

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
November 22, 2004– 3:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Acting Chair Bunky Ralph at 3:00 p.m.

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

Members Present: Lynda Burkett, Bunky Ralph, David Tharp, Tilmon Brown, Douglas
Kearley, Michael Mayberry, Cameron Pfeiffer, Robert Brown

Members Absent: Harris Oswalt, Joe Sackett, Cindy Klotz

Staff Members Present: Ed Hooker, Devereaux Bemis, Wanda Cochran

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Arthur Smith		055-03/04-CA
Wayne Dean	1064 Palmetto Street, Mobile	006-04/05-CA
Chip Brown	111 Gilbert Street	055-03/04-CA
Mike Hoffman	1457 Brown Street	007-04/05-CA

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Lynda Burkett moved to approved the minutes of the last meeting as mailed. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and approved.

APPROVAL OF THE MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:

David Tharp moved to affirm the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.

MID MONTH APPROVALS:

1. Applicant's Name: Scott Phillips
Property Address: 1152 New St. Francis Street
Date of Approval: 10/13/04 weh
Work Approved: Paint house the following colors as per submitted chips:
Body: medium gray
Trim: cream
Accent colors: Dark gray and Roycroft Red
2. Applicant's Name: Hal Alexander
Property Address: 1104 Montauk Avenue
Date of Approval: 10/13/04 weh
Work Approved: Repaint house in the following color scheme:
Body – Ivory Shadow, Devoe 1W20-4
Accent – Sherwin Williams Black Cherry, SW2724

3. Applicant's Name: Mark Macginnis/Joey O'Brien
Property Address: 959 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 10/14/04 asc
Work Approved: Hurricane damage repair to include: replace shingles as necessary to match existing; replace wood siding as necessary with new wood siding to match existing.
Paint new materials to match existing.
4. Applicant's Name: Thomas Roofing
Property Address: 1407 Monroe Street
Date of Approval: 10/18/04 asc
Work Approved: Install new timberline shingles, weathered wood in color. Repair storm damaged soffit and fascia boards with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
5. Applicant's Name: Harry McCarron
Property Address: 554 Eslava Street
Date of Approval: 10/20/04 weh
Work Approved: Re-paint house in the following color scheme:
Body: Devoe Artichoke Leaf
Trim: White
Shutters and porch: Bellingraph Green
6. Applicant's Name: Meijuan Zou/Hal Cain
Property Address: 121 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 10/20/04 asc
Work Approved: Remove marble panels from façade that are in danger of falling; replace panels to match existing.
7. Applicant's Name: Tuan Titlestad
Property Address: 1569 Fearnway
Date of Approval: 10/22/04 asc
Work Approved: Remove aluminum siding in order to inspect structure.
8. Applicant's Name: Palmetto Partners, LLC/Tuan Titlestad
Property Address: 12 S. Pine Street
Date of Approval: 10/22/04 asc
Work Approved: Repaint exterior in the following Sherwin-Williams colors:
body-Downing Earth
trim- Downing Sand
porch deck, steps and door-black.
9. Applicant's Name: Justine Brasley
Property Address: 1556 Monroe
Date of Approval: 10/25/04 jss
Work Approved: Install 3 foot picket fence in front of house from west corner to the front sidewalk. Fence to remain bare wood or painted at a later date. Repaint house in existing color scheme.

10. Applicant's Name: Allen's Home Improvements
Property Address: 1256 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 10/26/04 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with new materials to match existing materials in profile, dimension and material. Repaint house in existing color scheme.
11. Applicant's Name: SL King & Associates, Inc.
Property Address: 919 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 10/26/04 weh
Work Approved: Install signage as per submitted design. Sign to measure 4' wide by 3' high, mounted between 6"x6" capped wood posts. Sign to be constructed of sandblasted Spanish cedar, painted white. Text to be dark blue and dark green as per submitted color samples. Sign to measure approximately 6'-6" in height, or bottom of sign beginning at top of existing fence.
12. Applicant's Name: James J. Allen, Jr.
Property Address: 15 Houston Street
Date of Approval: 10/27/04 weh
Work Approved: Paint house the following colors:
Body – Conti Street Gray Green
Base - Bellingrath Green
Column Plinths – Monroe Street Green
Trim – DeTonti Square Off White
13. Applicant's Name: LeVert Trotter
Property Address: 112 Bush Avenue
Date of Approval: 10/27/04 weh
Work Approved: Reconstruct storm-damaged room as per plans provided by MHDC. New north and east walls to have paired 3-0 x 6-0 wood one-over-one windows. Wood lap siding to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint to match existing.
14. Applicant's Name: Banc Foreclosures, LLC
Property Address: 16 N. Reed
Date of Approval: 10/28/04 asc
Work Approved: Repair hurricane roof damage with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
15. Applicant's Name: J.P.S. Construction
Property Address: 1117 Church Street, Apt. A
Date of Approval: 10/29/04 weh
Work Approved: Construct handicap ramp, measuring 3' long x 3" high at rear of residence.

