

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
January 12, 2004

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Cindy Klotz called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

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

Members Present:

Karen Carr, Lynda Burkett, Harris Oswald, Bunky Ralph, Cindy Klotz, David Tharp, Mike Mayberry, Douglas Kearley

Members Absent:

Robert Brown, Dan McCleave

Staff Present: Ed Hooker, Anne Crutcher, Devereaux Bemis, Wanda Cochran

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
William Carroll	254 S. Broad St. 36603	036-03/04-CA
Col. Al Cleghorn	753 St. Francis 36602	033-03/04-CA
Joy Klotz	959 Dauphin St. 36604	033-03/04-CA
Doug Anderson	P.O. Box 16046 36618	033-03/04-CA
John Klotz	959 Dauphin St. 36604	033-03/04-CA
John A. Palughi	251 B St. 36607	033-03/04-CA
Laura Cummings	1011 Augusta St. 36604	033-03/04-CA
John Coleman	P.O. Box 2831 36652	033-03/03-CA
Martha Harris	20 S. Lafayette St. 36604	033-03/04-CA
Dan Elcan	P.O. Box 8326 36608	033-03/04-CA
Ben Cummings	1011 Augusta St. 36604	033-03/04-CA
Cameron Pfeiffer	204 Michigan Ave. 36604	033-03/04-CA
Ceil Oliver	261 S. Monterey 36604	033-03/04-CA
Tissa Loehr	201 S. Dearborn St. 36602	033-03/04-CA

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: December 22, 2003

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

APPROVAL OF THE MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the mid-months. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

MID MONTH APPROVALS:

1. Applicant's Name: DoRight Construction Company
Property Address: 160 S. Warren
Date of Approval: January 20, 2004 asc

- Work Approved: Replace rotten wood on siding and wooden steps and porch decking as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing color scheme.
2. Applicant's Name: Leneda Jones
Property Address: 79 S. Lafayette
Date of Approval: December 8, 2003 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint house in the following BLP paint colors:
Body: Leek Leaf 2606T (32-13T)
Trim: DeTonti Square off-white
3. Applicant's Name: Leneda Jones
Property Address: 79 S. Lafayette - B
Date of Approval: December 8, 2003 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint house in the following BLP paint colors:
Body: Leek Leaf 2606T (32-13T)
Trim: DeTonti Square off-white
4. Applicant's Name: Paul Diaz/ Ryals Construction
Property Address: 358 Michigan Avenue
Date of Approval: December 9, 2003 asc
Work Approved: Install new wood 5/4 tongue and groove decking. Prime and paint to match existing color scheme.
5. Applicant's Name: Jerry Arnold
Property Address: 558 Conti Street
Date of Approval: December 12, 2003 weh
Work Approved: Install 3' high wood picket fence, painted white, along south and west property lines behind existing concrete coping.
6. Applicant's Name: Wendell Quimby
Property Address: 211 Marine Street
Date of Approval: December 12, 2003 asc
Work Approved: Repair to rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile to include 1 x 6 siding and 1 x 4 tongue and groove decking. Install new roof using black shingles. Prime new wood and paint. (Colors to be submitted to MHDC at a later date.)

7. Applicant's Name: Thomas Neese
Property Address: 264 Stocking Street
Date of Approval: December 15, 2003 jss
Work Approved: Replace rotten joists and decking on porch to match existing wood in profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing color scheme.

8. Applicant's Name: John Mallory
Property Address: 300 George Street
Date of Approval: December 18, 2003 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood on porch deck with new 1x4 tongue and groove to matching existing. Paint new materials in existing color scheme.

9. Applicant's Name: Enoch Aguilera
Property Address: 1118 Government Street
Date of Approval: December 19, 2003 weh
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new to match existing in profile and dimension. Prime for painting. (Painting COA dated 11-24-03)

10. Applicant's Name: City of Mobile
Property Address: 753 Government Street
Date of Approval: December 23, 2003
Work Approved: Install new flat roof. Roof will not be visible from the street. Replace flashing as necessary. Color of flashing to be approved by MHDC.

