

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
March 14, 2005

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair Cindy Klotz.

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

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

Members Absent: Lynda Burkett, Michael Mayberry, 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>
Jeanelle Cala	1553 Fearnway 36604	019-04/05-CA
Hilary McKone	3850 N. Causeway Blvd., Suite 1600 Metairie, LA 70002	025-04/05-CA
Jim Barnes	2204 Government St. 36606	025-04/05-CA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

David Tharp moved to approve the minutes as mailed. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved.

APPROVAL OF MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:

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

MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: P. M. Gardner Construction Consultants
Property Address: 1323 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 2/15/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building with architectural shingles, sablewood in color.
2. Applicant's Name: Jim Wagoner
Property Address: 1805 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 2/15/05 weh
Work Approved: Repair rotten wood on front of residence with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Re-paint front of house in existing color scheme.
3. Applicant's Name: Langan Construction Company
Property Address: 601 Government Street
Date of Approval: 2/16/05 asc
Work Approved: Install new built up flat roof to match existing in profile and dimension.
- 4 Applicant's Name: Dobson Sheet Metal
Property Address: 1061 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: 2/16/05 asc

- Work Approved: Install new modified bitumen roof to match existing.
- 5. Applicant's Name: Slate and Tile Roofing
Property Address: 1008 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 2/17/05 weh
Work Approved: Repair slate roof and turret with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and color.
- 6. Applicant's Name: Baylor and Associates
Property Address: 452 E Government Street
Date of Approval: 2/17/04 weh
Work Approved: Install signage measuring 8'9" long by 2' high. Colors to be black background, gold text, red star. Sign to be framed in Honduras mahogany frame.
- 7. Applicant's Name: Grace Lutheran Church
Property Address: 1356 Government Street
Date of Approval: 2/17/05 weh March 17, 2005
Work Approved: Re-roof church with synthetic slate roofing.
- 8. Applicant's Name: Kimberly Tew
Property Address: 9 Semmes Avenue
Date of Approval: 2/18/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof shed with shingles to match the main house. Repair/replace rotten wood as necessary on front porch and north side of main house to include foundation sills, siding, etc. All new wood to match existing in dimension and profile. New wood to be primed in preparation for painting.
- 9. Applicant's Name: Patricia Finkbohner
Property Address: 1559 Blair Avenue
Date of Approval: 2/21/05 asc
Work Approved: Paint exterior in the following Olympic color scheme: body-Silk Sails; trim-Turban Shell; shutters and porch deck-Royal Hunter Green; door-Apple a Day with brown added.
- 10. Applicant's Name: Coulson Roofing
Property Address: 803 Government Street
Date of Approval: 2/21/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof to match existing with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, charcoal in color.
- 11. Applicant's Name: Graham Roofing Company
Property Address: 63 LeMoyne Place
Date of Approval: 2/21/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building with three tab fiberglass shingles onyx black in color.

12. Applicant's Name: Louis Felis
 Property Address: 206 S. Broad Street
 Date of Approval: 2/21/05 asc
 Work Approved: Repair roof with materials to match existing slate roof in profile and dimension. Repair water damaged wood on fascia and siding as necessary with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint new materials in existing color scheme.
13. Applicant's Name: Ronald A. Suggs
 Property Address: 354 Regina Avenue
 Date of Approval: 2/22/05
 Work Approved: Replace rotten floor on upstairs rear porch with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Replace missing shingles with roofing matching existing in profile, dimension and color. Repair or replace rotten trim around cornice & fascia with materials matching existing in profile and dimension.
14. Applicant's Name: Aubrey L. Dees
 Property Address: 257 Marine Street
 Date of Approval: 2/23/05 weh
 Work Approved: Install storage shed as per ARB stock plans. Building to be 6' from side and rear property line. Paint to match main house.
15. Applicant's Name: Hargrove & Associates, Owners, Ben Cummings, Architect
 Property Address: 210 South Washington Avenue
 Date of Approval: 2/23/04 weh
 Work Approved: Demolish non-contributing lumber shed at rear of building. Remove deteriorated canopy and construct new canopy as per submitted designs. Rework storefront/window openings as per submitted plans. NOTE: This work was previously approved by the ARB pending approval from the Planning Commission for rezoning. That approval was granted at the last Planning Commission meeting.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. **019-04/05-CA** 1553 Fearnway
Applicant: Jeanelle Millet Cala
Nature of Request: Construct a circular concrete driveway in front yard as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

2. **025-04/05-CA**
Applicant:
Nature of Request:
- 658 Government Street
McDonalds Restaurants
Demolish existing restaurant and construct new restaurant as per submitted designs.

