

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
February 28, 2005

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Cindy Klotz called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

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

Members Present: Robert Brown, Tilmon Brown, , Douglas Kearley, Cindy Klotz, Michael Mayberry, Harris Oswalt, Cameron Pfeiffer, Bunky Ralph, David Tharp.

Members Absent: Lynda Burkett, Joe Sackett.

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

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Linda Olen	1758 New Hamilton	027004/05-CA
Hilary McKone		025-04/05-CA
Jim Barnes		025-04/05-CA
Tommy Jordan		025-04/05-CA
Ross Holladay		025-04/05-CA

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

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

APPROVAL OF THE MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:

Michael Mayberry moved to approve the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved.

MID MONTH APPROVALS:

1. Applicant's Name: Ms. Patricia Davis/ Tom Gardner, GC
Property Address: 7 Macy Place
Date of Approval: 1/27/05 asc
Work Approved: Install new Timberline architectural 30 yr. shingle Desert Tan in color. Install new built-up roof on flat section to rear. Repair/replace rotten roof decking, fascia and soffit as necessary with new material to match existing in dimension and profile. Paint new wood to match existing color.
2. Applicant's Name: Victor Castro
Property Address: 162 Michigan Avenue
Date of Approval: 1/18/05 weh
Work Approved: Paint house to match existing light blue color scheme.
3. Applicant's Name: J. E. Mizell for John Simms
Property Address: 200 Roper Street
Date of Approval: 2/1/05 asc
Work Approved: Reroof the house using 20 year GAF black shingle.

4. Applicant's Name: Summers Roofing/Lewis Advertising
Property Address: 1668 Government Street
Date of Approval: 2/4/05 asc
Work Approved: Roof repairs to include: install new flat roof on flat portions of roof and replace dimensional shingles as necessary to match existing in color.

5. Applicant's Name: Larry Posner
Property Address: 163 St. Emmanuel Street
Date of Approval: 2/9/05 jss
Work Approved: Repair holes in roof as necessary, re-roof to match existing in profile, materials, color and dimension.

6. Applicant's Name: Reeves Construction Company
Property Address: 1119 Government Street
Date of Approval: 2/9/05 jdb
Work Approved: Re-roof building with timberline shingles, charcoal in color.

7. Applicant's Name: Affordable Painting and Construction
Property Address: 66 Semmes Avenue
Date of Approval: 2/9/05 jss
Work Approved: Re-roof building with fiberglass 3-tab shingles, black in color.

8. Applicant's Name: Virginia Meador
Property Address: 7 Blacklawn
Date of Approval: 2/9/05 jss
Work Approved: Repair wood on portico with new materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.

9. Applicant's Name: Cooner Roofing
Property Address: 300 George Street
Date of Approval: 2/10/05 asc
Work Approved: Install new shingle roof using charcoal black 3 tab shingles.

10. Applicant's Name: Jacinda Hollins
Property Address: 1000 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 2/11/05 jdb
Work Approved: Repaint house in the following American Traditions color: Red base 206267.

11. Applicant's Name: R. Preston Bolt Jr.
Property Address: 162 S. Georgia Avenue
Date of Approval: 2/14/05 jss
Work Approved: Paint the front porch ceiling and guest house Devoe Blue Quartz.

12. Applicant's Name: Enoch Aguilera
 Property Address: 1118 Government Street
 Date of Approval: 2/15/05 asc
 Work Approved: Re-roof house and garage with Timberline or 3 tab GAF shingles, weathered grey in color. Re-paint house and garage in existing color scheme. Repair existing wood fence with new materials to match existing in profile, and dimension.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **025-04/05-CA** 658 Government Street
Applicant: McDonalds Restaurants
Nature of Request: Demolish existing restaurant and construct new restaurant as per submitted designs.

TABLED. Certified Record attached.

2. **026-04/05-CA** 256 State Street
Applicant: Miller Hamilton Snider & Odom, Owners/
 Douglas Kearley, Architect
Nature of Request: Construct one attached shed and one free-standing shed at rear of properties as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

3. **027-04/05-CA** 1758 New Hamilton Street
Applicant: Linda Olen, Owner, Douglas Kearley, Architect
Nature of Request: Construct rear addition as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached

4. **028-04/05-CA** 955 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Ann A. Cowley
Nature of Request: Install 6' wood privacy fence along east and south side of residence as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

Miscellaneous Business:

1. Mattress Factory, 417 Dauphin Street
 Applicants have requested to remove the canopy from the front of the building. While staff has the ability to administratively renew a CoA, there were two certificates on file—one approving the canopy removal, one approving its restoration. After some discussion, it was felt that the current owners/architects should submit a complete application to the Board since the previous approvals dated from 2002 and different architects were now in charge of the project.

2. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

Douglas Kearley moved to nominate Cindy Klotz as Chair. The nomination was seconded by Harris Oswald. There were no additional nominations from the floor. The motion was approved. This will be the third consecutive term served by Cindy Klotz.

David Tharp moved to nominate Bunky Ralph as Vice-Chair. The nomination was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer. There were no additional nominations from the floor. The motion was approved. This will be the third consecutive term served by Bunky Ralph.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

025-04/05-CA 658 Government Street
Applicant: McDonald’s Restaurants
Received: 2/14/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 3/31/05 1) 2/28/05 2)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Nature of Project: Demolish existing non-historic restaurant & re-construct new restaurant as per submitted plans.

The building site is located on the north side of Government Street between Washington and South Dearborn Streets.

The existing front of the restaurant is situated within 5’ of the sidewalk with mature landscaping between the building wall and the sidewalk. The existing building is the only structure on the north side of the street between Washington and South Dearborn Streets. The remainder of the block is taken up with parking for the restaurant.

The proposed building measures approximately 45’ wide by approximately 105’ long.

The building faces south towards Government Street, and the front building line is located at a distance of 37’ from the sidewalk. The proposed building is one story brick veneer over concrete block on a slab-on-grade foundation. The ground plan is rectangular in design. The overall wall height is 17’ to the top of the parapet, with areas at the corners, the entrance, and over the drive thru windows raised to 19’-8”. The glazing system is anodized aluminum with clear insulated glass. A flat roof will be hidden behind the parapet wall.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation – concrete slab-on-grade
- b. façade – brick veneer over concrete block
- c. doors – clear glass in anodized frames
- d. windows –clear glass in bronze anodized frames
- e. awnings – green metal
- f. roof – flat concealed behind a parapet

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 restaurant
3,I	Placement and Orientation	
3,II	Massing and Scale	
3,III	Façade Elements	
3,IV	Materials and Ornamentation	
3, IV, A	Appropriate Materials for New Residential Construction	

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

3,I

- I. **Placement and Orientation:** The guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
- A. Setbacks in the Church Street East Historic District range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with a 5'-25' setback.
 - B. The proposed building site is located on the footprint of the existing building.
 - C. The existing setback is 5'.
 - D. The proposed setback is approximately 37'.
 - E. The extra distance is to accommodate an internal circle of traffic flow.

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 multiple examples of fast food restaurants in the Historic Districts.
 2. The proposed building is a 1 story brick veneer structure.
 - B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
 1. There are no other historic buildings within this block.
 2. The existing restaurant has a slab-on-grade foundation.
 3. The Arby's restaurant directly across the street has a slab-on-grade foundation.
 4. The proposed foundation is concrete slab-on-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 commercial roof shapes exist in the Church Street East Historic District, but the most common are flat roofs behind a parapet.

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 clear glass in bronze anodized frames is a common design element found in new construction throughout the Historic Districts.
 2. The use of a rusticated base with brick veneer and a header bands below the parapet add interest to the elevation.

3, IV

IV. **Materials and Ornamentation:**

- A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
 - 1. There are a number of commercial brick veneer structures in the Church Street East 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. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

V. **Miscellaneous:**

- A. The existing parking will remain unchanged.
- B. The existing brick and iron fence around the perimeter of the property will remain.
- C. The drive-thru area between the sidewalk and the building will be stamped concrete as per submitted photograph. This answers a recommendation of ARB staff by the applicant.
- D. There will only be one menu board per drive-thru lane.
- E. There will be a canopy over the menu board as per submitted photograph.
- F. Building signage includes four golden "M"s, each 16' square for a total of 64 square feet of signage.

Staff recommends approval of the application with the following conditions:

- 1. That the menu board poles be painted dark green to match the awnings.
- 2. That the canopies over the menu boards be painted dark green to match the awnings.
- 3. That the area between the sidewalk and the street be landscaped with liriopie or other low-maintenance plant as opposed to colored aggregate.
- 4. That there be a planting buffer between the proposed front drive and the city sidewalk.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Hilary McKone was present to speak on behalf of the application. She stated that McDonald's had no issue with painting the drive-through canopies green. Tommy Jordan, who had taken care of the plantings at this location for many years, stated that there is a problem trying to grow plants under the canopy of oaks. Jim Barnes was also present and stated that he would be willing to install plants in this location, but that it would need to be replanted each year after Mardi Gras.

Devereaux Bemis added that the applicants had appeared before the Technical Review Committee and had agreed to change the paving material at the front of the store to make it more pedestrian friendly.