11. Applicant's Name: Michael D. Smith
Property Address: 903 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: December 23, 2003
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new matching existing in profile and dimension.
Repaint house in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
Body: Downing Slate
Trim: Roycroft Vellum
Porch deck: Dark Green
Install 6' dog eared privacy gate to connect to an existing 6' privacy fence.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. 033-03/04-CA 1500 Government Street
Applicant: Saad Vallas, Realtors/Clark Geer Latham, Architects/ Dan Elcan, Developer
Nature of Project: Construct shopping center as per submitted plans.

DENIED as submitted. Certified Record attached.
2. 034-03/04-CA 1260 Selma Street
Applicant: Mack Lewis, Contractor/Matt McDonald, Owner
Nature of Project: Construct 6’ wood privacy fence as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
3. 035-03/04-CA 558 Conti Street
Applicant: Jerry Arnold, Owner
Nature of Project: Construct 8’ brick wall as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
4. 036-03/04-CA 965 Savannah Street/351 Charles Street
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
Nature of Project: Rehabilitate and construct addition to 3 room shotgun as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. Discussion of Rules & Regulations and Election of ARB Chair and Vice Chair
Douglas Kearley suggested postponing the discussion of rules and Board elections until the next meeting. All members concurred.
2. New Distribution of Board Correspondence
Ed Hooker reported that correspondence will be emailed rather than sent through the mail.

The meeting adjourned at 5:18 p.m.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

033-03/04 – CA 1500 Government Street
Applicant: Saad-Vallas, Realtors, Clark Geer Latham, Architect/Engineers, Dan Elcan, Owner
Received: 12/29/03 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/12/04 1) 1/12/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: LB-2
Additional Permits Required:
Demolition permit for 2 structures within the district
Demolition permit for former Ramada Inn
Permission to relocate two historic structures within the district

Conflicts of Interest:
Mike Mayberry recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.

Nature of Project:
Construct new shopping center as per submitted plans; demolish existing Ramada Inn facility, one story masonry medical building, and one story frame bungalow with brick veneer infilled porch; relocate 2 historic frame structures to lots created by resubdivision of property.

Project History:
Due to the size and magnitude of this project, and at the request of the owner/developers, the ARB appointed a Design Review Committee to meet with the owner/developer and architect. This meeting was held 12/22/03 following the regularly-scheduled meeting of the Architectural Review Board. The Design Review Committee’s comments are attached.

Preliminary Discussion

Prior to accepting public testimony, the Chair asked Board members if enough information had been submitted on the project to make a decision, as only a site plan and front elevation had been submitted. Missing from the application were side and rear elevations, as well as detailed landscaping plans, a lighting plan and material colors.

Developers requested that the Board proceed with a decision on the site plan so they could assess the direction in which the project needed to proceed. They would, however, like comments from the Board with regard to other items, understanding that they would be required to return to the Board for final approval.

Ed Hooker introduced the application and showed slides of the subject properties. In addition a vicinity map and photographs of adjacent properties was presented.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

John Vallas and **Linda Snapp**, architect, presented for the developers. They explained that the developers had met with the staff of the MHDC as well as the Review Board Design Committee and had tried to incorporate as many of their suggestions as possible into their plans. Vallas presented drawings that were enlargements of the ones submitted with the application to illustrate details not easily seen in the small scale drawings. Mr. Vallas requested approval subject to submitting further information on the elevations and site plan.

Mr. Vallas stated that the site plan could not be modified and submitted aerial photographs of the Government Street corridor. He felt the aerials showed a variety of setbacks and asserted that the development site in question was dissimilar to any other parcel. He believed that the project should not be subject to the same guidelines as other projects in the district because of its size.

Members of the public spoke in favor of and in opposition to the project.

Those in favor of the project:

Doug Anderson, an attorney representing the developer, explained that the site plan was identical to the plan presented to the City Council for the rezoning. In addition, changes had been made to the plan following the wishes of adjacent neighbors—specifically, setting the building 35 ft. from Etheridge Street; relocating two historic houses from Catherine to Etheridge (instead of demolishing them); constructing a wall and increasing landscaping along Etheridge.

