

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
April 26, 2004

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair, Cindy Klotz at 3:03 p.m.

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

Members Present: Cindy Klotz, Bunky Ralph, Lynda Burkett, Tilmon Brown, Joe Sackett, David Tharp, Douglas Kearley

Members Absent: Michael Mayberry, Harris Oswald, Robert Brown

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Jim Wagoner	1805 Dauphin St.	060-03/04-CA
Sonja Holland-Wilcher	213 S. Warren St.	061-03/04-CA

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

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

APPROVAL OF THE MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

Lynda Burkett moved to approve the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Floyd Morris Roofing Company
Property Address: 70 S. Royal Street
Date of Approval: 3/30/04 jss
Work Approved: Re-roof flat roof to match existing materials
2. Applicant's Name: Murray Thames Contractor
Property Address: 1157 Church Street
Date of Approval: 3/30/04 jss
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
3. Applicant's Name: Cooner Roofing Company
Property Address: 71 South Lafayette Street
Date of Approval: 3/30/04 jss
Work Approved: Re-roof with 3 tab shingles, charcoal black in color.
4. Applicant's Name: Barry & Carol Jones
Property Address: 329 McDonald Avenue
Date of Approval: 3/31/04 weh
Work Approved: Replace existing privacy fence along south

property line. Install matching gate across existing driveway. Continue fence from corner to end at garage as per submitted site plan.

5. Applicant's Name: G & M Investments
Property Address: 200 Dexter Avenue
Date of Approval: 3/31/04 weh
Work Approved: Repaint rails from balustrade white with dark green cap. Repair or replace rotten wood with new materials matching existing in profile and dimension.
6. Applicant's Name: Jim Walker
Property Address: 470-476 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 3/31/04 weh
Work Approved: Prime window sash. Colors to be approved at a later date.
7. Applicant's Name: Mark & Jill Dabbs
Property Address: 1258 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: 3/31/04 asc
Work Approved: Repair to rotten wood to match existing in profile and dimension to include columns, porch decking, siding, etc. Paint new materials in existing color scheme. Install wood porch railing per MHDC stock design. Repair/replace existing fencing as necessary to match existing.
8. Applicant's Name: Chris Bowen
Property Address: 106 North Ann Street
Date of Approval: 4/1/04 asc
Work Approved: Repair roof to match existing in profile and dimension and color. Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint in the following Sherwin Williams colors:
Body – Peace Yellow SW2857
Trim – Classical White SW2829
Door Accent – Roycroft Bottle Green SW2847
9. Applicant's Name: Chris Bowen
Property Address: 108 North Ann Street
Date of Approval: 4/01/04 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof with 3 tab shingles, weathered wood in color. Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials matching existing in profile and dimension.
Repaint in the following Sherwin Williams colors:
Body – Rookwood Blue Green SW2811

Trim – Classical White SW2829
Door Accent – Rookwood Dark Red SW2801
Foundation infill lattice painted to match
door accent

10. Applicant's Name: Nationwide Vinyl Siding
Property Address: 956 Church Street
Date of Approval: 4/2/04 weh
Work Approved: Construct frame garage using MHDC stock garage plan. Garage to measure 11' x 19'. Garage to be wood sided, with architectural details matching that of the existing residence. Roofing and paint to match main residence.
11. Applicant's Name: Ian McPherson
Property Address: 162 South Lawrence Street
Date of Approval: 4/2/04 weh
Work Approved: Install signage measuring approximately 8.25 sf as per submitted design. Design to be 21" circular logo combined with individually-installed cast aluminum letters painted black. Install fabric awning over entry door as per submitted drawing.
12. Applicant's Name: Woodrow Walker
Property Address: 470-476 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 4/2/04 weh
Work Approved: Paint the building in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
470 Dauphin – Rookwood Sash Green, SW 2810
472 Dauphin – Rookwood Terra Cotta, SW 2803
474 Dauphin – Renwick Olive, SW 2815
476 Dauphin – Rookwood Amber, SW 2817
13. Applicant's Name: Maurice Pless & Sharon Hill
Property Address: 400 Chatham Street
Date of Approval: 4/5/04 asc
Work Approved: Install 3' picket fence painted white in front yard as per submitted site plan. Pickets to have curved top. Gate across walkway to match design of fence.
14. Applicant's Name: Frank Lepik
Property Address: 1763 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 4/5/04 weh
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repaint in the following Olympic color scheme:
Body – Olive Sprig 410-4

