

**MOBILE HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
March 24, 2003**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Cindy Klotz called the Architectural Review Board Meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

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

Present: Robert Brown, Buffy Donlon, Cindy Klotz, Dennis Carlisle, Nick Holmes, III,
Douglas Kearley

Absent: Karen Carr, Bill Christian, Dan McCleave, Jackie McCracken, Bunky Ralph
A quorum was declared after the roll was called.

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Virginia Andreades	115 Beverly Court	042-02/03-CA
Callieroy Andreades	115 Beverly Court	042-02/03-CA
Kathleen Reilly	110 Beverly Court	042-02/03-CA
Russell Reilly	110 Beverly Court	042-02/03-CA
Larry Thomas	Thomas Roofing	041-02/03-CA
Joe Pomeroy	Thomas Roofing	041-02/03-CA
Bill Ward	Emack Slate	041-02/03-CA
Tilmon Brown	13 North Dearborn St.	007-02/03-CA
Harris Oswalt	301 West Street	(new RB alternate)

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES and the MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF
APPROPRIATENESS:** February 24, 2003 Meeting

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the minutes and mid-month approvals as mailed.
Nick Holmes, III seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. 1308 Chamberlain Avenue: Norman Phillips.
Install 4 exterior storm windows custom made to match the profile of the
existing sash. Frames to be white to match existing trim.

APPROVED 3/5/03 weh

2. 200 Rapier Avenue: Robert Peck.
Re-roof garage with new 9/12 pitch roof, in keeping with the main house. Roofing material to match that of the main house. Repaint garage to match color scheme of the main house.

APPROVED 3/7/03 weh

3. 34 McPhillips Avenue: Michael Glossic
Repaint house as per existing: body-chocolate, trim-white, porch deck-dark green. Replace rotten wood as necessary with new to match existing in profile and dimension.

APPROVED 3/11/03 jss

C. OLD BUSINESS:

007-02/03-CA 501 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Charles Muncaster, Architect/ Tilmon Brown, Contractor
Nature of Project: Rehabilitate existing two story masonry building as per submitted plans.

APPROVED as submitted. The Board requested that a railing design for the balcony be submitted to staff. See attached Certified Record.

D. NEW BUSINESS:

040-02/03-CA 300 Chatham Street
Applicant: Eichold Company
Nature of Project: Install 3 ft. high picket fence painted white as per submitted plans.

APPROVED with conditions: The Board required the fence to be located behind the existing azaleas and that the wood be left natural to weather. See attached Certified Record.

041-02/03-CA 201 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Dr. Coleman Oswalt/Thomas Roofing Co., Inc.
Nature of Project: Remove slate roof and replace with synthetic slate system.

APPROVED as submitted. See attached Certified Record.

042-02/03-CA 110 Beverly Court
Applicant: Warren R. and Kathleen Reilly
Nature of Project: Request to retain 6.5 ft. wood privacy fence painted white installed without ARB approval. Also to construct an 8 ft. high wood privacy fence of the same design on east property line abutting adjacent architect's office and residence; to add black canvas awnings over front and rear doors; and to replace light fixtures on front porch and in front yard.

See Attached Certified Record.

Existing 6.5' wood privacy fence:

APPROVED with conditions: the fence be painted dark green, color submitted to staff for mid-month approval

Request for 8' fence:

DENIED. A 6.5' wood privacy fence was approved for this location to match the existing fence.

Black canvas awnings:

APPROVED as submitted.

Exterior lighting fixtures:

TABLED. The Board requested a scaled elevation showing the location of the proposed fixtures and their relationship to the existing front door and awnings.

043-02/03-CA 6 S. Joachim Street

Applicant: Centre for the Living Arts

Nature of Project: Request to remove Saenger Theatre sign at corner of Joachim and Conti Streets.

APPROVED as submitted. The Review Board noted that a replacement sign should be presented to the Board for review and approval.

OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

Discussion of "Mothballing Historic Buildings: A Practical Guide to Protecting and Preserving Mobile's Vacant Historic Buildings."

Staff explained that the final draft of the mothball plan was ready for review. The Board discussed the plan, and Robert Brown suggested that a Building Security component be added. Staff will incorporate this suggestion into the final draft, which will be reviewed a final time by the committee before the final draft is brought before the Board for adoption.

The Meeting Adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

007-02/03 – CA 501 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Charles Muncaster, Architect/Tilmon Brown, Contractor/John Switcer & Max Morey, Owners
Received: 10/28/02, 11/12/02 , 3/14/03 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 12/ 20/02 1) 11/4/02 2) 11/20/02 3) 3/24/03

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Additional Permits Required: (5) Building, Electrical, Plumbing, HVAC, Right-of-Way
Nature of Project: Rehabilitate the existing building for use as four loft condominiums.
History of the Project: This is the third review of exterior elevations to be submitted by the owners. Much of the Staff Comments from the previous review are applicable. Major design changes include:
Moving the balcony from the front elevation to the west elevation and creating balconies for the apartment
Creating a true storefront along Dauphin Street to house office space, as opposed to the false storefront concealing an apartment.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Guidelines

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
Building Condition 3	Original Design Significantly Altered	Rehabilitate existing storefront
2, a	Maintaining Basic Material Characteristics	
3	Upper Stories Above the Storefront	Install new windows in existing openings
4	Ornament and Design	Install replicated window hoods matching those on the west elevation
5	Balconies, Galleries and Awnings	Reconstruct balcony from historic photographs
Building Condition 3	Original Design Significantly Altered	Rehabilitate west facade

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on information contained in the Application, in Staff's judgement:

- A. The rehabilitation of the non-historic storefront, using historic photographic documentation as a source for information is acceptable according to the *Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Guidelines, Building Condition 3 – Original Design Significantly Altered*
1. The existing storefront in question is not original to the structure, nor is it historic.
 2. The proposed changes to the front elevation are based on historic photographs.
 3. The proposed changes would restore the front elevation to its original design using new materials.

- B. The reconstruction of the wood storefront system at the pedestrian level is appropriate according to the *Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Guidelines, Section 2 – Maintaining Basic Material Characteristics*
 - 1. The storefront is designed with a bulkhead-storefront-transom configuration, similar to the original storefront design.

- C. The proposal to remove the existing masonry infill in original window openings on the second level is appropriate according to the *Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Guidelines, Section 3 – Upper Stories Above the Storefront*.
 - 1. The new wood windows and doors onto the balcony will replicate those shown in the historic photograph.

- D. The proposal to install window hoods above the second floor windows is acceptable according to the *Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Guidelines, Section 4 – Ornament and Detail*.
 - 1. The proposed new window hoods match those on the west façade of the building and the historic photograph verifies their location and existence.

- E. The proposal to reconstruct the balcony is appropriate according to the *Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Guidelines, Section 5 - Balconies, Galleries and Awnings*.
 - 1. The proposed new balcony replicates the balcony shown in the historic photograph.
 - 2. The balcony will require a permit from Right-of-Way.

- F. The proposal to install four individual entrances on the west elevation is appropriate according to the *Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Guidelines, Building Condition 3- Design Significantly Altered*.
 - 1. The current deteriorated condition of the west wall will require significant structural repair and brick replacement/repainting.
 - 2. The proposed revised window configuration, sets of 4 two-over-two wood sash with transoms above are more compatible with the commercial nature of the district.