He underlined that it would be impossible for the developer to position the parking behind the buildings. Anderson cited retail studies that supported the site plan choice suggesting that an unsafe condition would be created by placing parking behind retail establishments. The public would be forced to walk from the rear of the building to the front entrance and, as a consequence, would not use the facility, causing its failure.

Dan Elcan, the developer, stated that he did not realize that a public hearing was part of the process. Had he known, he would have had neighbors who supported the project in attendance.

Ceil Oliver stated that she was in favor of the site plan as submitted. However, she would have liked to have received a card notifying her of the meeting. The Board's attorney explained the legal requirements for notification.

Ben Cummings, as a downtown resident and business owner, expressed a desire to have more places to shop. He was not opposed to the design of the development and felt that parking to the front of the development would encourage others to shop there.

Those who spoke in opposition to the project:

Allen Cleghorn, a resident of the historic district, expressed concern that the Board was reviewing an incomplete application. He was concerned about the uniqueness of the city and the need to maintain that unique character through compatible design. He stated that his impression was that the developers were asking for an exemption from the Guidelines and that if the Board made an exception in this case, there was no point in having the rules.

John Coleman, President of the Mobile Historic Development Commission, stated that the MHDC opposed the project. He underlined the fact that it was the duty of the MHDC to preserve the character of the historic districts. The development of a strip mall was out of character with the historic district and would adversely impact the entire city by affecting historic Government Street. Mr. Coleman pointed out that the aerials provided by the developer showed that there were no other parking lots in the district that were of the magnitude of the one proposed by the developer and that there was no other setback even close to 320 feet.

John Palughi questioned the exact terminus of the 6 ft. wall along Etheridge Street. He also said that consideration should be given to providing employee parking at the rear of the development, thus reducing the number of parking spaces at the front. In response, John Vallas stated that the drawings were incorrect and that the 6 ft. wall would be extended to the end of the building as previously agreed upon.

Martha Harris stated that there should be more neighborhood-oriented businesses and that she was opposed to a strip mall because it was a suburban-style development with all of the parking at the front, and no landscaping to soften its impact..

John McClelland wanted the developers to identify themselves, which they did.

Cameron Pfeiffer talked about the unique nature of the historic districts, the resurgence of the midtown neighborhoods and the steady increase in property values throughout the district. She suggested that the developers capitalize on this uniqueness, rather than using a stock plan. People move to historic districts because the buildings there (old and new) reflect the design principles laid out in the guidelines.

Tissa Loehr considered the setback an important issue. The setback did not conform to the established new construction guidelines and having all of the parking in front seemed to be out of keeping with the historic district.

Doug Anderson requested an opportunity to rebut the previous speakers which was granted. He explained that the developers felt they were doing positive things in this plan, specifically, creating 2 residential lots on Etheridge, and instead of demolishing the two historic houses on Catherine, relocating them to Etheridge. Also every oak tree on the site would remain.

Board Questions

Bunky Ralph questioned the proposed design plans for the out parcel on Government Street.

Tommy Latham responded that it would remain undeveloped green space, until the parcel is developed.

Harris Oswalt asked about the location of the entrance drive and adjacent oak trees.

Tommy Latham answered that it would be in approximately the same location with one small oak to be relocated.

Douglas Kearley questioned whether a retaining wall and stair remaining from historic Blacksher Gardens would be retained. The Blacksher House had been located at Government and Etheridge Streets. The Blackshers had developed the rear of the property into a garden to which the public had access. That house and garden were replaced by the current hotel building.)

Tommy Latham responded that the feature would remain.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Due to the complexity and nature of the project, the Board considered the Findings of Fact by topics as expressed in the original staff report. Discussion was held on various findings of fact:

Tharp quoted the guidelines noting that setbacks were required to “approximate the setbacks of nearby buildings.” He noted that the current hotel building is set back 65 ft., so it is possible to construct a building closer to Government Street than is proposed. While the Board does have flexibility, he believed the 320 feet proposed was unacceptable.

Tharp also questioned the parking count. The developers confirmed that the count on the plans was accurate and contained 80 more spaces than required by the Zoning Code. It was explained that the extra spaces would be for use of the future development on the out parcel. The question arose about this future use. It was explained that the developer has no firm plan. The question arose regarding the possibility of selling the parcel, which would mean that the current development would have an excessive number of parking spaces.

