

CITYOF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
January 26, 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: Cindy Klotz, Tilmon Brown, Lynda Burkett, Harris Oswalt, Bunky Ralph, Douglas Kearley, David Tharp and Robert Brown.

Members Absent: Michael Mayberry

Staff Present: Ed Hooker, Anne Crutcher, Wanda Cochran

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
James Farris	1801 Dauphin Street	039-03/03CA
Don Williams	6300 Piccadilly Square Drive	042-03/04-CA
Enoch Aguilera, Jr.	1118 Government St.	042-03/04CA
Steven Flaskerd	1118 Government St.	042-03/04-CA
John Schotta	16179 Setter Circle, Foley 36535	038-03.94-CA
Devlin Wilson	1511 Church Street	041-03/04-CA

APPROVAL OF THE Minutes: January 12, 2004

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the minutes as mailed. Robert Brown seconded the motion that passed unanimously.

APPROVAL OF THE MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the mid-month COAs. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and unanimously passed.

MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Buffy Donlon
Property Address: 960 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 12/30/03 weh
Work Approved: Install three foot tall steel painted fence along front of property as per submitted plans.
2. Applicant's Name: Cherri Pacatte
Property Address: 1008 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 1/2/04 weh

- Work Approved: Re-roof house to match existing 5 v crimp metal roof. Prep to paint house. Repaint house. (Color scheme to be submitted for approval at a later date.)
3. Applicant's Name: Blackard Roofing, Inc.
Property Address: 119 N. Julia St.
Date of Approval: 1/7/04 asc
Work Approved: Repair porch area leaks in roof to match existing roofing materials.
 4. Applicant's Name: Eric Thompson
Property Address: 65 Fearnway
Date of Approval: 1/9/04 weh
Work Approved: Construct 8'x10' storage building as per submitted plans. Building to be painted to match main residence. Roofing to match main residence.
 5. Applicant's Name: Devlin Wilson
Property Address: 1511 Church Street
Date of Approval: 1/12/04 weh
Work Approved: Paint house in the following colors:
Body – BLP Springhill Brown
Trim – BLP Old Dauphin Way Gold
Accents – Chatham Street Blue
Claiborne Street Red

NEW BUSINESS:

1. 038-03/04-CA 1115 Government - Taco Bell Restaurant
Applicant: Bayou Bells, Inc.
Nature of Request: Install 6' aluminum fence, approximately 135' in length, across the rear of the property as per submitted site plan. Install 6' wood privacy fence, approximately 165' in length, along the east property line as per submitted site plan.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
2. 039-03/04-CA 1801 Dauphin Street
Applicants: Chad Johnson and Jim Farris
Nature of Request: Install 6' high wood privacy fence as per submitted site plan.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

3. 040-03/04-CA 56 North Reed Avenue
Applicants: Robert and Lori Arras
Nature of Request: Install 6' high wood privacy fence as per submitted site plan.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

4. 041-03/04-CA 1511 Church Street
Applicants: Devlin Wilson
Nature of Request: Construct rear addition, measuring 12' x the width of the rear of the residence, as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

5. 042-03/04-CA 1118 Government Street
Applicants: Don Williams, Engineer for Enoch Aguilera
Nature of Request: Reconstruction of roadway sidewalk, reconstruction of existing driveway entrance and construction of a 6 car parking lot for proposed Bed & Breakfast facility, as per submitted plans.

APPROVED as amended. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. Discussion of Rules & Regulations
In the absence of Wanda Cochran, discussion on the rules and regulations was postponed.
2. Election of ARB Chair and Vice Chair
Douglas Kearley moved to re-elect **Cindy Klotz Chair** for another year. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and passed unanimously. David Tharp moved to appoint **Bunky Ralph Vice-Chair** for another year. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and unanimously passed.
3. Design Review Committee
The original Design Committee was reconfigured to include: Cindy Klotz, Lynda Burkett, David Tharp and Tilmon Brown.
4. Harris Oswald suggested that the meeting time be changed to 4:00 p.m. from 3:00 p.m. to allow members of the public to more easily attend Review Board meetings. There was no action taken on the suggestion.

There being no further business, Lynda Burkett moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph. The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

038-03/04 – CA 1115 Government Street
Applicant: Bayou Bells, Inc./ Taco Bell Restaurant
Received: 1/12/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/26/04 1) 1/26/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (new construction)
Zoning: B-2, Neighborhood Business
Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence
Nature of Project: Install 6’ aluminum fence, approximately 135’ in length, across the rear of the property as per submitted site plan. Install 6’ wood privacy fence, approximately 165’ in length, along the east property line as per submitted site plan.