Trim – White Smoke – 310-1, or
Fisherman’s Net – 512-4
Door and Awnings – Burgundy 4631

15. Applicant’s Name: Rogers & Willard
Property Address: 1500 Government Street
Date of Approval: 4/7/04 weh
Work Approved: ARB approval for Land Disturbance ONLY.
Additional permits required prior to construction commencing.
16. Applicant’s Name: Liberty Roofing Company
Property Address: 18 Macy Place
Date of Approval: 4/7/04 jdb
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension. Re-roof house with 3 tab asphalt shingles, walnut in color.
17. Applicant’s Name: Sallye Irvine
Property Address: 1157 Church Street
Date of Approval: 4/8/04 weh
Work Approved: Repaint house the following colors:
Body – Benjamin Moore Pleasing Pink
Trim – Crème
Shutters – Benjamin Moore Mallard Green or Dark Teal
Remove existing fabric awning and construct new metal awning supported by turned wood columns as per submitted design.
18. Applicant’s Name: Jo Beth Murphree
Property Address: 203 South Dearborn Street
Date of Approval: 4/9/04 jdb
Work Approved: Repaint house in following color scheme:
Body – Gristmill SW2083
Trim – Aged Ivory SW2450
Accent – Sealbeach Green SW2091
Door – Vermillion SW2914
19. Applicant’s Name: L’Arche/Murray Thames Contracting
Property Address: 161 Michigan Avenue
Date of Approval: 4/12/04 asc
Work Approved: Replace lattice work on foundation with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing color.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **060-03/04-CA** Jim Wagoner & Charles Howard
Property Address: 1805 Dauphin Street
Nature of Request: Construct an 8' stucco-covered masonry fence as per submitted site plan.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

2. **061-03/04-CA** Sonja Holland
Property Address: 213 South Warren Street
Nature of Request: Construct second story addition on existing one story wing addition as per submitted plans; construct side addition per submitted plans.

APPROVED as amended. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS & ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. NAPC Conference, July 15-18 – Indianapolis, Indiana
Conference Hotel: Crowne Plaza at Union Station
Please let staff know if you intend to go to Indianapolis.
2. Consideration and Discussion of a Resolution regarding landscaping requirements.
There was some discussion concerning the appropriateness of adding landscaping requirements to the guidelines. Lynda Burkett felt that parking and trees should not be traded off against each other. Tharp commented that only the minimum number of spaces required by the City should be allowed in proposed parking lots. Wanda Cochran commented that the Planning Commission should incorporate historic preservation in the land use process. If the Planning Commission asked for a report from historic, it would be a way to prevent applicants from manipulating the process.
3. Robinson Ironworks Trip – May 6, 2004 – Preservation Week Activity
4. The Sturdivent appeal, 161 S. Warren Street, is on the Council agenda on April 27, 2004. Cindy will attend the Council meeting. Wanda Cochran has prepared a short brief for the Council.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

054-03/04 – CA 1805 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Jim Wagoner & Charles Howard
Received: 4/12/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 6/17/04 1) 4/26/04 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: Construct 8’ high stucco-covered- masonry with brick pier wall along east and north property line as per submitted plan.

Additional Information:

The applicants purchased ½ of 1803 Dauphin Street, the vacant lot between 1801 and 1805 Dauphin Street, to expand their outdoor area. Historically, the area between the two houses was the garden for the family of 1801 Dauphin. The applicants’ yard is currently enclosed by an 8’ wood privacy fence.