16. Applicant's Name: Darnell Steele
Property Address: 125 Herndon Avenue
Date of Approval: 10/29/04 weh
Work Approved: Paint house the following Sherwin Williams colors:
Body – Haven, SW6437
Trim – Spinach White SW6434
Windows and doors – Courtyard SW6440
17. Applicant's Name: Ryan Friesen
Property Address: 20 North Reed Avenue
Date of Approval: 11/01/04 asc
Work Approved: Install wood privacy fence in rear yard as per submitted plans.
Fence to be 6' high dog eared fencing left natural to weather.
Variance to construct fence will not be required.
18. Applicant's Name: Bill Cutts
Property Address: 1005 Government Street
Date of Approval: 11/01/04 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof main residence and front porch with materials matching
existing in profile and dimension.
19. Applicant's Name: Bill Cutts
Property Address: 250 Chatham Street
Date of Approval: 11/01/04 weh
Work Approved: Repair or replace damaged and deteriorated exterior materials
with new materials matching existing in profile and dimension.
Prep exterior for painting.
20. Applicant's Name: Clyde and Sarah Helmer
Property Address: 950 Government Street
Date of Approval: 11/2/04 weh
Work Approved: Repaint house the following color:
Body – Fig
Windows – Outer Trim – Polar Bear
Inner Trim – Red Brick
Window Sash – Trolley Car
Columns – Desert Camel with Will Tweed in fluting
Porch rail – Desert Camel, Red brick, Trolley Car
Detailed color chart in file for reference.
21. Applicant's Name: Vaughan Drinkard
Property Address: 1070 Government St.
Date of Approval: 11/2/04 asc
Work Approved: Install new natural slate roof, gray in color, to match existing.

22. Applicant's Name: Payne Construction Company
 Property Address: 11 Semmes Avenue
 Date of Approval: 11/2/04 asc
 Work Approved: Install new 3 tab shingle roof to match existing; re-deck as necessary. Repair chimney to match existing.
23. Applicant's Name: Pro Tech Home Improvements
 Property Address: 304 West Street
 Date of Approval: 11/3/04 asc
 Work Approved: Re-roof with architectural shingles, Onyx black in color.
24. Applicant's Name: Allen Butts
 Property Address: 57 N. Ann Street
 Date of Approval: 11/4/04 asc
 Work Approved: Install new black shingle roof to match existing.
25. Applicant's Name: Katherine Weber
 Property Address: 51 S. Julia Street
 Date of Approval: 11/4/04
 Work Approved: Install new roof using 30yr. Desert Tan asphalt shingles to match the existing color.
26. Applicant's Name: Michael Smith
 Property Address: 1002 Dauphin Street
 Date of Approval: 11/4/04 weh
 Work Approved: Repair rotten wood to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. **055-03/04 – CA** 1751-1759 Old Shell Road
 Applicant: Cornell Family Properties/Arthur Smith Real Estate
 Nature of Request: Demolish two existing historic residential structures in order to increase parking to meet City of Mobile Parking Requirements to accommodate new 6,000 sf restaurant in the rear of the existing structure located at 1751 Old Shell Road, corner of Old Shell and Semmes Avenue.

DENIED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **004-04/05-CA** 315 South Monterey Street
 Applicant: Helen Buttram
 Nature of Request: Construct a deck of pressure treated wood at rear of property in L-shaped area by wall of kitchen and wall of sunroom. Dimensions to be 11'-7" by 19'-8". Handrail to be stock MHDC Sample Handrail Number 1.