Painted aluminum fence to extend across rear of property at a distance of 30’ from the sidewalk and tie into existing fence at 1117 Government. Wood privacy fence to run a distance of 165’ from its intersection with the aluminum fence north along the east property line.

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 Install aluminum 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 structure is a painted stucco .
2. The proposed fence materials are 6' painted aluminum and 6' solid wood.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

John Shotta representing Taco Bell appeared. He had no information to add to the application.

There was no additional public testimony in favor of or in opposition to the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion on the application.

FINDING OF FACTS AND DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved to find the facts in the staff report and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Harris Oswald seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 01/26/05

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

039-03/04 – CA 1801 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Chad Johnson and Jim Farris
Received: 1/12/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/26/04 1) 1/26/04 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) Fence
Nature of Project: Install 6’ wood dog-eared privacy fence, in rear yard as per submitted site plan.

Unpainted 6’ wood privacy fence to begin at the rear of the residence at the existing stoop & back steps and run south 38’, then turn west and run 18’, then turn north and run 38’ and end at the southwest corner of the residence. Two 3’ pedestrian gates to be placed in the fence; one at the southeast corner of the fenced area, the other at the northwest corner adjacent to the 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	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 structure is a two story wood frame American Foursquare.
 - 2. The proposed fence material is 6’ solid wood.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Jim Farris appeared before the Board and added no additional information on the application.

There was no public testimony in favor of or in opposition to the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion on the application.

FINDING OF FACT AND DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 01/26/05

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

040-03/04 – CA 56 North Reed Avenue
Applicant: Robert and Lori Arras
Received: 1/12/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/26/04 1) 1/26/04 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) Fence
Nature of Project: Install 6’ wood privacy fence, around rear yard as per submitted site plan.

 Unpainted 6’ wood privacy fence to begin at the back porch and frame the perimeter of the rear yard.

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 structure is a one story wood frame bungalow.
 2. The proposed fence material is 6’ solid wood.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicant did not appear before the Board.

No one spoke in favor of or in opposition to the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion on the application.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved to find the facts in the staff report. Lynda Burkett seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved to find the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and passed unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 01/26/05

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

041-03/04 – CA 1511 Church Street
Applicant: Devlin Wilson
Received: 1/12/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/26/04 1) 1/26/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (4) Building, Mechanical, Plumbing, Electrical
Nature of Project: Construct rear addition, measuring 12’ deep by the width of the existing residence, as per submitted plans.

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

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change: ... Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district...”

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicants are requesting to extend the rear line of the existing residence out 12’ in the area of an existing rear porch. The shed porch roof is supported by irregularly-spaced 4” square wood posts. The existing porch structure will be repaired, leveled and used as the floor system for the addition. The existing end gable will continue out over the addition. An existing two-over-two wood double hung window will be reused in the addition. The existing rear door will remain and become an interior door. All corner boards, window trim, soffit, eave and fascia will match that of the existing structure. Siding on the side will be feathered in to the existing. Single diamond-shaped windows

will be placed on the east and west facades of the addition as illustrated on the drawing. The entire house will be painted in a period color scheme previously submitted and approved by staff.

STAFF REPORT

- A. Piers, Foundations and Foundation Infill: The Guidelines state that “foundation screening should be recessed from the front of the foundation piers.”
 - 1. The existing foundation is brick pier with lattice infill.
 - 2. The proposed addition is brick pier with framed lattice infill, matching existing.
- B. Exterior Materials: The Guidelines state that “ Replacement...must match the original in profile and dimension and material.”
 - 1. The existing exterior sheathing is wood lap siding.
 - 2. The proposed exterior sheathing for the addition is wood lap siding.
- C. The Guidelines state that “ Original doors and door openings should be retained along with any mouldings, sidelights and transoms.”
 - 1. The existing rear half glass door will remain as an interior door.
 - 2. Proposed plans call for the installation of a pair of new wood single light French doors, on the south elevation.
- D. The Guidelines state that “The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
 - 1. Windows in the historic residence are predominantly wood 2 -over-2 double hung.
 - 2. Windows in the addition are proposed to match the existing in profile, light configuration, and dimension.
 - 3. A smaller two-over-two window is proposed as clerestory-type window in the extended gable.
 - 4. Single diamond-shaped windows are proposed for the east and west elevations.
- 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 line of the existing gable.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Devlin Wilson appeared before the Board and expressed the desire to amend the application before the Board. The application called for the relocation of an original 2/2 wood window to the newly created rear elevation and the addition of two windows that would match the original. Rather than using windows that would match the configuration of windows on the house, the applicant requested to use Anderson insulated windows. These windows do not have true divided lights. In the event that the Anderson windows were approved, the original 2/2 light window would not be reused.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board stated that the guidelines specified that replacement windows must have true divided lights. Tilmon Brown stated that 2/2 wood windows with true divided lights were readily available and that the original historic appearance of the building should be maintained.