Burkett asked about the ratio of building to property, which is approximately 18% as shown on the plan.

Considering the application submitted, the staff report, the public testimony, and other evidence presented at the hearing, the Board on motion adopted the following Findings of Fact as set out below:

I. Placement and Orientation

- A. The Guidelines state that “New construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings. New buildings should not be placed too far forward or behind the traditional "façade line", a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the façade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape.”
1. The proposed setback is approximately 320’ from the southeast corner of the building to the sidewalk at Government Street. The proposed side setback is approximately 50’ from the east wall of the building to the sidewalk at Etheridge Street. The proposed setback is approximately 60’ from the west wall of the building to sidewalk at South Catherine Street. All storefronts face south towards Government Street.
 2. Currently, the corner parcel is occupied by a Firestone Store. The building is set back approximately 35’ from the sidewalk along Government Street, and features a partial hexagon which addresses the corner.
 3. Currently, the existing hotel facility is set back approximately 70’ at the porte-cochere (southwest corner) and 60.55 at the southeast corner, for an average setback of approximately 65’.
 4. Currently, the houses along South Catherine Street have an average setback of approximately 18’.
 5. As a comparison, in terms of large structures along Government Street, Blacksher Hall, 1056 Government Street, one of the deepest, has a setback of approximately 80’. The building immediately to the west, Kingdom Hall, 1060 Government Street, one of the nearest, has a setback of approximately 18’. The Bay-Haas Building, 1150 Government Street, has a setback of approximately 30’ with front lawn, and perimeter and rear parking.
 6. The proposed setbacks are not compatible with setbacks along Government Street.

II. Massing and Scale

- A. The Guidelines state that “Building mass is established by the arrangement and proportions of its basic geometric components. Similarity of massing helps create a rhythm along a street, which is one of the appealing aspects of historic districts. Therefore, new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.”
1. The proposed structure is massed into 3 attached components:
One anchor store measuring approximately 120’ x 142’, containing 17, 076 sf.
One anchor store measuring approximately 136’ x 88.25’, containing 12,000 sf.

A rectangular section measuring 85' x 160', containing 13,600 sf (to be divided among multiple tenants)

2. The total length of the building is approximately 341'. The depth telescopes from 160' at the east end to 85' at the west end.
3. The overall massing and building footprint give the impression of a "strip" center.

B. The Guidelines state that "The foundation, the platform upon which a building rests, is a massing component of a building. Since diminished foundation proportions have a negative effect on massing and visual character, new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings."

1. All adjacent non-historic commercial structures, including the Firestone, The Ramada Inn, The Winn-Dixie, and the Dollar General, are built utilizing slab-on-grade construction.
2. All adjacent historic residential structures are constructed on crawl spaces and vary in height from 2' to 5' above grade.
3. The proposed new construction is proposed to be slab-on-grade construction.

C. The Guidelines state that "the main body and wings are the most significant components. A building's form, or shape, can be simple (a box) or complex (a combination of many boxes or projections and indentations). The main body of a building may be one or two stories. Secondary elements, usually porches, or wings, extend from the main building. These elements create the massing of a building. Interior floor and ceiling heights are reflected on the exterior of a building and should be compatible with nearby historic buildings."

1. The largest mass of the development occurs at the east end of the development, and is essentially a rectangle in footprint, with a 3 bay facade measuring 30' tall at the entry parapet, stepping down to 22' on each side. The second largest mass occurs directly to the west of the largest mass, is rectangular in footprint, and also has a 3 bay facade measuring 22' tall at the parapet, stepping down to 18' on each side. The third portion of the development has a rectangular footprint with a 5 bay facade, the center of which measures 18' in height, and is flanked by a pair of arched parapets, which are flanked by straight-topped parapets.

D. The Guidelines state that "A building's roof contributes significantly to its massing and to the character of the surrounding area. New construction may consider, where appropriate, roof shapes and pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings. The use of built-up or flat roof systems hidden behind parapet walls may be used in new commercial construction."

1. The proposed main roof system is a flat roof occurring at different levels, and concealed behind parapet walls.
2. The three attached structures are tied together with a continuous sidewalk partially covered with Spanish Tile and Standing Seam roof.