Tilmon Brown stated that the east side elevation was flat and thought that reducing the flat expanse of brick could be achieved through adding windows or recessing brick to appear as bricked up windows, etc. The interior of the area in question is allocated for self-serve beverages.

Ross Holladay, a Conti Street neighbor, was present to voice his concern over the possibility of increased truck traffic on Dearborn Street. He also addressed the issue of noise and pointed out that pay phones were located at the southeast corner of the development. It is in this location that there is loitering. Wanda Cochran advised Mr. Holladay to contact Urban Development and Traffic Engineering about his concerns; the ARB would be reviewing the building design and site plan to determine if it will harm the adjacent historic district.

Regarding a pending application before the Planning Commission, Richard Olsen of UDD stated that curb cuts are considered in that application.

The Board asked about a lighting plan since there were codes regulating light spill, however, the Chair stated that the Board will review only the design of the lighting fixtures. The Board also requested specifics on the dumpster enclosure.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed tabling the motion until additional information was submitted regarding the lighting plan and east elevation modifications.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved to table the application. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and approved. Since time is of the essence for the applicant, materials may be submitted by Friday, March 4th in order to be placed on the agenda of the March 14th meeting.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

026-04/05-CA 256 State Street
Applicant: Miller Hamilton Snider & Odom, Owners, Douglas Kearley, Architect
Received: 2/14/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 3/31/05 1) 2/28/05 2)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-B, Residential Business
Conflicts of Interest Douglas Kearley and Tilmon Brown recused themselves from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Construct two storage sheds – one 6’ x 8’ freestanding, and one attached, 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	Accessory Structures	Construct 2 storage sheds

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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment:

- A. The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.
 - 1. The main complex is a series of historic and contemporary structures maintaining the look of separate structures but connected at the rear.
 - 2. The proposed accessory structure designs are compatible with the main buildings.
 - 3. The proposed accessory structure building materials are compatible with the main buildings.
 - 4. The proposed building materials are as follows:
 - foundation – slab on grade
 - exterior walls:
 - attached shed - painted board & batten siding
 - freestanding shed – painted hardiplank lap siding
 - exterior doors – 1”x4” beaded edge on 1”x4” frame with false strap hinges
 - roofing – asphalt shingles over plywood decking

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.
There was no public comment to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

David Tharp moved to find the facts enumerated in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that based upon the evidence presented in the application the Board finds the proposed work does not impair the building or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for the work. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/28/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

027-04/05-CA 1758 New Hamilton Street
Applicant: Linda Olen, Owner/ Douglas Kearley, Architect
Received: 2/14/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 3/31/05 1) 2/28/05 2)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Construct rear addition measuring 27’-8” by width of existing rear residence as per submitted plan. Addition to contain new master bedroom and bathroom, new den and new 18’ x 20’ covered porch.

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	Additions	Construct rear addition

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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment:

- A. The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.
 - 1. The main structure is a one and one-half story wood frame bungalow with recessed three bay front porch, end gable roof and a large central front dormer.
 - 2. The proposed addition occurs across the rear of the residence.
 - 3. The proposed one story addition squares off the rear elevation, and measures 27’-8” deep by the existing width of the rear elevation.
 - 4. A 6’ deep recessed porch is supported by 3 12” square wood box columns matching the front porch columns.
 - 5. The Materials List and Design Details are appropriate for this structure.
 - a. siding to match existing;
 - b. brick piers with framed lattice infill to match existing;
 - c. wood box columns;
 - d. cornice, soffit, fascia, corner boards to match those of the main house;
 - 6. The addition will be approximately 5’ from the property line, following the existing line established by the main house.
 - 7. The Historic District Overlay Ordinance will compensate for this narrow setback.
 - 8. The proposed addition will not be visible from public view.

Staff recommends Approval as Submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Linda Olen was present but had no additions to the application. There were no public comments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswalt moved to find the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Bobby Brown and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved that the addition did not impair the historic structure of the adjacent historic district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for the work.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/28/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

028-04/05-CA 955 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Ann A. Cowley
Received: 2/21/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/7/05 1) 2/28/05 2)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Install 6’ high wood privacy fence as per submitted site plan. Fence to have a flat top and left natural to weather.

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 wood privacy fence in rear & side yards.

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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment:

- A. The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.
 - 1. The main structure is a one story frame Victorian cottage.
 - 2. The proposed wood fence is 6’ in height.
 - 3. The fence will be unpainted, left to weather.
 - 4. There are no setback issues as this is a lot in the middle of the block and the fence will be located on the east and south property lines.

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. There were no public comments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved to find the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that based upon the application and the facts presented in the staff report that the proposed work will not impair the historic house or adjacent district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work be issued. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/28/06