

**MOBILE HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

Minutes of the Meeting

November 10, 2003

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Cindy Klotz called the Architectural Review Board meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

Ed Hooker called the role as follows:

Present: Douglas Kearley, Bunky Ralph, Dan McCleave, Cindy Klotz, Robert Brown, David Barr, Mark Davis, Harris Oswalt

Absent: Nick Holmes, III, Jackie McCracken, Bill Christian, Karen Carr, Dennis Carlisle, Jim Wagoner

A quorum was declared after the roll call.

Staff Present: Ed Hooker, Anne Crutcher, Wanda Cochran

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
John Szteuter (CSM)	304 Little Flower Ave. 36606	018-03/04-CA
Bettye Smith	302 Congress St. 36603	008-03/04-CA
Emanuel Gazzier	153 S. Monterey St. 36604	017-03/04-CA
Gregory L. Dickinson	251 Government St. 36602	046-02/03-CA

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES - October 20, 2003 meeting

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the minutes as mailed. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

APPROVAL OF THE MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

Douglas Kearley moved to approve mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Franklin Lewis Golsan
Property Address: 15 Hannon Avenue
Date of Approval: October 7, 2003 jss
Work Approved: Repair or replace missing bricks on front porch to match existing in profile and dimension. Repair or replace rotten wood on trim to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint trim white to match existing.

2. Applicant's Name: Thomas Roofing
Property Address: 354 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: October 7, 2003 jss
Work Approved: Rework and properly flash the east side parapet wall.
This will include:
 1. Removal of the existing shingles and excess mastic
 2. Installation of new metal side wall flashing

3. New shingles properly worked back to the side wall flashing
4. Modified bitumen membrane over the metal and adhered up and over the parapet wall
5. New aluminum coping with and oversized drip edge on top of the wall
6. Rework gutter laps on the front of the building and fix a gutter strap

3. Applicant's Name: Cecilia Murphy
 Property Address: 1112 Selma Street
 Date of Approval: October 10, 2003 weh
 Work Approved: Construct storage building per ARB stock plans. Building to measure 10' x 18', with a hipped roof matching the pitch of the existing residence. All corner boards, soffit, fascia, eaves, etc. to match that of the main residence. Paint to match main residence.
 Install stained concrete drive off existing alley as per submitted site plan. Drive to measure 12' wide by 35' long
4. Applicant's Name: Liberty Roofing
 Property Address: 1650 Dauphin Street
 Date of Approval: October 10, 2003 weh
 Work Approved: Re-roof building with dimensional shingles, weathered wood in color.
5. Applicant's Name: Ralph Reynolds Roofing
 Property Address: 115 S. Conception Street
 Date of Approval: October 14, 2003 asc
 Work Approved: Replace existing gutter with new copper gutter.
6. Applicant's Name: Eugene Caldwell
 Property Address: 911 Selma Street
 Date of Approval: October 14, 2003 weh
 Work Approved: Replace deteriorated siding with new material matching existing in profile and dimension. Replace deteriorated window trim with materials matching existing in profile and dimension.
7. Applicant's Name: Jim Mitchell/Sign-O-Rama
 Property Address: 151 Dauphin Street
 Date of Approval: October 14, 2003 weh
 Work Approved: Install one 4' x 5 ½ wood sign, white sign with black lettering and black border, above awning facing Dauphin Street, as per submitted design.

8. Applicant's Name: Gary Allen Construction Company
Property Address: 960 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: October 15, 2003 jdb
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood on columns, railings and siding with new wood to match existing in profile and dimension.
Paint to match existing color scheme.
9. Applicant's Name: Nancy Whitten
Property Address: 62 Semmes Avenue
Date of Approval: October 16, 2003 weh
Work Approved: Remove metal awnings and open up screened in front porch. Sand, prime and paint to match existing color scheme.
10. Applicant's Name: Eva Haustien
Property Address: 11 S. Lafayette St.
Date of Approval: October 20, 2003 jss
Work Approved: Repaint house white, per existing, body and trim. Replace rotten wood as necessary, repair bad screens.
11. Applicant's Name: Laurie Benjamin
Property Address: 115 Providence Street
Date of Approval: January 6, 2004 weh
Work Approved: Install hanging 12"x24" white wooden sign on front porch as per submitted plans.
12. Applicant's Name: Tom Roux/Chuck Weems, contractor
Property Address: 124 Ryan Avenue
Date of Approval: October 21, 2003 asc
Work Approved: Repair and replace rotten siding, matching original in profile, dimension and materials. Paint to match existing.
13. Applicant's Name: Latonya Construction Company
Property Address: 1802 New Hamilton Street
Date of Approval: October 21, 2003 weh
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood on porch and fascia with new wood matching existing wood in profile and dimension. Paint in the following Sherwin Williams Color Scheme:
Body: Roycroft Brass SW 2843
Trim: Roycroft Vellum SW 2833
Accent: Roycroft Copper Red SW 2839

