant: Tony Cooper/Nu Wave Studios

Nature of Request: Paint exterior of brick veneer building as per submitted

rendering; install new wood windows with glass block transoms on front elevation (in original window openings); remodel storefront/entrance; install new metal canopy with decorative brackets; install two rear single entry doors on

rear elevation; install mesh on east elevation with lights behind; also to cover up utility service entrances, all as per

submitted plans.

**APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached.

006-02/03 - CANortheast corner of Kenneth and Dauphin Streets 3.

Applicant: **Infirmary Health Systems** 

Nature of Project: Request to alter previously-approved design to construct masonry

monument sign, measuring 5' 2 ½" by 9'-6", installed on a 1' berm,

as per submitted plans.

**APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached.

**NEW BUSINESS:** 

1. 001-03/04-CA 264 Roper Street

> Lana Kershner Applicant:

Nature of Request: Alter roof line and facades of existing one story

brick residence as per submitted plans.

**APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached.

2. 002-03/04-CA 303 Rapier Street

> Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund Applicant:

Nature of Request: Request to enclose rear porch & add deck as per submitted

plans.

**APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached

3. 003-03/04-CA Lot 8, DeTonti Square Historic District

> Applicant: Susan Milling

Nature of Request: Construct new 1 ½ story residence as per submitted

plans.

**APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached.

4. 004-03/04-CA 126 Houston Street

> Applicant: Mary Gayle Connor

Repair fire damage to structure as per submitted Nature of Request:

plans.

**APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached.

5. **005-03/04-CA** 451 Dauphin Street

Applicant: Paul Christopher

Nature of Request: Remove existing deteriorated awning from front of

building as per submitted plans.

**APPROVED** as amended. Certified Record attached.

6. **006-03/04-CA** 118 Macy Place

Applicant: Issam El – Farkh

Nature of Request: Construct rear addition as per submitted plans.

**APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached.

7. **007-03/04-CA** 201 Tuttle Avenue

Applicant: George Phillips

Nature of Request: Construct wood picket fence as per submitted

design and site plan.

**APPROVED** as amended. Certified Record attached.

8. **008-03/04-CA** 302 Congress Street

Applicant: Decora Smith

Nature of Request: Continue construction of 2 story accessory

structure, first floor garage with apartment above.

**DENIED** for lack of information. Certified Record

attached.

9. **009-03/04-CA** 116 Government Street

Applicant: Steve Olen

Nature of Request: Paint west elevation of building to match painted

brick front.

**APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached.

10. **010-03/04-CA** 1458 Church Street

Applicant: Loyd A. Marston

Nature of Request: Demolish deteriorated outbuilding.

**APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached.

11. **011-03/04-CA** 60 Bradford

Applicant: Andrea Ghersi

Nature of Request: Construct 6' and 3' wood picket fence as per

submitted plans.

**APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached.

12. **012-03/04-CA** 1358 Dauphin Street

Applicant: Wrico Signs

Nature of Request: Install signage as per submitted plans.

**APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached

13. **013-03/04-CA** 114 North Lafayette Street

Applicant: J.M. Clark

Nature of Request: Install vinyl fencing around two lots of record as

per submitted plans.

**APPROVED** with conditions and as amended.

Certified Record attached.

14. **014-03/04-CA** 258 Marine Street

Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund/Douglas Kearley

Architect

Nature of Request: Construct new residence as per submitted plans.

**APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached.

15. **015-03/04-CA** 259 Marine Street

Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund/Douglas Kearley

Architect

Nature of Request: Construct new residence as per submitted plans.

**APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached.

There being no other business before the Board, a motion was made to Adjourn at 4:35 p.m.

**091-02/03 – CA Applicant:**8 St. Joseph Street
Mobile Revolving Fund

Received: 10/06/03 Meeting Date (s):

**Submission Date** + **45 Days**: 11/20/03 1) 9/08/03 2) 10/20/03 3)

## INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

**<u>Historic District:</u>** Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District

Classification: Non-Contributing /Vacant Lot

**Zoning:** B4 - General Business **Additional Permits Required:** (1) Fence

**Nature of Project:** Construct temporary site fence across front and rear of lot as per submitted design.

Rear fence to be 8' solid wood privacy fence, constructed using 6"x6" pressure treated posts and solid wood panels. Front fence to be 6' steel fence spanning the width of the lot. Landscaping to be installed as per submitted design.

<u>Current Conditions:</u> Currently the site is covered in red clay infill, and is accessible from both St. Joseph Street in the front and Royal Street, through the parking lot, in the rear. The Revolving Fund is actively marketing the parcel. A means of controlling access is necessary, while still maintaining the site's visibility.

#### **Additional Information:**

At the August 2003 meeting of the ARB, the Board denied the use of vinyl chain link fencing as a temporary means of restricting access to the lot.

Since then, landscape architect Terry Ploche and engineer Rob McElroy, have developed a landscape plan and fencing plan for the Mobile Revolving Fund. The City of Mobile Parks Department has installed a sprinkler system, and plants will be installed in February. The proposed landscape plan meets the landscape requirements established by City Code.

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

<u>Sections</u> <u>Topic</u> <u>Description</u> of Work

Fences, Walls and Gates Construct fence

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..."

- A. The 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 vacant lot is adjacent to a concrete masonry parking garage on the north property line and a two story brick commercial structure on the south property line.
  - 2. The proposed front property line fence is 6' steel.
  - 3. The proposed rear property line fence is 8' solid wood privacy fencing.
- B. The Guidelines state that "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."
  - 1. The height of the proposed fence is 6' at the sidewalk and 8' at the rear of the lot.
  - 2. All adjacent property is zoned B-4, General Business.

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.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Cindy Klotz clarified that the wood privacy fence would be double-sided.

## FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved to accept the Findings of Fact and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Douglas Kearley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

064-02/03 – CA 651 Dauphin Street **Applicant:** Tony Cooper

Received: 10/6/03 Meeting Date (s):

**Submission Date** + **45 Days**: 11/20/03 1) 7/14/03 2) 10/20/03 3)

## INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

**<u>Historic District:</u>** Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District

Classification: Non-Contributing, New Construction

**Zoning:** B-4, General Business **Additional Permits Required:** (1) Building

**Nature of Project:** Rehabilitate the exterior of the existing building. Paint building dark sage green as per submitted

rendering. Install new wood windows with glass block transoms on front elevation (in original window openings); remodel storefront/entrance; install new metal canopy with decorative metal brackets; install two rear single entry doors on rear elevation; install mesh on east elevation with

security lights behind; all as per submitted plans.

**History of the Project:** 

The ARB approved plans in July 2003 to rehabilitate the existing structure. A copy of the Certified Record is attached for your review. This application is a continuation of the work.

## **APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**

Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Guidelines

Sections Topic Description of Work

Distribution 1 Original Design Intest

Description of Work

Description of Work

Description of Work

Building Condition 1 Original Design Intact Rehabilitate existing exterior

#### 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**

A. The Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Guidelines,

Building Condition 1 states that "Some portion of the façade may require maintenance and repair..."