APPROVED with conditions. Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **029-04/05-CA**
Applicant:
Nature of Request:
- 1960 Government Street
Title Max, Owner/ DeNyse Signs, Contractor
Install 2 signs, each measuring approximately 30 square feet, as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached

ADDENDUM:

1. **030-04/05-CA**
Applicant:
Nature of Request:
- 210 Dauphin Street
Steven Mark Stafford
Install new roof and extend rear of two story building to property line as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

1. Devereaux Bemis announced that the guideline committee had begun work on revising the Design guidelines. Anyone wishing a copy of the modified guidelines at this stage, should request a copy.
2. Welcome packets are being prepared for newcomers to the historic districts. It has taken several years to begin receiving names from the Water and Sewer Board. MHDC anticipates receiving a list of new residents each month.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

019-04/05-CA 1553 Fearnway
Applicant: Jeanelle Millet Cala
Received: 2/09/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/02/05 1) 1/24/05 2) 3/14/05 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Construct a circular concrete driveway in front yard as per submitted plans.
Conflicts of Interest: Cindy Klotz recused herself from discussion and voting on the application.
History of the Project: The ARB considered this application at the January 24, 2005 meeting. A copy of the Certified Record is attached.

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	Install circular drive

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 not in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.
 - 1. The main structure is a ca. 1927 Tudor Revival residence.
 - 2. The Design Review Guidelines state that “Circular drives and parking pads in the front yard are generally inappropriate in the historic districts.”
 - 3. The linear front footage of the lot is approximately 102'. Typical lots in the Fearnway sub-division are 75'-80' wide.
 - 4. The site situation is unique in that the house has a Fearnway address but the driveway is off Catherine Street.
 - 5. On the opposite side of the entrance to Fearnway, the residences at 56 and 1552 Fearnway share a common alley off Catherine Street, providing ample safety for ingress/egress.
 - 6. The circular drive is proposed to provide a safe means of access to the property.
 - 7. Heavy landscaping is proposed to minimize the effect of the circular drive.
 - 8. There are no other circular drives on Fearnway.

9. No application has been submitted to Traffic Engineering for a second curb cut.
10. The originally proposed circular drive was 20' in width. The revised proposal for the circular drive has been reduced to 12' with brick and concrete paving at the proposed entrance steps.

Staff recommends denial as submitted based on the fact that circular drives are not allowed in front yards and such a circular drive would impair the historic integrity of the property and the district.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Jeanelle Cala was present to discuss the application. She stated that A.9 in the staff report was no longer correct. She had obtained approved from Traffic Engineering for an additional curb cut.

Devereaux Bemis added that the applicant had agreed to reduce the width of the driveway from 18ft. to 12 ft. and to use a stamped concrete to lessen its visual effect. Although staff had recommended denial based upon the guidelines, should the Board decide to grant the request, the unusual nature of the lot might be a justification for the exception.

Wanda Cochran pointed out that the guidelines state that circular drives are *generally inappropriate*. However, Board decisions are made on a case by case basis and the facts brought out at the hearing will determine the Board's ruling.

Douglas Kearley added that certain facts should be appended to the Staff report. These include:

11. The lot is pie shaped narrowing to 15 ft. at the rear thus preventing a car from turning around and exiting forward from the lot.
12. Catherine Street is a heavily traveled north-south artery.
13. The existing driveway exits into the intersection of Catherine Street and Fearnway.
14. The location and use of the existing driveway creates a hardship due to safety.
15. Circular drives, while rare, are not unknown in the historic districts, e.g., the Bragg-Mitchell House, Shell Cottage at 1818 Springhill Avenue, the Luce House on Levert, the Luce House on Lanier, the Slaton House on Levert, to name a few.

There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Staff had no comments from the public to read into the minutes.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

David Tharp moved to add the facts enumerated by Douglas Kearley during the testimony portion of the proceedings and to modify fact 9 in the staff report dealing with the approval of a curb cut by Traffic Engineering. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved that, based upon the information in the application and the testimony supplied at the meeting, that the proposed work will not impair the house or the adjacent historic district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness should be issued for the work. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and approved on a 6 to 1 vote, Bunky Ralph opposing the motion.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 03/14/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

025-04/05-CA 658 Government Street
Applicant: McDonald's Restaurants
Received: 3/04/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/16/05 1) 2/28/05 2) 3/14/05

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
History of the Project:

At the February 28, 2005 Board Meeting, the ARB tabled this application pending the submission of additional information. A copy of the Certified Record is attached.