14. Applicant's Name: Phillip Holley
Property Address: 1214 Selma Street
Date of Approval: October 21, 2003 weh
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood decking with new wood to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint to match existing color scheme.
15. Applicant's Name: Emanuel Gazzier
Property Address: 153 South Monterey Street
Date of Approval: October 21, 2003 weh
Work Approved: Repair or replace deteriorated wood siding with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repaint in existing color scheme:
Body – Springhill Brown
Trim – DeTonti Square Off White
Door and Front Steps – Bellingrath Green
16. Applicant's Name: Patricia Walters
Property Address: 116 Macy Place
Date of Approval: October 27, 2003 asc
Work Approved: Repaint house white
17. Applicant's Name: J.C. Duke Construction/ Montauk Arms Apartments
Property Address: 1114 Montauk Avenue
Date of Approval: October 24, 2003
Work Approved: Reconstruct roof system destroyed by fire. New roof to match original in profile and dimension. Re-roof with materials to match existing. Clean brick to remove smoke damage. Repaint woodwork to match existing.
18. Applicant's Name: Taco Bell
Property Address: 1115 Government Street
Date of Approval: October 24, 2003 asc
Work Approved: Repair flood lights that illuminate monument sign at front of property. Flood lights to match existing.
19. Applicant's Name: Bill Christian
Property Address: 510 Monroe St.
Date of Approval: October 24, 2003 asc
Work Approved: Repair to rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing to include, siding, eaves, entrance stairs. Paint exterior in the existing color scheme

OLD BUSINESS:

1. 046-02/03-CA 251 Government Street
Applicant: Radisson/Admiral Semmes Hotel
Nature of Request: Replace existing signage with new corporate logo signage as per submitted plans.
2. 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.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. 016-03/04-CA 256 North Conception Street
Applicant: Joe Kulakowski
Nature of Request: Reconstruct front porch, repair/replace deteriorated wood columns; install railing on second floor porch, all as per submitted plans. Construct 8' wall around the property as per submitted plans.
2. 017-03/04-CA 153 South Monterey Street
Applicant: Emanuel Gazzier
Nature of Request: Remove existing wood siding and install hardiplank as per submitted photographs.
3. 018-03/04-CA 1562 Luling Street
Applicant: CSM Properties
Nature of Request: Construct rear addition as per submitted plans.
4. 019-03/04-CA 273 Dauphin Street
Applicant: David Rasp, Hero's Sports Bar
Nature of Request: Construct deck/outside dining area as per submitted plans.
5. 020-03/04-CA 165-167 State Street
Applicant: Devereaux Bemis
Nature of Request: Install 8' high board & batten privacy fence constructed of hardiplank and treated wood as per submitted plan.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

045-02/03 – CA 251 Government Street
Applicant: Ash Corporation/dba Radisson Hotel
Received: 10/20/03 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 12/04/03 1) 4/14/03 2)11/20/03 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4: General Business
Additional Permits Required: Urban Development Land Use Sign Permit
Nature of Project: Replace existing Radisson wall-mounted signage with new Radisson logo wall signage as per submitted designs, totaling approximately 170 sf.

History of the Property:

In 1992 the applicants were granted a variance to allow a total of 300 sf of signage for this property. This was to be divided between an interstate sign (type of signage described in Board of Zoning Adjustment application) not to exceed 200 sf, and other signage not to exceed 100 sf.

In 1993, the case was re-opened when the applicants requested a change from the previous decision. The applicants wished to have two interstate signs. The Board allowed the 200 sf allocated for interstate signs to be divided into two, allowing two interstate signs, neither of which was to exceed 100 sf.