- 1. The proposed changes are to allow the building to be adaptively reused.
- 2. Proposed new single entry and exit doors at the rear will improve ingress and egress to the facility.
- 3. Painting of the non-descript brown brick is a reversible treatment.
- B. The Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Guidelines, Section C-1, Overall Character, states that "the appearance of the building should reflect its period of significance."
  - 1. The subject building is a non-contributing modern structure.
  - 2. The proposed changes will not give the building a false sense of history.
  - 3. The installation of the mesh screens will break up the massing of the monolithic brick walls.

- C. The *Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Guidelines, Section C-1, Overall Character,* states that changes should "Reflect the character established within the block."
  - 1. Café 615 directly across the street is constructed of stucco-covered masonry with similar entry doors and geometric elements similar to the proposed glass block.
  - 2. Adjacent historic and non-historic buildings have canopies cantilevered over the sidewalk.

Staff recommends that the Review Board approve the application as submitted.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

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

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Douglas Kearley clarified that this is an existing, non-contributing structure.

## FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved to accept the Findings of Fact, and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Bunky Ralph seconded the application, which passed unanimously.

006-02/03 – CA Northeast corner of Kenneth and Dauphin Streets

**Applicant:** Infirmary Health Systems

Received: 10/06/03 Meeting Date (s):

**Submission Date + 45 Days:** 11/20/03 1) 11/13/02 2) 10/20/03 3)

## INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way Historic District

**Zoning:** R-1, with variance

Additional Permits Required: (2) Building, Electrical

**Nature of Project:** Construct masonry monument sign, measuring 5' 2 ½" by 9'-6",installed on a 1' berm, as

per submitted plans.

**Conflicts of Interest:** Jim Wagoner recused himself from review of this application.

**Variances and Previous Approvals:** Variance granted by Board of Zoning Adjustment 10/10/2001

Certificate of Appropriateness issued by Old Dauphin Way Review

Board November, 2002

**Additional Information**: The Mobile Infirmary is re-submitting plans for the design of the sign with minor

alterations. The applicant is requesting to substitute brick caps for the approved pre-cast

concrete caps as shown in the elevations. All other aspects of the project remain

unchanged.

A copy of the Certified Record from the November 2002 meeting is attached for your

review.

## **APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**

Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u> <u>Topic</u> <u>Description of Work</u>

D Materials Construct masonry monument sign

Fences, Walls and Gates Construct boundary wall

## **STAFF COMMENTS**

- A. The proposed sign materials are brick and cast concrete.
  - 1. Applicant believes the Old Mobile brick relates to the brick pier foundations of the adjacent wood frame structures.
- B. The proposed boundary fence materials are brick and iron pipe.
  - 1. The average height of the wall is  $1'-10\frac{1}{2}$ " high.
  - 2. The column height is 3' 1 ½" high.
  - 3. The wall is set back from the sidewalk 2' to allow for a low landscaped planting area.
  - 4. The materials include brick veneer with a brick cap, and a 4" diameter pipe rail, painted black.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

<u>Support</u>: Mr. Dirk Trusty, applicant, and Wade Wright of Wrico Signs, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board noted that were no further changes, other than those requested. The applicants concurred.

## FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved to accept the Findings of Fact and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. David Barr seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

001-03/04 – CA 264 Roper Street
Applicant: Lana Kershner

**Received:** 10/06/03 **Meeting Date (s): Submission Date + 45 Days:** 11/20/03 1) 10/20/03 2)

## INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

<u>Historic District:</u> Oakleigh Garden Historic District
<u>Classification:</u> Non-Contributing (modern residence)

**Zoning:** R1-Single Family Residential

**Additional Permits Required:** (1) Building

Nature of Project: Remove existing front-gable roof structure and construct new side-gable roof structure, utilizing pre-fabricated trusses. Re-roof with metal roofing as per submitted plans. Paint red brick. Construct garage in location of former lean-to carport as per submitted plans.

Install new wood windows with true divided lights as per submitted elevations. Install new wood picket fencing as per submitted site plan.

3)

Current Conditions: The non-contributing and non-historic red brick residence is located in the 250 block of Roper Street. The current roof is low-pitched, covered with deteriorated 3-tab asphalt shingles. Existing windows are silver aluminum. Existing porch columns are vertical aluminum supports.

## APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<b>Sections</b>	Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's <u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Exterior Materials and Finishes	Paint brick
3	Windows	Remove aluminum windows & install wood windows
3	Roofs	Remove roof structure and replace with new, reoriented roof system
3	Fences, Walls and Gates	Install wood picket fencing

## **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..."

## **Exterior Materials and Finishes**

- A. The Guidelines state that "The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period..."
  - 1. The subject residence is a non-historic and non-contributing structure within the district.
  - 2. The subject residence has no architectural style or importance in design.
- B. The Guidelines state that "Painting of unpainted brick is inappropriate in most cases."
  - 1. The subject residence is faced in a generic red brick veneer.
  - 2. The red brick veneer has no historic or character-defining significance.

#### Windows

- A. The 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.
  - 1. The existing aluminum windows have no historic or architectural significance.
  - 2. The proposed new wood windows with true divided lights are more compatible with adjacent historic structures.

#### Roofs

- A. The Guidelines state that "A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building."
  - 1. The current low-pitched, front-gabled roof has no architectural or character-defining significance.
  - 2. The proposed new end-gabled roof will be a strong character-defining feature.

## Fences, Walls and Gates

- A. The Guidelines state that fences "...should compliment the building and not detract from it."
  - 1. The proposed fence is a 4' wood gothic picket.
  - 2. The fence is to begin at the front line of the residence and run south to tie into an existing wood privacy fence.

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

<u>Support</u>: Mrs. Lana Kershner, applicant, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Mrs. Kershner noted that the eaves, soffit and fascia would be wood.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no discussion by the Board.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that based on the facts presented in the application and at the public hearing, the Board finds staff comment A to be acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley, and passed unanimously.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Douglas Kearley moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Dennis Carlisle seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**002-03/04 – CA** 303 Rapier Street

**Applicant:** Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund/Douglas Kearley Architect

**Received:** 10/06/03 **Meeting Date (s):** 

**Submission Date** + **45 Days**: 11/20/03 1) 10/20/03 2) 3)

## INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

<u>Historic District:</u> Oakleigh Garden Historic District <u>Classification:</u> Non-Contributing (modern residence)

**Zoning:** R1-Single Family Residential

Additional Permits Required: (1) Building

**Nature of Project:** Alter enclosed rear porch as per submitted plans. Construct new wood deck as per submitted

plans. Install new gravel drive contained between landscape timbers, as per submitted plan. Remove existing clapboard and screen enclosure at rear porch and install new wall with lattice facing at exterior.

Built 14' x 18' wood deck.