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 & Gates	Construct masonry 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 “The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should compliment the design and scale of the main building.”
1. The main structure is a two story frame with lap siding structure.
 2. Currently there is an 8’ high wood fence along the existing property line that will be removed.
 3. Currently there is an 8’ high wood fence and motorized gate at the driveway that will be removed.
 4. The proposed wall for the east and north property line is an 8’ high capped stucco-covered masonry fence with capped stucco piers.
 5. The proposed gate at the driveway is steel painted black in a design similar to the photo submitted.
 6. While the Guidelines typically limit privacy fences to 6’, 8’ high fences and walls have been approved for areas along busy streets such as Springhill Avenue, Old Shell Road, and Dauphin Street.
 7. In terms of scale in relation to the adjoining residential structures, an 8’ wall would not be inappropriate for this location.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

James Wagoner commented that the new wall will replace an existing fence. The wall will be capped, painted and planted with fig vine. The wall will be stuccoed as per the submitted photograph. Piers are also stuccoed, rather than left natural brick, as stated in the staff report.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The fence is higher than allowed in the guidelines. The fence is in scale with adjacent two story buildings and replaces an existing 8 ft. fence.

FINDING OF FACTS AND DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Lynda Burkett moved to find the facts in the staff report and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and approved. Douglas Kearley refrained from voting since he arrived late.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 4/26/05

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

061-03/04– CA 213 South Warren Street
Applicant: Sonja Holland
Received: 4/12/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 6/17/04 1) 4/26/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (4) Building, Electrical, Plumbing, HVAC
Nature of Project: Construct second floor addition to existing one story rear addition; enlarge existing kitchen by extending the existing wall out 5’ on the north elevation, all as per submitted plans.

The proposed addition measures approximately 24’ x 24’ and is proposed to be constructed over an existing one story addition approved by the ARB in 1993. Exterior sheathing is to be wood lap siding to match existing. New wood 6-over-6 windows to match existing. Roof pitch to match existing, with matching fiberglass shingles.

Construct a side addition, measuring 5’ x 21’ – 9”. The proposed foundation is of brick piers with framed lattice infill to match existing. Exterior sheathing is to be wood lap siding to match existing. Existing wood 6-over-6 windows to be reused. Hipped roof with matching fiberglass shingles.

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...”

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	

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.

Work Item 1 –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 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 window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
 - 1. Proposed plans call for an existing 6-over-6 window and an existing diamond-shaped window, where the addition is to be constructed, to be removed and reused.
- D. The Guidelines state that “...historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained.”
 - 1. The existing roof form is an end gable.
 - 2. Proposed roof form for the addition is end gable for approximately 13’-7” and a shed roof for approximately 8’-2”.

Work Item 2 – Rear Addition

- A. Exterior Materials: The Guidelines state that “Replacement...must match the original in profile and dimension and material.”
 - 1. The existing rear addition is sheathed in wood lap siding matching that of the main residence.
 - 2. The proposed second floor addition will have wood lap siding matching that of both the one story addition and the main residence.
- B. The Guidelines state that “...historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained.”
 - 1. The existing roof form at the rear is an end gable with a 4 and 12 pitch.
 - 2. The proposed roof for the second floor addition is a hipped roof with a 5 and 12 pitch.
- C. 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. Proposed plans call for new 6-over-6 window and a new diamond-shaped window.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Sonja Holland wished to alter her application by removing a diamond shaped window from the front elevation of the kitchen addition and the middle 6/6 window on the second story of the two story rear addition. There was no additional public testimony in favor of or in opposition to the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Lynda Burkett questioned whether the diamond shape was a common window form. Ed Hooker responded that it was common in local 19th century vernacular architecture.

David Tharp questioned the use of a hip roof on the two story rear addition. Ed Hooker responded that the hip hides the low pitch of the main roof and that other adjacent buildings have hipped roofs.

FINDING OF FACTS

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness conditional on the removal of the diamond shaped window from the front kitchen elevation and a 6/6 window from the second story rear elevation.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 4/26/05.