APPROVED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. **005-04/05-CA** 53 Houston Street
Applicant: Joe Booth
Nature of Request: Install 6' wood privacy fence along rear property line to tie into existing privacy fences on the north and south property lines as per submitted plans. Install 6' wood privacy fence in side yard set back 25' from the sidewalk and running south to tie into the existing 6' wood privacy fence. Install 6' wood gates at driveway as per submitted plans.

APPROVED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

3. **006-04/05-CA** 1064 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Wayne Dean
Nature of Request: Install new roofing material on existing historic residence as per submitted sample.

APPROVED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

4. **007-04/05-CA** 1457 Brown Street
Applicant: Michael C. Hoffman Sr.
Nature of Request: Construct master bathroom addition, measuring 8' x 18', on the east side of residence as per submitted plans.

APPROVED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

5. **008-04/05-CA** 911 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
Nature of Request: Construct two story Charleston side house with courtyard and detached garage as per submitted plans.

APPROVED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Lynda Burkett moved to adjourn the meeting. Michael Mayberry seconded, and the meeting was adjourned.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

055-03/04 – CA 1751-1759 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Cornell Family Properties/Arthur Smith Real Estate
Received: 3/29/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 12/9/04 1) 4/12/04 2) 11/22/04 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-2, Neighborhood Business
Nature of the Project: Demolish the existing historic residential structures at 1757 and 1759 Old Shell Road to construct a parking lot.

Additional Information: See attached comments from Urban Development Staff
See attached memo regarding alternative parking.

History of the Project: At the April 12, 2004 meeting the ARB denied a similar application. The applicants did not timely appeal and have resubmitted. A copy of the April 12, 2004 minutes are attached.

STAFF REPORT

Section 10 of the Preservation Ordinance prohibits the demolition or relocation of “any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such buildings will not be detrimental to the historical and architectural character of the district...” In making this determination, the Board must examine a number of factors set out in the ordinance, each of which is discussed below:

A. Historic or Architectural Significance

1. The Old Dauphin Way Historic District was created in 1984.
2. 1757 Old Shell Road is a one story frame vernacular structure, constructed ca. 1919.
3. The properties in question were part of the Porter’s First Subdivision of 1897.
4. Deed records suggest that the properties were built by developer Moses Kohn around 1919.
4. 1757 Old Shell Road is a contributing structure within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
5. 1759 Old Shell Road is a one story frame vernacular structure, constructed ca. 1919.
6. 1759 Old Shell Road is a contributing structure within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
7. 1757 and 1759 were 2 of the first ensemble of 8 to be constructed on this section of Old Shell Road. 1761- 1771 were built after 1925 according to the 1925 Sanborn Map.

B. Importance to the Integrity of the District

1. Old Dauphin Way is significant as Mobile’s earliest suburban neighborhood dating largely from the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Building in the district began in the 1830s with development along major thoroughfares such as Dauphin Street, Old Shell Road and Springhill Avenue. An increase in building construction appeared in the 1870s and 1880s as a result of the establishment of a horse-drawn trolley, which permitted residential living outside the city’s core. The presence of the automobile and a general boom period at the turn of the 20th Century spurred construction in the district west of Ann Street.
2. Most buildings are small scale residential structures, most often 1 or 1 ½ stories in height, with similar setback from the street throughout the neighborhood, creating a feeling of homogeneity.

3. 1757 Old Shell Road is a small single story wood frame vernacular house with gabled roof oriented to the street; a shed roof projects from the façade above a full width porch and there is a small square addition to the west side of the building; there is some original porch detailing remaining.
4. 1757 Old Shell Road is 1 of 8 existing residential structures in a row between Semmes Avenue and Kenneth Street.
5. 1759 Old Shell Road is a small single story wood frame vernacular house with pedimented gable roof oriented to the street; main façade is divided into three bays and recessed under a full width front porch; entrance is located on the west side of the porch with two full length windows in the central and eastern bays.
6. 1759 Old Shell Road is 1 of 8 existing residential structures in a row between Semmes Avenue and Kenneth Avenue.

C. Ability to Reproduce Historic Structures

1. The type and quality of the materials used in the construction of both 1757 and 1759 Old Shell Road are no longer readily available.
2. Both structures date from the first quarter of the 20th century, before the introduction of nominal dimension lumber. Components include old growth pine structural members and siding, historic windows, doors and interior decoration, etc. Replacement material would have to be garnered from salvage yards or specially milled.
3. In the event that reconstruction was attempted, the cost to reproduce 1757 and 1759 Old Shell Road would be prohibitively expensive.