**Conflicts of Interest:** Douglas Kearley recused himself from review of this application.

## <u>APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT</u>

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

<b>Sections</b>	<u>Topic</u>	Description of Work
3	Exterior Materials and Finishes	Construct new porch wall
3	Accessory Structures and Site Considerations	Construct Deck

#### **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..."

- A. The Guidelines state that "The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period..."
  - 1. The subject residence is a historic wood frame bungalow with classical revival detailing.
  - 2. The proposed rear porch enclosure maintains the character of a porch while creating interior space.
- B. The Guidelines state that "The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by
  - guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should compliment the design and scale of the main building."
  - 1. The main residence is a one story wood frame structure, with classical revival detailing.
  - 2. The proposed deck is located at the rear of the residence and will not be visible from the street

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

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

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no discussion with regard to this application.

## FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Dennis Carlisle moved to accept the staff comments as Findings of Fact and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

003-03/04 – CA Lot 8, DeTonti Square Historic District

**Applicant:** Susan Milling

Received: 10/06/03 Meeting Date (s):

**Submission Date** + **45 Days**: 11/20/03 1) 10/20/03 2) 3)

## INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

<u>Historic District:</u> DeTonti Square Historic District

Classification: Non-Contributing (new construction)

**Zoning:** RB, Residential Business

Additional Permits Required: (5) Building, Electrical, Mechanical, HVAC, Plumbing

**Nature of Project:** Construction of a 1 ½ story, wood frame residence with stucco exterior as per submitted plans.

The building is sited on the east side of Jackson Street. The lot measures 49' wide by 150' deep. The building measures approximately 48'-10" deep x 34' wide with a 2 car carport/storage area measuring 26'-8" x 20' connected by a 10' long breezeway. The front porch of the building located at a distance of 10' from the sidewalk. The north side of the house is set back 10' from the lot line. The south side of the house is set back 5' from the lot line. The main façade will face Jackson Street. The proposed building is a 1 ½ story frame with continuous brick foundation and stucco exterior. The ground plan is rectangular in design. The proposed building has a 3' finished floor above grade. The distance from grade to the second floor is 15' in height, meaning a 12' high first floor height, and an overall ground-to ridge height of 31'-6". The front porch measures 8'deep; the rear screened porch measures 12'-6" deep. The proposed roof is an end gable. Proposed roof has a pitch of 7.5/12; roofing material is 26 gauge galvalume, silver in color.

Windows are vinyl-clad wood casements. Porch columns are 12" square chamfered posts. Front door is a pair of wood French doors, <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> glass with recessed panels below. Wood shutters are vertical tongue & groove with horizontal wood straps.

A 10' driveway is to be located on the north property line.

A 6' wood privacy fence is to be located at the rear of the property running between the northeast corner of the house to the northwest corner of the garage.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation continuous brick veneer over concrete block
- b. façade true stucco
- c. doors wood and glass
- d. windows vinyl clad wood casement
- e. porch details wood columns,
- f. roof –26 gauge galvalume, silver in color

# <u>APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT</u> Guidelines for New Commercial and Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts

SectionsTopicDescription of Work3Design Standards for New ConstructionConstruct new residence3,IPlacement and Orientation3,IIMassing and Scale3,IIIFaçade Elements3,IVMaterials and Ornamentation

## 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**

**3,I** 

- I. **Placement and Orientation**: The guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
  - A. Setbacks in DeTonti Square range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with a 5'-15' setback.
  - B. This is a lot in the middle of the block in the heart of the neighborhood.
  - C. The proposed front setback for this building is 10' from the sidewalk/property line.

**3,II** 

## II. Massing and Scale:

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
  - 1. 3 bay facades are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
  - 2. 1, 1 ½ and 2 story wood frame structures and masonry structures with stucco exteriors are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
  - 3. The proposed building is a 1 ½ wood frame structure with a true stucco exterior.
- B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
  - 1. Historic buildings in DeTonti Square are constructed on piers, or are elevated above grade by a continuous foundation wall at a height of 2'-3', and some even taller given the topography of the lot.
  - 2. Property covenants require new construction to be 2'-6" above grade.
  - 3. The proposed foundation is designed using solid brick veneer over concrete block, at a height 3' 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. Side gabled roofs are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
- 3. The proposed roof is an end gable.

3, III

## **III.** Façade Elements:

The guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.

- A. The use of casement windows is a design element found in the Historic Districts.
- B. The use of double French doors with ¾ glass and recessed panels below is a design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
- C. The use of wood chamfered columns is found throughout the districts.

## 3, IV

## IV. Materials and Ornamentation:

- A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
  - 1. There are number of wood frame 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 upon nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
  - 1. Examples of historic ornamentation include wood chamfered posts, batten-type shutters, and casement windows.
  - 2. The use of casement windows and stucco exterior is reminiscent of early French Creole residences once found in Mobile.
  - 3. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

<u>Support</u>: Ms. Susan Milling, applicant, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no discussion regarding this application.

## FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved to accept the staff comments as Findings of Fact and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Dennis Carlisle seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**004-03/04 – CA** 126 Houston Street **Applicant:** Mary Gayle Connor

**Received:** 10/06/03 **Meeting Date (s):** 

**Submission Date** + **45 Days**: 11/20/03 1) 10/20/03 2) 3)

## **INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way Historic District

**Classification:** Contributing

**Zoning:** R-1, Single Family Residential

Additional Permits Required: (5) Building, Electrical, Mechanical, HVAC, Plumbing

<u>Nature of Project:</u> Extensive repair to residence from fire damage. Reconstruction of rear wing as per submitted

plans.

The building is sited on the northwest corner of Houston and Clearmont Streets. The owners plan to reconstruct the rear wing, incorporating the same interior spaces and functions under one single roof line. New windows, siding, exposed outriggers, soffit, fascia and cornice to match original. The reconstruction of the rear will not exceed the existing building footprint.

**Current Conditions:** The rear and attic of the residence suffered extensive fire damage. The rear was a series of additions, along with a wrap-around deck. A well-constructed 6' high wooden privacy fence conceals the rear of the property from the street.

## APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

<b>Sections</b>	<u>Topic</u>	Description of Work
3	Exterior Materials and Finishes	Repair/Replace wood siding
3	Windows	Repair/Replace wood windows
3	Roofs	Repair/Replace roof structure and
		with new to match original

## 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..."

#### **Exterior Materials and Finishes**

- A. The Guidelines state that "The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period..."
  - 1. The subject residence is a contributing structure within the district.
  - 2. The subject residence is an excellent and important example of the Neo-Classical Bungalow.
- B. The Guidelines state that "Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material."
  - 1. The façade of the subject residence is painted wood lap siding.
  - 2. The replacement material will match the original in profile, dimension and material.

#### Windows

- C. The 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.
  - 1. The existing wood windows are multi-pane casement and multi-pane top over single pane bottom double sash.
  - 2. The existing windows will be repaired as necessary.
  - 3. The new windows will match the existing in profile, materials and dimension.

#### Roofs

- D. The Guidelines state that "A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building."
  - 1. The existing end gable roof with deep overhang supported by decorative outriggers is an important and character-defining feature of the subject structure.
  - 2. The new roof will match the original in pitch, dimension and materials..

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

<u>Support</u>: Ms. Mary Gayle Connor and her son Billy, applicants, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no board discussion with regard to this application.

## FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Barr moved to accept the staff comments as Findings of Fact and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**005-03/04 – CA Applicant:**451 Dauphin Street
Paul Christopher

## INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District

Classification: Contributing

**Zoning:** B-4, General Business **Additional Permits Required:** (1) Building

**Nature of Project:** Extensive repair to existing wood and metal canopy. Possible removal.

The building is sited on the southwest corner of Hamilton and Dauphin Streets. The owner submitted plans for stabilization of the canopy. Under separate cover was sent a letter requesting to remove the canopy and construct a two story balcony at a later date.

3)

The Mobile City Ordinance entitled "Historic Preservation" require that Demolition plans for either character-defining elements or entire structures be submitted with time lines.

**Current Conditions:** The owner was cited under the Minimum Maintenance Ordinance for the deteriorated canopy.

**Additional Information**: The ordinance requires that the Architectural Review Board review all mothball plans.

## APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District Design Guidelines

Sections Topic Description of Work

4,A Rehabilitation/Restoration Guidelines

for Existing Buildings Remove canopy

## 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..."

#### A. High Priority Principles:

- 1. Respect the original character of the building.
  - a. The canopy is an integral part of the building façade and has achieved significance whether original or a later addition.
- 2. Preserve and repair original materials.
  - a. The proposed plans to repair the canopy call for repair and replacement of exiting materials.

Staff recommends that the canopy be retained and repaired as per the submitted plan.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

<u>Support</u>: There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Mr. Nicholas noted that the north or rear elevation also needed painting as it too was not exposed.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Staff explained to the Board that the drawings for stabilization were received under separate cover, prior to the receipt of the letter from the owner requesting to remove the canopy. Staff further explained that the Board was reviewing this application due to the fact that a hazard warning and ticket had been issued to the owner as part of the Minimum Maintenance Ordinance. Staff noted that the canopy was a character-defining feature and no plans for its replacement were submitted. A letter from the owner stating his desire to replace the canopy with a two story balcony is entered into the record.

Under the current Demolition Requirements, the Board may grant permission to demolish only if an acceptable plan for replacement and a time table is provided.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved to accept the Findings of Fact. David Barr seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved to deny the request to remove the canopy based on lack of information about the replacement structure. David Barr seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Bunky Ralph moved to approve the request to repair the canopy as submitted. David Barr seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**006-03/04 – CA Applicant:**118 Macy Place Issam El-Farkh

Received: 10/06/03 Meeting Date (s):

**Submission Date + 45 Days:** 11/20/03 1) 10/20/03 2) 3)

## **INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**<u>Historic District:</u>** Old Dauphin Way Historic District

**Classification:** Contributing **Zoning:** R-1, Single Family **Additional Permits Required:** (1) Building

<u>Nature of Project:</u> Demolish existing one car garage. Construct rear addition, measuring 22' x 28' as per submitted plans.

The building is sited on the west side of the 100 block of Macy Place. The structure is a one story frame bungalow with an end gable roof, smaller cross gable over a projecting bay with a pair of wood windows, and a one bay shed-style front porch supported by two large brick columns. A small eyebrow gable is located mid-way up the roof centered over the front door.

The proposed rear addition extends across the entire rear of the structure and extends past the existing rear wall 22'. The proposed roof is a cross gable matching the pitch of the existing roof. Proposed foundation is brick pier with lattice infill. Siding, corner boards, window and door trim, and all other exterior details to match the original in profile and dimension. Windows to match the existing in size, light configuration, and material.

## APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

<b>Sections</b>	<u>Topic</u>	<b>Description of Work</b>
3	Piers, Foundations and Foundation Infill	Construct addition
3	Exterior Materials and Finishes	
3	Doors and Doorways	
3	Windows	
3	Roof	

## 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**

- A. Piers, Foundations and Foundation Infill: The Guidelines state that "foundation screening should be recessed from the front of the foundation piers."
  - 1. The existing foundation is brick pier with lattice infill.
  - 2. The proposed addition is brick pier with framed lattice infill, matching existing.

- B. Exterior Materials: The Guidelines state that "Replacement...must match the original in profile and dimension and material."
  - 1. The existing exterior sheathing is wood lap siding.
  - 2. The proposed exterior sheathing for the addition is wood lap siding.
- C. The Guidelines state that "Original doors and door openings should be retained along with any mouldings, sidelights and transoms."
  - 1. Proposed plans call for the installation of a pair of new wood 15 light French doors, on the west elevation.
- D. The Guidelines state that "The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building."
  - 1. Windows in the historic residence are predominantly wood 9 -over-1 double hung.
  - 2. Windows in the addition are proposed to match the existing in profile, light configuration, and dimension.
  - 3. Triangular-shaped fixed wood windows are proposed as clerstory-type windows in the new cross gable.
- E. The Guidelines state that "...historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained."
  - 1. The predominant roof form is end gable.
  - 2. The roof for the proposed addition is a cross gable connecting to the main gable.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

<u>Support</u>: Mr.Issam El-Farkh, applicant, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one present in opposition to the application.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Staff advised the Board that a Stop Work Order had been placed on the project by Urban Development because the inspector found that the work being done exceeded the approval issued by the ARB.

## FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Dennis Carlisle moved to accept the staff report as Findings of Fact, and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Douglas Kearley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

007-03/04 - CA201 Tuttle Avenue George Phillips **Applicant:** 

10/06/03 Received: **Meeting Date (s):** 

Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/20/03 1) 10/20/03 2) 3)

## INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Leinkauf Historic District **Historic District:** 

**Classification:** Contributing Zoning: R-1, Single Family Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence

Construct wood picket fence along north and east property line, and at end of driveway as per **Nature of Project:** 

submitted site plan.

The applicant submitted two alternate heights for the Board to consider. Alternate 1 requests a 4' high picket fence. Alternate 2 requests a 3' high picket fence. Fence is to be constructed using 3 1/4" pickets spaced 2" apart. Picket design to be cut at a 45 degree angle at the top.

The proposed fence starts at the northeast corner of the property and runs the width of the east property line a distance of 51'. Also at the northeast corner the fence runs west along the sidewalk a distance of 32', and turns south to run a distance of 30' along a 10' green space adjacent to a 10' driveway. The fence turns after the 30' run and dies into an existing deck.

#### **Additional Information:**

This fence was begun without a Certificate of Appropriateness or a Fence Permit. A Stop Work Order was issued September 25, 2003. Currently the center 4"x4" posts are set.

The applicant has claimed that a representative from UDD has stated that the construction of a 4' high picket fence at this location would be acceptable. However, this should be confirmed prior to the issuance of a building permit.

## APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

**Topic Description of Work Sections** Fences. Walls and Gates Construct Picket Fence

## 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

- A. The 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 residence is a one story wood frame residence with a 3 bay front porch and hipped roof.
  - 2. The proposed fence is wood picket designed to compliment the residence.

Staff recommends approval with conditions:

That the fence be constructed at 3' in height to comply with the Zoning Ordinance.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Support: There was no one present to speak in favor of the application.