E. The Guidelines state that "The size of a building is determined by its dimensions - height, width, and depth - which also dictate the building's square footage. SCALE refers to a building's size in

relationship to other buildings - large, medium, small. Buildings which are similar in massing may be very different in scale. To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.”

1. No retail development-of this magnitude has been proposed or constructed within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The Weinaker Shopping Center (which pre-dates the historic district), across South Catherine Street to the west, is the closest in terms of scale and property size. However, the proposed development is substantially larger in terms of building footprint and parking lot coverage. The Storage Max is the most similar in terms of scale on Government Street.
2. The Board has reviewed the Mobile Infirmary office building at 1700 Springhill Avenue. This is a large building that was brought close to the street.

III. Façade Elements

- A. The Guidelines state that “The number and proportion of openings - windows and entrances - within the façade of a building creates a solid-to-void ratio (wall-to-opening). New buildings should use windows and entrances that approximate the solid-to-void ratio of nearby historic buildings. Windows and entrances should also be arranged in a manner consistent with nearby historic buildings. In addition, designs for new construction should also incorporate the traditional use of window casements and door surrounds. Where a side elevation faces a side street, proportion and placement of its elements may have an impact upon the visual character of the side street.”
 1. The proposed storefronts vary in terms of design and materials, but all have the same components – bulkhead, storefront, and transom. This design is consistent throughout the façade.
 2. The masses are differentiated from each other by changing building materials. The east portion is shorter in length than the other two, which helps break up the massing. However, there is not enough differentiation on the ground plane or in elevation to break up the massing between the two elements.

IV. Materials and Ornamentation

- A. The Guidelines state that “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but not to create a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples. The choice of materials and ornamentation for new construction is a good way for a new building to exert its own identity. By using historic examples as a point of departure, it is possible for new construction to use new materials and ornamentation and still fit into the historic district.”
 1. A variety of building materials can be found throughout the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The predominant wall material for commercial, institutional and educational structures is masonry.

Proposed Building Materials:

- Parking Surface – Asphalt with concrete curbing
- Building Exterior - Split Face Concrete Block
Brick Veneer
True Stucco
- Glazing - Anodized aluminum metal storefronts
- Roofing - Sidewalk Coverings - Spanish Tile, barrel-vaulted
Standing Seam Metal
Main Buildings – flat roofs behind parapets

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved to approve the application as submitted. The motion died for lack of a second.

David Tharp moved to deny the application based upon the Findings of Fact. Lynda Burkett seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 4 to 3. Voting yes: Lynda Burkett, Karen Carr, David Tharp and Harris Oswald. Voting no: Bunky Ralph, Cindy Klotz and Douglas Kearley.

The Chair asked the Board members to determine if they could approve the project subject to the following conditions:

- 1) the setback from Government Street be decreased;
- 2) the elevation, massing and footprint of the building be less linear;
- 3) there be larger unpaved areas on Government Street; and
- 4) the size of interior parking islands be increased.

Bunky Ralph expressed concern that these conditions were not explicit. Karen Carr countered that the Board had given sufficient guidance and it would be improper to dictate a specific design solution.

Douglas Kearley moved to grant approval to the project providing conditions 2, 3, and 4 were met. Harris Oswald seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. The motion failed.

Report from the Design Committee 22 December, 2003

Following the regularly-scheduled meeting of the ARB December 22, 2003, The Design Committee of the Architectural Review Board met with the developer's representative and the architect to discuss preliminary site plan and elevations.