Bunky Ralph questioned the location of a window placed high in the gable. The applicant explained that the placement provided light in a room with a vaulted ceiling.

The Board also questioned the lack of a handrail on the new entrance stairs. The applicant acknowledged that there was not one proposed.

There was no additional public comment in favor of or in opposition to the application.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved to approve the application as originally submitted, noting that windows without true divided lights are not permitted according to the adopted design guidelines. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 01/26/05

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

042-03/04 – CA 1118 Government Street
Applicant: Don Williams, Engineer for Enoch Aguilera
Received: 1/12/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/26/04 1) 1/26/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Request pending before Board of Zoning Adjustment to allow change of use from single family residential to Bed & Breakfast
Additional Permits Required: (2) Building, Right-of-Way
Nature of Project: Reconstruction of roadway sidewalk, reconstruction of existing driveway entrance and construction of a 6 car parking lot for proposed Bed & Breakfast facility, as per submitted plans.

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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Drives, Walks & Parking	Construct 6 car parking lot

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...”

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In addition to requesting to install parking, the applicant is requesting to repair existing deteriorated driveway and sidewalk conditions. The applicant is proposing to construct an asphalt parking area on the west side of the existing wood frame structure. The parking area would measure 120' by 30', and would accommodate 6 cars in 45 degree angled places. A turn-around/back up space measuring 18' wide x 62' long is proposed to be placed on the west side of the front yard. The asphalt area is proposed to run down the west property line from the front sidewalk past the house to the rear of the lot, to the existing garage.

STAFF REPORT

- A. The Guidelines state that “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.”
1. The main structure is a 1 ½ story wood frame late Victorian/Queen Anne residence.
 2. The proposed parking surface is asphalt.
- B. The Guidelines state that “Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting. Asphalt is inappropriate for walkways. Gravel or shell are preferred paving materials, however, a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment is required for commercial applications. Hard surfaces may also be acceptable.”
1. There are a number of existing trees in the right-of-way and on the property.
 2. No landscaping is proposed as part of this application.
- C. The Guidelines state that “The appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design.”
1. The proposed parking is located at the west side of the structure, with access off Government utilizing an existing curb cut.
- D. The Guidelines state that “Parking areas should be screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences, or landscaping. Circular drives and parking pads in the front yard are generally inappropriate in the historic districts.
1. A turn-around is proposed for the west side of the front yard.
 2. Front lawns are a predominant feature of both residential and commercial lots in this area of Government Street.
 3. Parking is typically either on the side, concealed from view, or at the rear.

Staff recommends the application be approved with the following conditions:

1. The front yard turn-around be moved to the rear of the property.
2. Stamped or stained concrete be used instead of asphalt
3. The perimeter of the parking be heavily landscaped with hedge-type material to minimize the visual impact of the parking.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Don Williams and Enoch Aguilera appeared as applicants. Don Williams stated that staff recommendations 1 and 3 would be acceptable to the applicant. The front turn around would be relocated to the rear of the property; the west property line would be landscaped with a hedge. Asphalt would remain their paving material of choice since the adjacent Bay Haas parking lot was asphalt. .

There was no additional testimony in favor of or in opposition to the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Bunky Ralph questioned whether asphalt was a compatible paving material with a 19th century Victorian house. After some discussion, it was the general feeling of the Board that asphalt paving was not prohibited by the guidelines and that its use would not materially impair the house or the adjacent district. Douglas Kearley asked if the retaining wall would be rebuilt. Don Williams responded that the Urban Forester did not want any built up area that would damage the 4 trees on the property line. Mr. Williams

stated that the walking path in front of the trees would become the legitimate sidewalk with the originally designated sidewalk area abandoned.

There was discussion on the type of landscaping at the front of the lot. The applicants responded that the front portion of the property would be grass with the hedge at the west side.

Lynda Burkett asked what would happen to the parking if the Board of Adjustment request is not granted. Any approvals granted for this application are based upon the request being granted and are not valid should the request be denied.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness to include the following amendments: that 2 parking places be moved to the rear of the structure; that a hedge be installed along the west property line and that new concrete coping be installed. David Tharp seconded the motion which was approved. Bunky Ralph opposed the motion on the basis of the incompatibility of asphalt paving with a 19th century house.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 01/26/05