Mrs. Kim Wilson of 1511 Church Street,, appeared before the Review Board in opposition to the application. Mrs. Wilson was concerned about the height of the fence obstructing her windows along the west property line.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board noted that a 3' high wood picket fence was in keeping with the Design Review Guidelines. In consultation with UDD staff Frank Palombo, a determination was made that unless the picket was considerably smaller than the spacing, then anything over 3' constituted a line-of-site hazard.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved to accept the staff comments as Findings of Fact. Jim Waggoner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a 3' high wood picket fence, constructed of 3 \(^1/4\) wood slats spaced 2" apart. Fence to remain unpainted to weather. Jim Wagoner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**008-03/04 – CA 302 Congress Street Applicant:**Decora Smith

Received: 10/06/03 Meeting Date (s):

**Submission Date** + **45 Days**: 11/20/03 1) 10/20/03 2) 3)

## INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

<u>Historic District:</u> DeTonti Square Historic District <u>Classification:</u> Non-Contributing (new construction)

**Zoning:** RB, Residential Business

Additional Permits Required: (5) Building, Electrical, Mechanical, HVAC, Plumbing

**Nature of Project:** Construction of a 2 story masonry and frame structure as per submitted plans.

The building is sited on the north side of Congress Street. The lot measures approximately 40' wide by 112' deep. The main residence is directly on the sidewalk facing Congress Street. The building measures approximately 22' deep x 30' wide with a 2 car carport/storage area. The proposed building is a 2 story structure, first story concrete block with stucco veneer, the second story frame with stucco veneer. The ground plan is rectangular in design. The foundation is slab on grade. The first floor measures 9'-6" in height, the second floor measures 8'-6" in height. The proposed roof is an end gable. The height from ground to ridge is approximately 28'. Windows are wood casements. Garage doors are raised panel metal. Garage door openings are arched with a keystone to coordinate with the design of the main façade of the residence. An exaggerated belt course between the first and second floors also is designed to replicate a design element on the front elevation of the residence.

## **History of the Project:**

Contractors representing the owners requested a Certificate of Appropriateness to repair rotten wood on an existing two story garage. Days later ARB staff began receiving complaints about a new structure being constructed on the subject property. Urban Development was dispatched and issued a Stop Work Order for exceeding the scope of work permitted. At some point during the early stages of the project, Urban Development responded to requests for inspections and dispatched inspectors to inspect footings prior to concrete being poured, as well as a new slab.

Urban Development has no explanation how unpermitted work was allowed to be inspected.

Staff has worked with the owner/applicant to submit an appropriate and complete set of plans for review. However, the Board may have questions for the applicant and may feel the need to request further information.

## **Current Conditions:**

Prior to work being stopped, the first floor of the structure was constructed using concrete blocks. The second floor framing system was installed, and metal garage doors were installed on the two garage bays. Framing of the second floor wall system was begun. At that point the Stop Work Order was issued.

## **Additional Information:**

As this property is zoned R-B, there are no setback restrictions, no lot coverage issues, and no use restrictions other than those imposed by R-B zoning.

Due to the size and use of this structure, this application is being reviewed under the Design Review Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation slab on grade
- b. façade true stucco over concrete block on first floor true stucco over frame on second floor
- c. doors garage doors metal raised panel entry doors wood six panel
- d. windows -wood casement,
- e. roof-fiberglass to match existing on residence

## APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Guidelines for New Commercial and Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts

<u>Topic</u>	Description of Work	
Design Standards for New Construction	Construct new garage apartment	3,I
cement and Orientation		
Massing and Scale		
Façade Elements		
Materials and Ornamentation		
ppropriate Materials for New Residential Cons	struction	
	Design Standards for New Construction cement and Orientation  Massing and Scale Façade Elements  Materials and Ornamentation	Design Standards for New Construction  cement and Orientation  Massing and Scale  Façade Elements  Construct new garage apartment  Construct new garage apartment

## **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

#### **3.I**

- **I. Placement and Orientation**: The guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
  - A. Setbacks in DeTonti Square range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with a 5'-15' setback.
  - B. This is a lot in the middle of the block in the heart of the neighborhood.
  - C. The proposed setbacks for this building are as follows:

Rear lot line – 5'

East lot line -5'.

West lot line – 5'

Distance from main residence to garage – 15'

#### **3.II**

## I. Massing and Scale:

A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.

- 1. 3 bay facades are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
- 2. 1, 1 ½ and 2 story wood frame structures and masonry structures with stucco exteriors are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
- 3. The proposed building is a 2 story structure constructed with a combination of concrete block with true stucco veneer on the first floor and wood frame with true stucco veneer on the second floor.
- B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
  - 1. The proposed foundation is slab on grade to accommodate its use as a garage on the first floor
- 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 Side gabled roofs are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
  - 3 The proposed roof is an end gable.

## 3, III

## **III.** Façade Elements:

The guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.

- A. The use casement windows is a design element found in the Historic Districts.
- B. The use of arched wood doors is not uncommon in the districts.
- C. The use of paneled metal doors on garages is allowable.

## 3, IV

## IV. Materials and Ornamentation:

- A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
  - 1. There are number of wood frame 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 upon nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
  - 1. Examples of historic ornamentation include arched garage bays and casement windows...
  - 2. The use of casement windows and stucco exterior is reminiscent of early French Creole residences once found in Mobile.
  - 3. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

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

The Board noted that several details were missing from the application, including soffit, fascia and eave details, and end gable design and materials

# FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved to deny the application as submitted due to lack of information. Karen Carr seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**009-03/04 – CA** 166 Government Street

**Applicant:** Steve Olen

**Received:** 10/06/03 **Meeting Date (s):** 

**Submission Date** + **45 Days**: 11/20/03 1) 10/20/03 2) 3)

## INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

**<u>Historic District:</u>** Church Street East Historic District

**<u>Classification:</u>** Contributing

**Zoning:** B-4, General Business **Additional Permits Required:** (1) Building

**Nature of Project:** Paint west side of historic brick structure to match painted brick front.

**Current Conditions**: Historically, the west wall of this structure has been concealed from public view by the YMCA

building. Since this building was demolished, the entire west elevation is now visible. Sections

of the brick wall have been patched over time with different types and colors of bricks.

## APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

SectionsTopicDescription of Work3Exterior Materials and FinishesPaint unpainted brick

## 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**

- F. Exterior Materials: The Guidelines state that "Painting of unpainted brick is inappropriate in most cases."
  - 1. The elevation in question has been obscured from public view for over 100 years.
  - 2. Due to the demolition of the historic YMCA building, the elevation in question is highly visible.
  - 3. Painting the brick wall to match the front would conceal the areas of patching and repair to the elevation.
  - 4. Due to the unusual circumstances and the unexpected exposure of this elevation, painting of unpainted brick could be considered appropriate.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Support: Mr. Steve Nicholas, applicant, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions.

There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Mr. Nicholas noted that the north or rear elevation also needed painting as it too was not exposed.

There was no board discussion regarding this matter.

# FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved to accept the Findings of Fact, with the amended request to paint the north/rear elevation in addition to the west elevation, and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Douglas Kearley seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**010-03/04 – CA** 1458 Church Street **Applicant:** Loyd A. Marston

**Received:** 10/06/03 **Meeting Date (s):** 

**Submission Date** + **45 Days**: 11/20/03 1) 10/20/03 2) 3)

## INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

**<u>Historic District:</u>** Leinkauf Historic District

<u>Classification:</u> Non-Contributing

**Zoning:** R-1, Single Family Residential

Additional Permits Required: (1) Demolition

**Nature of Project:** Demolish non-contributing and non-historic deteriorated structure.

**<u>Current Conditions</u>**: This building has been cited by Urban Development under the Unsafe Building Act. The subject

building was associated with 1459 Government Street, an early 20<sup>th</sup>-Century two story residence damaged by fire. After the fire, the owners of the property, Eastern Savings Bank of Maryland, decided to demolish the property rather than mothball it. They combined this parcel with the

corner lot, and are now marketing it for commercial use.

A copy of the *Notice to Remedy Unsafe Structure* is attached for your review.

## APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Mobile City Ordinance - Chapter 44 - "Historic Preservation"

SectionsTopicDescription of Work10Demolition/RelocationDemolish deteriorated

structure

## **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 10, DEMOLITION/RELOCATION, states the following: "The Board shall not grant Certificates of Appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district..."

#### STAFF REPORT

- A. Based on the Ordinance, the Facts are as follows:
  - 1. The structure is non-contributing.
  - 2. The structure is in a deteriorated state.
  - 3. The structure has been declared a nuisance by the City of Mobile's Urban Development Department.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

<u>Support</u>: Mr. Loyd Marston, applicant, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

There was no board discussion regarding this matter.

# FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved to accept the Findings of Fact, and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. David Barr seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**011-03/04 – CA** 60 Bradford Avenue **Applicant:** Andrea Ghersi

**Received:** 10/06/03 **Meeting Date (s):** 

**Submission Date** + **45 Days**: 11/20/03 1) 10/20/03 2) 3)

## INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

**<u>Historic District:</u>** Old Dauphin Way Historic District

**Classification:** Contributing

**Zoning:** R-1, Single Family Residential

Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence

**Nature of Project:** Construct 6' and 3' wood fencing as per submitted application.

Construct 3' solid wood dog-eared privacy fence, beginning at the sidewalk, the northeast corner of the property, and running 25' west. At that point, begin 6' wood dog-eared privacy fence running fifty feet and connecting to existing 6' wood privacy fence, as per submitted site plan.

#### APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

SectionsTopicDescription of Work3Fences, Walls and GatesConstruct 3' and 6'<br/>wood privacy fence

## 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**

- A. The 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 residence is a one story wood frame residence.
  - 2. The proposed fence is a 25' section of 3' privacy fencing
  - 3. The proposed fencing is a 50' section of 6' privacy fencing.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

# **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

<u>Support</u>: There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. A letter, received via hand delivery to the MHDC office, from the resident of 58 Bradford Avenue, Pastor William Sizemore, was entered into the public record

The Board discussed the contents of the letter with regard to ingress and egress of an adjoining driveway, and the issue of the adjoining property's roof draining onto the drive. The Board noted that these issues were not relevant in terms of the Board's mission.

# FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Dennis Carlisle moved to accept the Findings of Fact, and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**012-03/04 – CA** 1358 Dauphin Street

Applicant:Wrico Signs, contractor/James E. Loris, Jr., ownerReceived:10/06/03Meeting Date (s):

**Submission Date** + **45 Days**: 11/20/03 1) 10/20/03 2) 3)

## INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way Historic District

**Classification:** Non-Contributing

**Zoning:** R-1, Single Family Residential but grandfathered in as a commercial parcel

Additional Permits Required: (1) Sign

**Nature of Project:** Install double-sided pole sign, measuring 5' wide by 3'-4" tall, mounted between 4"x4" posts, at a point a 2' above the ground, as per submitted design. Sign to be double faces, 2" thick redwood,

a point a 2" above the ground, as per submitted design. Sign to be double faces, 2" thick redwood,

sandblasted and painted to match green and white colors on building.

# APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

Topic	Description of Work
Mounting & Placement	Install Pole Sign
Design	
Size	
Materials	
	Mounting & Placement Design Size

#### 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 COMMENTS**

- A. The Guidelines state that "the height of freestanding signs generally shall not be higher than 8 feet."
  - 1. The proposed sign is 5'-4" in height
- B. The Guidelines state that "For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors."
  - 1. The subject building is a non-descript modern red brick structure.
  - 2. The sign colors are taken from the trim and accent colors of the building.
- C. The Guidelines state that "The total allowable square footage for the display area of...pole signs is 40 square feet."
  - 1. The proposed signage measures 40 square feet.
- D. The Guidelines state that "The structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building. Wood, metal, stucco, stone or brick is allowed."
  - 1. The proposed sign material is painted redwood.

Staff Recommends approval of the application as submitted.

# **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

<u>Support</u>: Mr. James Loris, applicant, and Wade Wright, sign contractor, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

The Board asked if the sign was to be lighted. The applicant stated that that decision had not been determined. The Board noted that if the sign was to be light, the applicant should confer with ARB staff prior to installing lighting.

# FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved to accept the Findings of Fact, and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Jim Wagoner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**013-03/04 – CA** 114 North Lafayette Street

**Applicant:** J.M. Clark

**Received:** 10/06/03 **Meeting Date (s):** 

**Submission Date** + **45 Days**: 11/20/03 1) 10/20/03 2) 3)

# **INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

<u>Historic District:</u> Old Dauphin Way Historic District
<u>Classification:</u> Non-Contributing (modern construction)

**Zoning:** R-1, Single Family Residential

Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence

**Nature of Project:** Install cedar fencing and vinyl fencing as per submitted site plan.

This project is divided into six phases addressing specific fencing materials and heights at each phase. Please refer to illustrations for clarification of location and direction.

Phase I – Construct 8' high solid cedar privacy fence along north property line. At a point 40' from the northwest corner of the lot construct an 8' high cedar fence. – beginning at the north wall of the residence, running north to the property line, then turning east and running a distance of 92 feet, to a point where the lot takes a 90 degree turn north.

Phase II – Along the west property line, at a point approximately 132' from North Lafayette Street, construct an 8' high solid cedar privacy fence running a distance of approximately 72', behind two pieces of commercial property facing North Lafayette Street.

Phase III – Along north property line, construct an 8' high solid cedar privacy fence running approximately 60'.

Phase IV – At a pint approximately 191' from the northeast corner of North Lafayette and Campbell Streets, install a 6' high solid vinyl fence beginning at a point 25' from the sidewalk and running approximately 154' to intersect with the 8' high solid cedar privacy fence, there the 8' high solid cedar privacy fence takes a 90 degree turn.

Phase V-At a point 45' from the northeast corner of North Lafayette and Campbell Streets, install a 4' high reverse arch vinyl picket fence. Fence to begin at a corner of the house, run approximately 14.7' south to the sidewalk, then turn east and run approximately 146' to the southeast property line, then turn north and run 25' and tie into 6' high solid vinyl privacy fence.