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 a parapet wall capped with pre-cast stone.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation – concrete slab-on-grade
- b. façade – brick veneer over concrete block
- c. doors – clear glass in bronze anodized frames
- d. windows – clear glass in bronze anodized frames
- e. awnings – green metal
- f. roof – flat concealed behind a pre-cast stone capped 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 brick and iron fence around the perimeter of the property will remain.
- B. 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.
- C. There will only be one menu board per drive-thru lane.
- D. There will be a canopy over the menu board as per submitted photograph.
- E. The canopies over the menu boards will be painted dark green to match the awnings.
- F. Building signage includes four golden "M"s, each 16' square for a total of 64 square feet of signage.

Staff recommends approval of Scheme A, which has an additional metal awning on the west elevation between the first and second bays.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Hilary McKone and Jim Barnes were present to answer questions concerning the application. Ms. McKone commented that a brick sample, cast stone sample, 3 variations of the west elevation and the garbage enclosure had been sent for Board review. Cindy Klotz commented that information on the light fixtures had also been submitted. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public to read into the record. Tilmon Brown questioned whether there would be ground cover at the front, however, there is already a green space provided between the drive and the sidewalk.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved that the design as submitted would impair the adjacent historic district. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and approved. Douglas Kearley moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness with the conditions that Scheme A showing an extension of the awning into the first bay of the west elevation be used in the design, that the menu boards and canopies over the menus boards will be painted dark green, and that a planting buffer be used in the right of way rather than colored aggregate. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 03/14/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

029-04/05-CA 1960 Government Street
Applicant: Title Max, Owner/ DeNyse Signs, Sign Contractor
Received: 3/04/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/18/05 1) 3/14/05 2)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Government Street Sign Corridor

Nature of Project: Install two wall mounted signs, measuring approximately 116” x approximately 3’, as per submitted design.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES AND DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Government Street Corridor

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Wall Signs	Install 2 wall mounted signs

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 Guidelines state that “The total allowable square footage for the display area of building signage is 64 square feet.”
 - 2. The building itself is non-historic and is not under the control of the ARB. Proposed sign colors are red and white on a blue background.
 - 3. The proposed sign material is high density urethane.

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

- 1. That prior to the sign being installed the building colors be changed to be compatible with the sign colors.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

A representative of DeNyse Signs in Orlando, Florida was present to answer Board questions. Although painting of the building to coordinate with the proposed sign is not within the purview of the Board, the applicant reported that the owner has agreed to paint the building. He was unsure about the color, however, he reported that the company will often use a royal blue.

Tilmon Brown questioned the proportion of the sign in relation to the parapet where it will be placed.

There was no one else 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

Bunky Ralph moved to find the facts in the staff report. Douglas Kearley seconded the motion which was approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that the sign does not impair the building or the adjacent area and that a Certificate of Appropriateness should be issued for the work. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and approved, with Tilmon Brown opposing the motion.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 03/14/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

030-04/05-CA 210 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Steven Mark Stafford
Received: 3/7/05

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District
Nature of Project: Reconstruct roof and increase height of second floor rear per submitted plans.

Since this project appeared as an addendum to the agenda, there were no staff comments regarding the project.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the request. The Board questioned staff regarding the urgency of adding this item to the agenda without elevations to consider. Staff stated that, since the building had burned some months ago, the City is anxious for the owner to proceed with repairs.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Using the submitted drawing, the Board considered the proposed construction and discussed its appropriateness for the building. The issue of introducing window openings into the wall was discussed, however, since the building is on the property line, no window openings will be allowed by code. Brick will be matched as closely as possible, however, staff reminded the Board, that the west wall had at one time been an interior wall connecting to the building next door. The roof will be slightly sloped with modified bitumen roofing material and metal parapet.

FINDING OF FACT

Staff suggested some facts for the Board to consider:

1. the building had burned
2. the building had been a contributing building in the district, but had lost integrity as a result of the fire
3. the building had lost its roof
4. side walls had been a party wall.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that the proposed work would not impair the building or the adjacent district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness should be issued for the work. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 03/14/06.