Design Committee Members: Cindy Klotz, Dan McCleave, David Barr
Developer's Representative: John Vallas, Saad Vallas Realty
Architect: Linda Snapp, Clark Geer & Latham
Staff: Anne Crutcher, Ed Hooker

The Committee had the following comments and concerns:

New Development:

- Setback of the proposed development from Government and Catherine Streets
The Committee questioned why the building could not be moved closer to Government and Catherine Streets to maintain the setbacks established by existing buildings. The developers' representatives stated that the placement of the building at the rear of the parcel was tenant-driven. The Committee noted that tenant desires should not drive the appearance of the historic district.
- Landscaping on the perimeter and interior of the parking lot
The Committee noted that most buildings along Government have lawn-type settings with landscaping, and that this development should try to repeat that landscape theme. The developer's representatives stated that landscaping plans had not yet been developed but the intent was to leave the existing berm at Government Street, and to have heavily landscaped islands within the parking area. The retention pond on Catherine Street will not be required as previously proposed, so that area will become green space. The Committee felt that the internal areas in the parking lot designated as planting areas were not large enough. The Committee noted that effective landscape design can aid in creating/maintaining the streetscape and noted a landscape plan was required for review.
- Extent/size of the parking lot
The Committee noted the excess number of parking spaces and recommended utilizing those spaces as landscaping areas. The developer's representatives stated that the number of parking spaces shown was also in part a requirement of the tenants. The Committee suggested that possibly the additional spaces be alternative paving. The developer's representatives stated that alternative paving had not proven to be successful for retail use. They also stated that Parcel 1, facing Government Street, may be the site of a new restaurant, and parking to accommodate that use would be shared by the parking proposed for this development. Perhaps a low brick wall around the parking should be investigated.
- The proposed development's addressing of Catherine Street
The Committee noted that a blank wall was proposed to face Catherine Street. The Committee requested that the architect present some type of storefront or window pattern to wrap the corner.
- Better pedestrian access from Government and Catherine Streets. A blank wall is unacceptable because there is no dialogue with Catherine Street.
- The Committee noted that the only planned pedestrian access was from Catherine Street. However, access from Government Street should be accommodated for people using public transportation as well approaching the development either on foot or by bicycle.

- Breaking up the massing of the development to read as individual buildings
The Committee noted that the architect had attempted to break up the massing of the building using different materials and design elements. However, the Committee noted that the elevations still read as strip-like. They suggested preparing perspective sketches to bring to the Review Board Meeting to provide a better interpretation of the elevation. How the project will relate to the street should be illustrated.
- Streetscape
The Committee noted this project removed the established streetscape at Government and Catherine Street and does not replace it. The view from both streets is now paved parking. This design exacerbates the poor design of the Weinaker's Shopping center directly across the street.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

034-03/04 – CA 1260 Selma Street
Applicant: Mack Lewis Construction, Contractor/ Matt McDonald, Owner
Received: 12/10/03 Meeting Date (s):
Submission Date + 45 Days: 1/25/04 1) 1/12/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence
Nature of Project: Install privacy fence as per submitted drawings and site plan.

Fence to begin on the east property line at the end of the existing driveway, in line with the northeast/rear corner of the residence, and run to the northeast property line, then turn west and run to the northwest property line, then turn south and run to a point in line with the bay window on the west elevation, then turn east and die into the residence. A 3’ wide walkway gate to be located on center of the south section of fence, and a double gate to be located at the driveway. Fence to be pressure-treated and 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	Install 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 “These should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship

to the historic district. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally limited to six feet...”

1. The main residence is a two story wood frame structure.
2. The proposed fence is 6’ wood privacy fence.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no comment 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

Bunky Ralph moved to find the facts in the staff report and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and approved unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/12/04

1. The main residence is a one story painted solid masonry structure.
2. The proposed wall is 8', including the existing concrete coping.
3. 8' privacy fences/walls constructed at the sidewalk are allowed by B-4 zoning.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no public testimony 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 noting that the 8 ft. high wall was acceptable in an urban B-4 area. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/12/04

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

036-03/04 – CA 965 Savannah Street/ 351 Charles Street
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
Received: 12/29/03 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/11/04 1) 1/12/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment to build within 5’ of the property line.
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on this application.
Nature of Project: The request is to rehabilitate an existing 3 room wood frame shotgun dwelling, and add an addition to the west side. The proposed addition, measuring 19’4” x 30’-8”, will then become the front of the residence and face Charles Street.

Existing front porch of residence to be enclosed for bathroom and closet, leaving existing porch elements and infilling between columns with painted wood lattice. Existing brick piers to be re-pointed and infilled with painted wood lattice. Existing cornice to be repaired and painted. Existing siding to be repaired or replaced, and painted. New wood double hung two-over two windows to be installed in existing openings to replace existing aluminum windows. Existing roof to be re-decked and re-roofed with timberline shingles.