D. Ensemble of Historic Buildings Creating a Neighborhood

1. The subject area along Old Shell Road is an intact, thriving neighborhood complete with both parochial and public educational facilities (Old Shell Road School, St. Mary's and McGill-Toolen), and small shops.
2. As two of eight structures, the demolition of these would reduce the historic integrity of this ensemble by 25%.

E. Proposed Redevelopment Plans for the Site

1. Applicant states that negotiations are ongoing to place a restaurant in the rear portion of the existing structure located at 1751 Old Shell Road, at the corner of Old Shell and Semmes. Applicant states that additional parking is required by the Zoning Ordinance and that site selection is contingent on the additional parking. Currently there are approximately 30 existing parking spaces and 61 are required. The removal of 2 historic residential structures and the reconfiguration of traffic circulation within the confines of the existing parking lot will create 37 new spaces, and eliminate 6 existing spaces, for a total of 31 new parking spaces.
2. The proposed parking material is concrete.
3. Proposed understory trees are crepe myrtle to match those existing.
4. A letter from the proposed tenant states that "the selected site, 1751 Old Shell Road, is contingent on the addition of 55-60 on premise parking spaces being permitted." However, the total proposed is 61.

F. Effect of Proposed Project on the Old Dauphin Way Historic District

1. The removal of 1757 and 1759 Old Shell Road would expand the size of the existing parking lot.
2. The removal of 1757 and 1759 Old Shell Road would degrade the streetscape along this relatively intact section of Old Shell Road.
3. The removal of 1757 and 1759 Old Shell Road would adversely affect the architectural, cultural, historical, social, aesthetic and environmental character of not only this section of Old Shell Road but also the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
4. The 25% decrease of residential units in this area of Old Shell Road will result in the loss of critical mass, encouraging additional loss of comparable structures.

G. Content of Application

1. Property information:

- a. 1757 Old Shell Road was acquired by the applicant in August 2000 for \$62,500.
- b. The applicant states that the property is in Good/Fair condition.
- c. 1759 Old Shell Road was acquired by the applicant in January 2004 for \$72,000.
- d. The applicant states that the property is in Good/Fair condition.
- e. 1757 Old Shell Road appears to be vacant; 1759 appears to be inhabited.

2. Alternatives Considered

- a. In the first public hearing, the applicants stated that they had considered and rejected all previously suggested alternatives as unworkable.

3. Sale of Property by Current Owners

- a. Information presented in the application notes that 1757 and 1759 Old Shell Road have not been listed for sale, nor does the applicant intend to list the properties for sale.

4. Financial Proof

- a. The letter provided by Regions Bank lists no specific support for the subject project.

H. Other Considerations

1. Guido's in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District contains approximately 3,445 square feet of restaurant space.

- a. Guido's provides approximately 20 off street parking spaces in a crushed limestone parking lot.

2. La Pizzeria in the Leinkauf Historic District contains approximately 3,760 square feet.

- a. La Pizzeria provides no off street parking places.
- b. Patrons of La Pizzeria are permitted to park at Leinkauf School across from the parking lot.
- c. The school superintendent has stated that a similar arrangement for parking could be worked out at Old Shell Road School.

Staff recommends denial.

Staff would recommend that the property owners pursue the following alternatives:

- (1) Seek an off-site parking variance (similar to the one just approved by the Board of Zoning Adjustment for the law offices of Moore & Wolfe on Dauphin Street)
- (2) Pursue concept of on-street parking on Semmes Avenue (similar to the parking situation at Guidos and LaPizzeria)
- (3) Seek a variance to allow reduction in required number of parking places.
- (4) Explore agreement with Mobile School Board to use the parking lot at Old Shell Road School across Old Shell Road as overflow parking.
- (5) Leave existing historic buildings on site and expand parking behind with alternative materials.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Douglas Kearley recused himself from review of this application.

Tilmon Brown stated that prior to the Board's first review of this application in April, he had spoken with Clarke Brennan in New Orleans concerning his building on Dauphin Street as a possible location for a Brennan's restaurant. Brown noted that Mr. Brennan was not interested in his property. Brown noted that this conversation would not affect his judgment in reviewing this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Applicant's representative Arthur Smith, a realtor, was present to address the Board. Mr. Smith did not dispute the facts as found in the staff report, but addressed the alternatives to parking that were suggested by staff.