The property in question was constructed in 1940 and is a “prominent part of Mobile’s skyline.” The National Park Service noted that the building is “an important historic skyscraper and is notable for its high degree of integrity.” The hotel is listed by the National Trust for Historic Preservation as one of the Historic Hotels of America. The Mobile Historic Development Commission holds a preservation and conservation easement on this property.

Additional Information:

At the May 2003 meeting of the ARB, the Board denied the application as submitted due to the inappropriate nature of the signage.

At the June 2003 meeting of the MHDC Properties Committee convened to consider the request, as the committee that oversees façade easements. The Committee decided to uphold the decision of the Architectural Review Board.

The current application is requesting to install two wall-mounted signs, channel-lit raceway, in the location of existing signs on the south and west elevations. The applicants have also provided information on existing signage.

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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
6-A	Miscellaneous Provisions: Signage	Replace existing signage

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on information contained in the Application, in Staff's judgment:

1. The Guidelines state that sign materials should compliment the façade materials of the building. Simple designs are most effective and encouraged.
 - a. The existing signage was installed in 1994.
 - b. The removal of the existing signage would not materially impair the integrity of the structure or the district.
 - c. The modern and informal design of the proposed signage, described as "raceway mounted channel letters with white faces".

2. The size (square footage) and number of the existing signage falls within the limits allowed by the Board of Zoning Adjustment in 1993.
 - a. The Board of Adjustment allowed two interstate wall signs, neither of which was to exceed 100 sf. Currently there are three interstate wall signs:
 - On the south elevation, signage "Radisson Hotels" with the stylized "R" logo (81 + sf)
 - On the east elevation, signage "Radisson", measuring 3' x 26'-7 7/8" (81 sf)
 - On the west elevation, signage "Radisson", measuring 3' - 6" x 19' (57 sf)
 - b. The proposed signage plan calls for 2 signs.
 - The sign proposed for the south elevation measures approximately 100 sf.
 - The sign proposed for the west elevation measures approximately 70 square feet.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Gregory Dickinson of the Radisson Admiral Semmes appeared in support of the application. No one spoke in favor of or in opposition to the application

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion on the application.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved to find the facts in the staff report and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Dan McCleave and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/10/04

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

008-03/04 – CA 302 Congress Street
Applicant: Decora Smith
Received: 10/27/03 Meeting Date (s):
Submission Date + 45 Days: 12/20/03 1) 10/20/03 2)11/10/03 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: 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 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 states 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.

At the October 20, 2003 meeting of the ARB, the Board denied the initial request to continue work due to lack of information. The applicants have submitted additional information requested by the Board and have agreed to attend the November 10, 2003 meeting to answer any additional question.

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 the 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

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

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 of 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 a 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

Betty Smith was present to answer Board questions. She took exception to the staff report that claimed the first floor was new construction. She described it as existing construction that had at one time had a second floor.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board noted that the roof would be a gable although certain drawings showed it as a hip. Garage doors were standard.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Douglas Kearley moved to find the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Dennis Carlisle and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/10/04

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

016-03/04 – CA 256 North Conception Street
Applicant: Joe and Rachel Kulakowski
Received: 10/27/03 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 12/11/03 1) 11/10/03 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-B, Residential Business
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Nature of Project: Restore front porch as per submitted plans. Construct 8’ masonry-covered stucco and brick wall as per submitted plans around perimeter of property.

The existing structure is a two story solid masonry side-hall residence. The existing porch reflects generations of alterations and repairs. The first floor porch columns have been changed out and currently are crude wood box columns. The framing of the wide cornice between the porches has lost its siding and is exposed. The second floor columns have been truncated at the height of the balustrade. However, they do retain their original necking and capital details. There is evidence of the original handrail design, which will be replicated and replaced on the second floor. The first floor design is based on similar arched porches of the period.

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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	General	Restore front porch
3	Porches and Canopies	
3	Fences, Walls and Gates	Construct 8’ masonry wall

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

General

- A. The Guidelines state that “The standards listed and shown...illustrate elements that contribute to the architectural character of the buildings in Mobile’s historic districts. These define the architectural style of the buildings and establish a repetition of forms and details, which create harmony and character of the historic districts.
1. The existing structure is a two story solid masonry residence, originally finished with scored stucco.
 2. The proposed design of the porch reflects designs typical of the period of the original residence.