Proposed addition to be wood frame with wood lap siding to match existing, constructed on brick piers to match existing. Piers to be infilled with framed lattice. New wood two-over-two windows to match those installed in the existing portion of the residence; new two-over-four floor-length windows on new front of residence. New three bay front porch, with columns matching the existing front porch in profile and dimension. New front porch railing, MHDC stock design Number 1, with circular-design porch frieze as illustrated. Recycled ¾ glass front door with two vertical panels below, as illustrated.

Additional Information:

The house was damaged by an electrical fire in late summer. The owner approached the ARB about demolishing the structure and constructing a new rental property on the site. Staff inspected the property, along with a

building inspector from Urban Development. A determination was made that the house was structurally sound and could be restored. The owner submitted a Demolition Application requesting to raze the property. The Board held over the request pending the sale of the property for restoration. The Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund has purchased the property for restoration.

Urban Development has cited this structure under the Unsafe Buildings Act.

This project is being undertaken by the Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund, a partner organization of the Mobile Historic Development Commission. If necessary, Section 106 review of this project should be carried out through the Alabama Historical Commission.

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 shotgun-style dwelling with vernacular detailing.
2. The proposed addition is to be located at the west side of the existing structure, reorienting the main façade, incorporating the existing structure into a building twice the size and height of the original, making the original structure subordinate to the addition.

Work Item 1 – Rehabilitation of Existing Structure

- A. Piers, Foundations and Foundation Infill
 1. The existing foundation is brick pier.
 2. Rehabilitation plans call for repointing of masonry and installation of framed lattice panels between the piers.
- 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 existing exterior sheathing is to be repaired or replaced with wood lap siding to match existing.
- C. The Guidelines state that “Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
 1. Windows in the historic residence are aluminum.
 2. Windows proposed to replace the existing and proposed for the addition are wood double hung two-over-two.
- D. The Guidelines state that “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their original period.”
 1. The original double bay front porch is incorporated under the main hipped roof and supported by three square plain wood posts.
 2. The proposed rehabilitation plan calls for new wood built-up columns to replace the existing wood posts.
- E. The Guidelines state that “Enclosing the front porch is generally prohibited. Where rear or side porches are to be enclosed, one recommended method is to preserve the original configuration of columns, handrails and other important architectural features.”
 1. The proposed rehabilitation plan calls for the existing front porch to be enclosed with framed lattice panels concealing exterior walls behind.
 2. The proposed rehabilitation plan also calls for the existing front porch to become an enclosed side porch with the construction of a new front porch and reorientation of the structure to Charles Street.
- F. 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 hipped.

2. The roof for the proposed addition follows the pitch of the main roof but extends up past the main ridge to almost twice the height of the existing roof.

Work Item 2 –Rear/Side 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 solid masonry with brick veneer 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 use of a recycled $\frac{3}{4}$ glass front door with a pair of vertical panels below.
- 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 aluminum.
 2. Windows proposed to replace the existing and proposed for the addition are wood double hung two-over-two.
- E. The Guidelines state that “...historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained.”
 3. The predominant roof form is hipped.
 4. The roof for the proposed addition follows the pitch of the main roof but extends up past the main ridge to almost twice the height of the existing roof.

Staff defers comment on this project as there is a conflict of interest between the organization requesting approval and the reviewing agency.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Palmer Hamilton appeared on behalf of the Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund. He explained that the Revolving Fund received funding from Fannie Mae as well as local funds. 8 projects were currently under way in Oakleigh. He presented a petition signed by neighbors in support of the project. The petition will become part of the certified record as an attachment.

He explained that the small shotgun is only three rooms and that to be viable in today’s market must have an addition. The addition will blend with the neighborhood.

William Carroll spoke in favor of the project. It will build a critical mass on Charles Street and is part of the downtown revival efforts to establish downtown living.

No one spoke in opposition to the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved to find the facts in the staff report and testimony provided at the meeting and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion passed with Bunky Ralph voting in opposition feeling that the addition will completely alter the historic resource.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/12/04