- (1) Seek an off-site parking variance (similar to the one just approved by the Board of Zoning Adjustment for the law offices of Moore & Wolfe on Dauphin Street)
Smith noted that there were no current vacant B-2 lots in the vicinity that could accommodate off-site parking.
- (2) Pursue concept of on-street parking on Semmes Avenue (similar to the parking situation at Guidos and LaPizzeria)
Smith noted that according to representatives of the City of Mobile's Traffic Engineering, Semmes Avenue only allowed for 8-10 on-street parking immediately adjacent to the building, and no parking is allowed on Old Shell Road.
- (3) Seek a variance to allow reduction in required number of parking places.
Smith felt that if a variance were granted, his client would be confronted with problems associated with parking on Semmes Avenue and Old Shell Road, stemming from resident complaints.
- (4) Explore agreement with Mobile School Board to use the parking lot at Old Shell Road School across Old Shell Road as overflow parking.
Smith stated that in conversations with Mobile County School Board Properties Manager Tommy Sheffield, that no overflow parking would be allowed on School Board property.
- (5) Leave existing historic buildings on site and expand parking behind with alternative materials.
Smith noted that in order to leave the two houses on site and add parking behind, each residence would only retain 10' of rear yard, and that the parking lot could only be increased by 14-15 new spaces.

Mr. Smith informed the Board that his client, Eddie Cornell, had purchased the former Regan Company property in 2001 at a cost of \$105,000. Smith stated that the front portion of the building was constructed in 1943 and the rear portion was constructed in 1945. Smith stated that Mr. Cornell had invested \$100,000 in the rehabilitation of the building, and \$50,000 on the concrete parking lot. Smith stated that during the building's use by the Regan Company the property's use was B-3. Cornell's current use as a market/shop conforms to B-2.

Smith stated that there was approximately 5,600 square feet in the rear portion of the building, and that Mr. Cornell intended to invest \$150,000 in adapting the space for use as a restaurant. Smith noted that the restaurant would be designed to seat 120-130 people. He further stated that the addition of the restaurant would create approximately 20 new jobs.

Smith noted that attempts to find persons willing to relocate the residences had been unsuccessful. Smith also noted that Cornell paid approximately \$132,000 for both properties. Smith noted that Cornell was in the final stages of lease negotiations with the prospective tenant, and that the lease was contingent on resolving the issue of parking.

Smith noted that the request for 64 parking spaces was based on the City of Mobile's Zoning Ordinance which requires 1 parking space per 100 square feet of building. Smith stated that there had been no analysis of the exact amount of parking needed for the restaurant. He stated that it was possible the owner could accept few than 60 spaces, possibly even 50.

Smith noted that none of the Brennan's restaurants in New Orleans had on-site parking. Most are in dense commercial or residential areas and rely on off-site or on-street parking for their patrons. Smith further noted that the restaurants in New Orleans were successful and popular tourist attractions without on-site parking.

Chip Brown, a neighborhood resident, was present to speak against the application. Brown noted that he was concerned about this area of Midtown being plagued with numerous parking lots. Brown further noted that by placing parking behind the existing historic residences, he was concerned that this would be detrimental to the future of the structures, in that without a rear yard the residences would be converted for commercial use.

Devereaux Bemis stated that he met with Mobile County School Superintendent Harold Dodge to discuss the possibility of using parking across the street at Old Shell Road School. Bemis noted that Dodge was positive about the idea, citing a program called Partners in Education whereby local business partner with the School System. Bemis noted that there were approximately 34 spaces available at Old Shell Road School. (see attached memo)

Wanda Cochran inquired of Arthur Smith how long the lease for the restaurant would be. Smith noted that he was not directly involved in the arrangements, but that 15-25 years had been the number discussed. Cochran asked if the applicant had determined the approximate turn-over of restaurant traffic and did the restaurant, in fact, need the number of spaces requested.

Margaret Pappas with the City of Mobile's Urban Development Department, was present to explain to the Board the history of zoning of this section of Old Shell Road. She prepared a memorandum to the Board (attached to certified record) but briefly outlined the content of the memo for clarification. Pappas stated that zoning in this area was changed in the 1930s to allow for neighborhood businesses such as banks, bakeries, and restaurants. However, the zoning in the 1930s did not address parking. Pappas stated that the current Zoning Ordinance was the third incarnation of the original zoning, and dated to 1967. Pappas noted that the properties in question had always been used as residential even though they were zoned commercial.