Work Item 1 –Porch Restoration

- 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 solid masonry.
 2. The proposed porch foundation is stucco-covered masonry with false piers.
- B. Porches and Canopies: The Guidelines state that “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period.”
1. Portions of the existing porch will be repaired.
 2. Portions of the existing porch will be replaced using existing profiles and designs as prototypes.

Work Item 2 – Perimeter Privacy Wall

- A. Fences, Walls and Gates: The Guidelines state that “ These 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... If a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an 8’ fence may be considered.”
1. The wall is to be constructed of stucco-covered masonry with brick veneer columns and brick cap.
 2. The structure associated with the wall is constructed of solid masonry with portions of the original scored stucco intact.
 3. The property is zoned R-B, therefore walls may be allowed at the line of the sidewalk.
 4. The property adjoins commercial property and therefore an 8’ wall is appropriate according to the guidelines.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was 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 moved to find the facts in the staff report and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by David Barr and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/10/04

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

017-03/04 – CA 153 South Monterey Street
Applicant: Emanuel Gazzier
Received: 10/27/03 Meeting Date (s):
Submission Date + 45 Days: 12/11/03 1) 11/10/03 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Nature of Project: Remove original existing wood siding and install cement fiber board (hardiplank).
Current Conditions: The two story Dutch-Colonial style house is brick veneer on the first floor and lap siding on the second floor. File photos from 1984 show the original natural brick red color, and painted siding. At some point in the past, the brick was painted the same color as the siding, creating a monotone paint scheme. There is no record in the file of this being approved.

Additional Information: Item number 15 in Mid-Month Approvals approved the repair and/or replacement of wood siding with materials matching existing in profile and dimension.

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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Exterior Materials and Finishes	Remove existing wood siding & replace with hardiplank

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. The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
 - 1. The existing wood lap siding is original to the structure.
 - 2. The proposed replacement material is cement-fiber board (hardiplank)
- B. Listed under “Inappropriate Materials” is masonite siding or panels.
 - 1. Masonite is no longer manufactured; hardiplank is a replacement for this material.

2. Hardiplank siding has only been approved by the Board for new construction.

Staff recommends denial of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicant was present to address the Board. He reported that the original siding had been replaced by the previous owner.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed that the material is allowed on new construction but not as a replacement material on historic buildings.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved to find the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Barr moved to deny the application. Harris Oswalt seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

018-03/04 – CA 1562 Luling Street
Applicant: CSM Properties
Received: 10/27/03 Meeting Date (s):
Submission Date + 45 Days: 12/11/03 1) 11/10/03 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Nature of Project: Construct rear addition, measuring 19’-6” x 29’, as per submitted plans.

The existing structure is a one story wood frame end-gable bungalow with craftsman influence. The rear of the residence is 29’ wide. The proposed addition will be 19’-6” in length by the width of the residence. The end gable roof of the addition will tie into the existing end gable, and be roofed to match existing. Siding will be feathered in to match existing. All corner boards, window and door trim, soffit, eaves and fascia to match that of the existing structure, as per submitted drawings.

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

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

General

- A. The Guidelines state that “The standards listed and shown...illustrate elements that contribute to the architectural character of the buildings in Mobile’s historic districts. These define the architectural style of the buildings and establish a repetition of forms and details, which create harmony and character of the historic districts.
1. The existing structure is a one-story wood frame residence with Craftsman bungalow detailing.
 2. The form of the proposed addition continues the massing of the original residence.
 3. The line of the addition follows the line of the existing residence on the east and west elevations.

Work Item 1 –Rear Addition

- 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 removal of the existing rear door.
 2. Proposed plans call for the installation of a new wood double French door on the north 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 a combination of wood 3-over-1.
 2. There are no windows proposed for the main addition. However, the Review Board typically requires some fenestration to break up the massing on long exterior walls.
- 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 continues the pitch of the existing end gable on the north.