Phase IV – Install 3' high vinyl picket fence around perimeter of front yard. Beginning at a point on the north property line 40' from the sidewalk, then running west to the sidewalk, along North Lafayette Street, then turn south and run approximately 75' to the northeast corner of North Lafayette and Campbell Streets, then turn east and run 45' to tie into 4' high reverse arch vinyl fencing.

The applicant has stated his desire to used vinyl/pvc fencing is due to the water ponding at the location on the lot where the fencing is to be placed. The applicant is concerned about maintenance and upkeep of a wood fence in standing water. In addition, the applicant has provided examples of locations within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District where vinyl/pvc materials have been used for porch details and fencing. It should be noted that in no case was the material or design approved by the Review Board.

# APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

SectionsTopicDescription of Work3Fences, Walls and GatesConstruct 3' and 6'<br/>wooden fencing

## **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

- A. The 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 residence is a non-contributing, one story brick veneer ranch-style house.
  - 2. The proposed fencing types are:
    - a. 8' high cedar solid privacy fence
    - b. 6' high solid vinyl privacy fence
    - c. 4' high reverse arch vinyl picket fence
    - d. 3' high straight top vinyl picket fence.
- B. The Guidelines state that "The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to 6'. However, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an 8' high fence may be considered."
  - 1. The subject property is adjoined by properties with commercial uses/zoning on the north and northwest property lines, where 8' high fencing is requested.
  - 2. 3' high picket fencing is allowed by zoning code for placement along the sidewalk. 4' high picket fencing is approved at the discretion of the Urban Development staff.
- C. The Guidelines provide a list of appropriate and inappropriate materials for fencing.
  - 1. Wood is an appropriate material for fencing in historic districts
  - 2. Vinyl, or pvc, is an inappropriate material for fencing in historic districts.

Staff recommends approval of the application with the following conditions:

Should the applicant wish to install a 6' fence to separate the lot, but is concerned with water ponding and rotting of the fence bottom, then a snake board or some other sacrificial design element on a wooden fence should be considered.

A wood picket fence would be an appropriate material according to the guidelines.

Fencing around the property should be consistent. 3' high picket fences are most appropriate in terms of height and scale for sidewalk/perimeter fencing.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

<u>Support</u>: Mr. J.M. Clark, applicant, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Mr. Clark explained his six phase plan to fence the subject property. He stated that where he was requesting the 6' high vinyl/pvc fencing, there was a problem with water standing after rains. Mr. Clark's concern was that a wood fence would rot after a short period of time.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board noted that according to the Design Review Guidelines, vinyl/pvc fencing was not appropriate for use in the historic districts

# FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved to accept the Findings of Fact, as they related to phases 1-3, and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for phases 1-4. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Dennis Carlisle moved to deny the request to install vinyl fencing as outlined in phases 4-6. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion. A vote was called. Dennis Carlisle, Bunky Ralph, Karen Carr, David Barr, Jim Wagoner and Cindy Klotz voted to deny the application. Douglas Kearley voted against denying the application.

**014-03/04 – CA** 258 Marine Street (Gothic House Number 1)

**Applicant:** Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund/Douglas Kearley, Architect

**Received:** 7/30/03 **Meeting Date (s):** 

**Submission Date** + **45 Days**: 9/14/03 1) 10/20/03 2) 3)

## INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden Historic District

**Classification:** Non-Contributing (vacant lot/new construction)

Additional Permits Required: (5) Building, Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing, HVAC

**Conflicts of Interest:** Board Member Douglas Kearley left the meeting prior to the discussion of this agenda item.

**Nature of Project:** Construct a 1300 square foot, wood frame, single story residence on raised

concrete slab. Site variance will be required.

The building site is located on the west side of the 250 block of Marine Street between Charleston and Augusta Streets. The lot measures 49.43' at the front and 52.22' at the rear; lot depth is 102.88'. The building measures approximately 30' wide by 48' long, with a 6' deep by 14' wide front porch. The front porch is located at a distance of 9' from the sidewalk. The front wall of the main house is located at a distance of 15' from the sidewalk. The main façade faces Marine Street. The proposed construction is of a 1 story wood frame, vertical board & batten, Gothic-Revival style residence. The ground plan is rectangular in design with a small rear ell. Porches include a projecting front porch and a shed-roofed rear porch. The proposed building has a 4' finished floor height above grade, and a first floor finished floor height of  $9' - 4\frac{1}{2}$ ". Overall ground to ridge height is 32'. The proposed roof is an end gable with a steeply-pitched cross gable on center of the front porch, a shed roof over the front porch, a cross gable at the rear ell and a shed roof over the rear porch. The proposed pitch of the main roof is 10/12. The proposed pitch of the gable over the front porch is 24/12. The proposed pitch of the shed roofs at the front and rear is 4/12. Proposed roofing material is GAF "Slateline" asphalt/fiberglass shingles, color Slate Gray.

Additional Information: The new construction proposed for 258 Marine Street is a modern interpretation of the Gothic Revival style promoted by mid-19th century architect A. J. Downing. There are several examples of this style of architecture remaining in Mobile's Historic Districts, including the Macy House (1867-68) located at 1569 Dauphin Street, and the Kimball House (ca. 1869-70) located at 1161 Old Shell Road.

In order to proceed with construction scheduling, after consultation with Board Attorney Wanda Cochran and Review Board Chair Cindy Klotz, staff issued a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow construction of the foundation and footings. The applicants submitted signed affidavits to both the Board of Zoning Adjustment and the Architectural Review Board agreeing to comply with the

Boards' findings even if altering the previously-constructed foundations and footings was required.

Typically the Board requires new construction to be in line with adjacent historic structures in order to maintain the existing streetscape. Due to Urban Development setback regulations, the required front setback for new construction is mandatory 25°. The applicants' request for a variance from this requirement will be heard at the November 4, 2003 meeting. UDD staff has recommended approval of the request.

**Additional Approvals:** The Board of Zoning Adjustment will consider the request of the owners to construct the new residence in line with existing historic structures on the street at the November 4, 2004 meeting.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation
  - front porch brick pier with framed cutwork infill main residence scored stucco-covered concrete block
- b. façade –hardiplank board & batten vertical siding
- c. doors wood & glass
- d. windows wood casement, wood fixed
- e. porch details –

front porch: Built-up wood columns with diamond-shaped decorative elements, traditional handrail with ½ wood square pickets

rear porch: Chamfered wood columns, horizontal wood railing

f. roof – architectural grade shingles

# <u>APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT</u> Guidelines for New Commercial and Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts

<b>Sections</b>	<u>Topic</u>	<b>Description of Work</b>
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	on

## **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**

## **3,I**

- I Placement and Orientation: The guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
  - A. Setbacks in the Oakleigh Garden District range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with a 5'-15' setback.
  - B. The proposed building site is located in the middle of the block, one block west of the eastern boundary of the neighborhood.
  - C. The proposed front setback for this building is 9' from the sidewalk/property line; the proposed side setback for this building is 10' on the south, and 9.43' on the north.