Pappas stated that under the current Zoning Ordinance, the proposed restaurant would require 60 parking spaces, using the 1 space per 100 sf of building. Pappas also noted that Guido's and La Pizzeria were granted variances to allow alternative parking.

To address the alternative of leaving the houses on site and placing parking behind, Pappas noted that each of the residential lots must have a minimum of 7,200 sf of land, as required by the current Zoning Ordinance.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Lynda Burkett suggested to the applicant that rather than not considering any one of the proposed alternatives, that possibly a combination of alternatives would suit the applicant's parking needs. Burkett further noted that the end solution must ultimately be what is best for the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. Burkett noted that other restaurants such as Guidos and La Pizzeria have alternative parking.

Tilmon Brown noted that the amount of parking requested by the applicant was based on City of Mobile Zoning Requirements.

David Tharp noted that there were more than 8-10 parking places available along Semmes Avenue. Arthur Smith clarified that comment by stating there were 8-10 parking spaces along side the building from Old Shell Road down Semmes Avenue.

Bunky Ralph noted that most neighborhood restaurants have a good deal of pedestrian traffic.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Lynda Burkett moved to accept the staff report as finding of fact. Robert Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Lynda Burkett moved that based on the information contained in the staff report and information discussed at the public hearing, that the proposed work would materially impair the historic integrity of the structures and the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. David Tharp seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

David Tharp moved to deny the application based on the finding of impairment. Lynda Burkett seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

004-04/05-CA 315 South Monterey Street
Applicant: Helen Buttram
Received: 11/5/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 12/20/04 1) 11/22/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single family residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence
Nature of Project: Construct a deck of pressure treated wood at rear of property in L-shaped area by wall of kitchen and wall of sunroom. Dimensions to be 11'-7" by 19'-8". Handrail to be stock MHDC Sample Handrail Number 1.

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	Accessory Structures	Construct wood 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..."

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 main residence is a one story frame structure.
 2. The residence is located on the east side of South Monterey at the corner of Lamar.
 3. The proposed deck is located on the north side of the property.
 4. The proposed handrail is an MHDC stock design.
 5. The proposed deck will not be visible from public view.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to speak in favor of or in opposition to this application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Douglas Kearley moved to accept staff report A, 1-5, as Findings of Fact. Lynda Burkett seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved that the proposed work did not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and further moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Douglas Kearley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Lynda Burkett moved to accept staff report items A, 1-5, as Findings of Fact. David Tharp seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Lynda Burkett moved that the proposed work would not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district, and further moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Douglas Kearley seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

006-04/05-CA 1064 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Wayne Dean
Received: 11/8/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 12/23/04 1) 11/22/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single family residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Roofing
Nature of Project: Install new roofing material on existing historic residence as per submitted sample.

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	Roofs	Install new metal roofing

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 “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
1. The main structure is a one story frame Victorian structure.
 2. The house retains its original wood shakes under the deteriorated architectural grade shingles.
 3. The residence is located on the northeast corner of Palmetto and George Streets.
 4. The material requested for use is a patterned steel shingle which measures 12 5/8” by 39 3/4”.
 5. The pattern replicates wood shakes.
 6. Historically, metal roofs were installed around the turn of the 20th century.
 7. Metal roofs varied in design from standing seam to 5-v crimp to tin shingle.
 8. This material has not been previously requested or approved for use in Mobile’s Historic Districts.
 9. The company representative provided two places this type of roof has been used: on Mohawk Street in the Midtown National Register District, and in Jackson Heights.

Staff recommends that the Board determine the appropriateness of the material for this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Applicant Wayne Dean was present to address the Board. Mr. Dean stated that prior to the current roof being installed, there were three layers of asphalt shingles over the original wood shakes. At the time the current roof was installed, those layers were removed and the GAF timberline shingles were installed directly over the original wood shakes. Mr. Dean stated that he wished to retain the original shakes because he had exposed the underside in a family room in the attic. Mr. Dean further stated that roofers from which he had gotten prices for re-roofing with asphalt shingles recommended removing the existing asphalt shingles and the historic wood shakes, decking with plywood and felt, and installing new shingles.