Staff recommends approval of the application with the following conditions:

That the east and west wall have some fenestration to break up the massing.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicant and the owner were present.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was discussion about using corner board to define the new addition, however, there are no corner boards on the house.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Douglas moved to find facts A 1 and 2 and B 1 and 2 in the staff report. His motion was amended to make the following changes: in C.2, that a new wood double French doors will be installed on the north elevation or that the existing half glass door would be reused; in D,2 that windows would be installed on the east and west elevations as per the amended plans submitted at the meeting and E, with the addition of 3, that brackets should be duplicated or reused. facts in C and D with the change in 2 door would be reused and that windows would be installed. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley Bunky moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness taking the above mentioned conditions into account. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/10/04

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

019-03/04 – CA 273 Dauphin Street
Applicant: David Rasp/Hero’s Sports Bar & Restaurant
Received: 10/20/03 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 12/04/03 1) 11/10/03 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley left the meeting prior to the discussion of this application.
Nature of Project: Construct wood deck, measuring 12’ – 8” wide by 39’ long in parking space along side of building as per submitted plans.

Deck is to be constructed at a distance of 5’ from the west wall of the existing restaurant. The deck is to be aligned with the existing building face, and extend out into the existing street/parking lane approximately 7’. A 12’-8” square pergola is to be located at the south end of the deck. Materials include pressure treated structure, railing, and canvas panels between posts to act as a balustrade-type treatment.

Additional Information:

This is a continuation of the Downtown Master Plan. This project has been reviewed by Urban Development, Right-of-Way, Traffic Engineering, and the Mobile Fire Department. This project also has the full support of Mayor Mike Dow and Main Street Mobile. Elizabeth Sanders, Director of MSM will be present at the meeting to answer questions of the Board.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

There are currently no applicable guidelines for this type of structure. Therefore, the design is reviewed in terms of compatibility and the structure’s impact on the historic district.

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

General

- A. The Guidelines state that “The standards listed and shown...illustrate elements that contribute to the architectural character of the buildings in Mobile’s historic districts. These define the architectural style of the buildings and establish a repetition of forms and details, which create harmony and character of the historic districts.
1. The proposed deck and pergola relate to the pergola across the street at Cathedral Square.
 2. The building materials are compatible and appropriate for use in the district.
 3. The proposed deck should be viewed as a non-permanent structure that can be easily removed.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Elizabeth Sanders, Main Street Mobile, was present to answer questions. Wanda Cochran stated that this request was an unusual design, different from anything that had been previously proposed in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District. The proposal is in line with the Project for Public Spaces report. The project will be taking a parking place and has been approved by the City’s secondary ROW use committee. Other similar proposals will be assessed on a case by case basis.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Board member felt that this request would be precedent- setting. Also they had concerns about the formality of this location adjacent to Cathedral Square and the Cathedral. They questioned whether the signage shown on the deck was part of this application and met the conditions of the sign ordinance.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved to find the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by David Barr and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Barr moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions: that no additional signage was approved; that exposed pressure treated wood was not appropriate to the location; that paint or stain would be submitted to the Board; and that any additional lighting would be submitted to the Board. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/10/04

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

020-03/04 – CA 165-67 State Street
Applicant: Devereaux Bemis
Received: 10/20/03 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 12/04/03 1) 11/10/03 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-B, Residential Business
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Nature of Project: Construct 8' high wood and Hardiplank fence as per submitted design.

Fence to be constructed of 4' x 8' panels of Hardiplank mounted between 6"x 6" treated wood posts. Panels to have ½" x 4" applied batten strips spaced evenly between the panel. Fence to be painted or stained.

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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Fences, Walls and Gates	Construct wood and hardiplank 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

General

- A. The Guidelines state that "The standards listed and shown...illustrate elements that contribute to the architectural character of the buildings in Mobile's historic districts. These define the architectural style of the buildings and establish a repetition of forms and details, which create harmony and character of the historic districts.
1. The existing structure is solid masonry.
 2. The building materials are compatible for use in the district.
 3. The Board encourages the use of new materials when appropriate.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had questions concerning the use of Hardiplank for fencing in the historic district. It also had questions concerning the structural integrity of the fence as designed. The Board would be willing to review a full scale mock up of the fence.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Douglas moved to find the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mark Davis and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley move to deny the application. The motion was seconded by Robert Brown and unanimously approved.