## **3,II**

# II. Massing and Scale:

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
  - 1. 3 bay facades are common in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
  - 2. 1, 1 ½ and 2 story wood frame structures are common in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
  - 3. The proposed building is a 1 story wood frame 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 Oakleigh Garden 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 brick piers with framed wood lattice infill for the front porch, and scored stucco-covered concrete block for the main residence, at a height 4' 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 Oakleigh Garden Historic District, but the most common are simple end gables and hips.
  - 2. Side gabled roofs are common in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

#### 3. III

## **III.** Facade Elements:

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.
  - 1. The use of wood casement windows is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
  - 2. The use of a single wood four-panel door with solid wood bottom panels and glass top panels, and triple light transom above, is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
  - 3. The use of a steeply-pitched front gable, decorative wood drip moulds above the windows, built-up decorative columns, and casement windows defines a Gothic-Revival style structure.

#### IV. **Materials and Ornamentation:**

- A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
  - 1. There are number of wood frame structures remaining in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
- B. The guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
  - 1. Examples of historic ornamentation include use of a steeply-pitched front gable, decorative wood drip moulds above the windows, built-up decorative columns, and casement windows.
  - 2. The proposed design utilizes a simple transom over the single entry door and triple-hung windows. The classically-detailed dormers on the roof break up the massing of the end gabled roof.
  - 3. The use of vertical board & batten hardiplank siding is a modern interpretation of a traditional building material.
  - 4. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

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

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no board discussion regarding this matter.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Barr moved to accept the Findings of Fact, and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Dennis Carlisle seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**015-03/04 – CA** 259 Marine Street (Gothic House Number 3)

**Applicant:** Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund/Douglas Kearley, Architect

**Received:** 7/30/03 **Meeting Date (s):** 

**Submission Date** + **45 Days**: 9/14/03 1) 10/20/03 2) 3)

# INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

**<u>Historic District:</u>** Oakleigh Garden Historic District

**Classification:** Non-Contributing (vacant lot/new construction)

Additional Permits Required: (5) Building, Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing, HVAC

**Conflicts of Interest:** Board Member Douglas Kearley left the meeting prior to the discussion of this agenda item.

**Nature of Project:** Construct a 1500 square foot, wood frame, 1 ½ story residence on raised concrete

slab.

The building site is located on the east side of the 250 block of Marine Street between Charleston and Augusta Streets. The lot measures 57.33' wide, and is 130.0' deep. The building measures approximately 28' wide by 28' long, with front and rear porches measuring 8' deep by 24' wide. The front porch is located at a distance of 17' from the sidewalk. The front wall of the main house is located at a distance of 25' from the sidewalk. The main façade faces Marine Street. The proposed construction is a 1 ½ story wood frame, sheathed in hardiplank vertical board & batten, Gothic-Revival style residence. The proposed foundation is of split-faced concrete block covered with an elastomeric coating, with a beveled edge block water table. The ground plan is square in design with shed-roofed front and rear porches. The proposed building has a 2'-8" finished floor height above grade, and a first floor finished floor height of 10' - 4". Overall ground to ridge height is 34'. The proposed roof plan is a double cross-gable (gable on every elevation). The proposed pitch of the main roof is 12/15. The proposed pitch of the shed roofs at the front and rear is 5/12. Proposed roofing material is GAF "Slateline" asphalt/fiberglass shingles, color Slate Gray.

Additional Information: The new construction proposed for 259 Marine Street is a modern interpretation of the Gothic Revival style promoted by mid-19<sup>th</sup> century architect A. J. Downing. There are several examples of this style of architecture remaining in Mobile's Historic Districts, including the Macy House (1867-68) located at 1569 Dauphin Street, and the Kimball House (ca. 1869-70) located at 1161 Old Shell Road.

In order to proceed with construction scheduling, after consultation with Board Attorney Wanda Cochran and Review Board Chair Cindy Klotz, staff issued a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow construction of the foundation and footings. The applicants submitted signed affidavits to both the Board of Zoning Adjustment and the Architectural Review Board agreeing to comply with the Boards' findings even if altering the previously-constructed foundations and footings were required.

Typically the Board requires new construction to be in line with adjacent historic structures in order to maintain the existing streetscape. Due to Urban Development setback regulations, the required front setback for new construction is mandatory 25'. The applicants' request for a variance from this requirement will be heard at the November 4, 2003 meeting. UDD staff has recommended approval of the request.

# **Additional Approvals:**

The Board of Zoning Adjustment will consider the request of the owners to construct the new residence in line with existing historic structures on the street at the November 4, 2004 meeting.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation split-faced concrete block covered with elastomeric coating, with beveled concrete block water table
- b. façade –hardiplank board & batten vertical siding
- c. doors wood & glass
- d. windows wood double hung, wood fixed
- e. porch details –

front porch: chamfered 8x8 posts, open work brackets cut from 2x12s, traditional handrail with ½ wood square pickets,

rear porch: chamfered wood columns, traditional handrail with ½ wood square pickets

f. roof – architectural grade shingles

# <u>APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT</u> Guidelines for New Commercial and Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts

<b>Sections</b>	<u>Topic</u>	Description of Work
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 Construct	ion

## **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**

**3.I** 

- **I. Placement and Orientation**: The guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
  - A. Setbacks in the Oakleigh Garden District range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with a 5'-15' setback.

- B. The proposed building site is located in the middle of the block, one block west of the eastern boundary of the neighborhood.
- C. The proposed front setback for this building is 17' from the sidewalk/property line; the proposed side setback for this building is 10' on the south, and 19.4' on the north.

**3,II** 

# II. Massing and Scale:

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
  - 1. 1, 1 ½ and 2 story wood frame structures are common in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
  - 2. The proposed building is a  $1 \frac{1}{2}$  story wood frame 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 Oakleigh Garden 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 brick piers with framed wood lattice infill for the front porch, and scored stucco-covered concrete block for the main residence, at a height 4' 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 Oakleigh Garden Historic District, but the most common are simple end gables and hips.
  - 2. Side gabled roofs are common in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

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 double-hung windows is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
  - 2. The use of a single wood four-panel door with solid wood bottom panels and glass top panels, and triple light transom above, is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
  - 3. The use of a steeply-pitched gable, decorative wood drip moulds above the windows, built-up decorative columns, and casement windows defines a Gothic-Revival style 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 wood frame structures remaining in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

- B. The guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found on nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
  - 1. Examples of historic ornamentation include use of a steeply-pitched front gable, decorative wood drip moulds above the windows, built-up decorative columns, and casement windows.
  - 2. The proposed design utilizes a simple transom over the single entry door and triple-hung windows. The classically-detailed dormers on the roof break up the massing of the end gabled roof.
  - 3. The use of vertical board & batten hardiplank siding is a modern interpretation of a traditional building material.
  - 4. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

<u>Support</u>: There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no board discussion regarding this matter.

## FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Barr moved to accept the Findings of Fact, and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Dennis Carlisle seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.