The steel shingle representative informed Mr. Dean that the original wood shakes could remain and that the new steel shingles could be installed over the original wood shakes.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Board member Lynda Burkett questioned the use of a new material on an existing historic house. Douglas Kearley noted that he had driven by the house cited on Mohawk Street as having this type of material, but that the Mohawk Street roof had much more of a distinct pattern, resembling a split shake. Kearley also noted the shakes on Mohawk Street were aluminum. Douglas Kearley noted that the proportions of the proposed roofing material did not imitate historic period shake roofs. David Tharp questioned whether there was a more appropriate metal, and asked the applicant if he had considered the 5-v crimp. Applicant Wayne Dean stated that he was unaware of a source for the 5-v crimp material.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Lynda Burkett moved to accept the staff report, A, 1-9, as Findings of Fact. Mike Mayberry seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that the use of the proposed metal shingles would not impair the historic integrity of the residence or the district, and further moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Douglas Kearley seconded the motion. The Motion passed 6 to 2, as Lynda Burkett and David Tharp voted to deny the request.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Applicant Michael Hoffman Sr. noted he had nothing further to add to the Staff Report.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDINGS OF FACT

David Tharp moved to find the facts in the staff report and that based upon the facts, that the application would not impair the building or the adjacent historic district. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved that the proposed work would not materially impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district, and further moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. David Tharp seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

008-04/05 – CA 911 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund/Douglas Kearley, Architect
Received: 11/08/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 12/23/04 1) 11/22/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (vacant lot/new construction)
Additional Permits Required: (4) Building, Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing

Nature of Project: Construct a 1300 square foot, wood frame, single story residence on a raised concrete slab. Site variance will be required.

The building site is located on the southeast corner of Palmetto and Marine Streets. This parcel was recently purchased and subdivided into 4 residential lots by the OVRF. Subject lot, Lot 1, measures 57.5’ by 178.46’. The building measures approximately 17’ wide with an 8’ front porch, by approximately 59’ long. The house faces west towards Marine Street, and the front porch is located at a distance of 10’ 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 a two story brick veneer residence raised on a crawl space.. The ground plan is rectangular in design with a small end gable bump-out on the south elevation. The proposed building has a 4’ finished floor height above grade, and a first floor finished floor height of 10’ – 4 ½”. Overall ground to ridge height is 35’. The proposed roof is hipped with a front projecting dormer. The bump-out has an end gable roof. The proposed pitch of the main roof is 7.25/12. Proposed roofing material is GAF “Slateline” asphalt/fiberglass shingles, color Slate Gray.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation –
 - front porch - brick pier/arches with 3 part stucco infill
 - main residence –brick veneer over concrete block
- b. façade – brick veneer with hardiboard trim.
- c. doors – wood & glass
- d. windows – wood casement, wood fixed
- e. porch details –
 - side porch: Built-up wood columns
 - traditional handrail with ½ wood square pickets, similar to MHDC stock rail design Number 1
- f. roof – architectural grade shingles, slate gray in color

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

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

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 on the southeast corner of Marine and Palmetto Streets. The proposed front setback for this building is 10’ from the sidewalk/property line; the proposed side setback for this building is 8’ on the south, and 13.5’ 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. There are a few original examples of the Charleston side house in Mobile.
 - 2. There is one example of a newly-constructed side house in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
 - 3. 1, 1 ½ and 2 story wood frame structures are common in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
 - 4. The proposed building is a 2 story brick veneer structure.
 - B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. Historic buildings in the 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 a combination of brick veneer and brick arches with 3 part stucco infill, 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. Hipped roofs with dormers occur 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 windows is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
 - 2. The use of wood French doors with transoms, is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.

3, IV

IV. Materials and Ornamentation:

- A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
 - 1. There are number of brick veneer 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 in the design of nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
 - 1. Examples of historic ornamentation include use of brick arches with stucco infill as the front porch foundation, wood columns and porch rail.
 - 2. The use of hardiplank siding and trim is a modern interpretation of a traditional building material and is allowed on new construction.
 - 3. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Karen Shirah, client for the Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund, was present but noted she had nothing further to add to the Staff Report.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Douglas Kearley recused himself from reviewing this application.

There was no Board discussion.

FINDINGS OF FACT

David Tharp moved to accept the Staff Report as Findings of Fact. Lynda Burkett seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that the proposed work would not impair the historic integrity of the district, and further moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Lynda Burkett seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.