Staff suggests that the Review Board grant Approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Contractor Tilmon Brown was present to answer any questions of the Board. Mr. Brown explained that the window lintels would be replicated on the Lawrence Street elevation. Brown also explained that the a/c units will be concealed in closets on the second floor porches. Brown also noted that the staff comments mentioned a balcony on Dauphin Street. The most recent set of plans eliminate this balcony.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Douglas Kearley noted that there was no balcony railing design submitted. He noted that the original balcony railing was visible in historic photographs, and could be replicated. A design should be submitted to staff.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Douglas Kearley moved that based upon the facts presented in the application, and at the public hearing, the Board finds that staff comments A-F, with the exception of fact E, be acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Nick Holmes, and passed by unanimous vote.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Nick Holmes, III moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Buffy Donlon seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Committee Members voting on the application: Robert Brown, Buffy Donlon, Cindy Klotz, Dennis Carlisle, Nick Holmes, III, Douglas Kearley

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/24/04

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

040-03/03-CA 300 Chatham Street
Applicant: Sam Eichold
Received: 3/10/03 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: **4/24/03** **1) 3/24/03 2) 3)**

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Nature of Project: Install 3 ft. high picket fence painted white as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of work</u>
3	Fences Walls and Gates	Install 3' high picket fence painted white with walk through gate of same design.

STAFF COMMENTS

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

1. Guidelines state that fences should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with its relationship to the historic district.
 - a. the residence is a mid-19th century brick residence with a stuccoed garage addition on Augusta Street.
 - b. the picket fence as proposed is illustrated in the Design Guidelines.
 - c. similar picket fences can be found throughout the neighborhood such as at 1063 Augusta Street
2. The height of the proposed fence is 3 ft.
 - a. the proposed fence meets height requirements set out by the Zoning Ordinance for fences within the 20 ft. side yard setback.
 - b. the fence is restricted to a triangular portion of the side yard and could be located behind existing azalea bushes.

Staff recommends that the application be approved with the following conditions: fence to be located behind the bushes and left natural to weather.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Nick Holmes, III moved that based on the facts presented in the application, the Board finds staff comments 1 and 2 to be acceptable as findings of fact. Holmes amended his motion to include the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness with the conditions recommended by staff that the fence be placed behind the azaleas and be left natural to weather. Dennis Carlisle seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Committee Members voting on the application: Robert Brown, Buffy Donlon, Cindy Klotz, Dennis Carlisle, Nick Holmes, III, Douglas Kearley

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/24/04

FINDING OF FACT

Buffy Donlon moved that based on the facts presented in the application and at the public hearing, the Board finds staff comments 1 and 2 be acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley, which passed by unanimous vote.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Nick Holmes, III moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Buffy Donlon seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Committee Members voting on the application: Robert Brown, Buffy Donlon, Cindy Klotz, Dennis Carlisle, Nick Holmes, III, Douglas Kearley

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/24/04

- c. the usual side setback in R-1 is 20 ft. before fences may be higher than 3 ft.
 - d. the variance was granted for 6.5 ft.
 - e. any fence along the rear property line must be no higher than 6.5 ft. for the first 20 ft. before it could step up to 8 ft.
4. The Guidelines state that awnings will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
- a. The proposed awning locations over entry doors are appropriate.
 - b. The proposed awning valance is represented in a dentil motif.
 - c. Typically, the Review Board requires the awning valances to be straight.

Staff recommends approval of the 6.5' fence with the following changes: that a finished cap be added and that the fence be painted dark green.

Staff recommends denial of the 8' fence because an 8' fence adjoining a commercial property with a residential component cannot be justified. 8' fences are appropriate where residential adjoins heavy commercial such as fast food restaurants, gas stations, etc.

Staff recommends approval of the placement of the awnings, with the condition that the valance be straight.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

As part of the staff's introduction to the project, a statement received from neighbor Nancy Seibt was read into the record, and entered into the Certified Record as Exhibit "A".

Neighbors Callero and Virginia Andreades were present to speak in opposition to the design, placement and color of the fence. They presented photo boards of the houses in Beverly Court, along with photos of the subject property. They read a prepared statement, which was entered into the Certified Record as Exhibit "B".

Warren and Kathleen Reilly stated that they did not move into the neighborhood to downgrade the property in the neighborhood. They further noted that they intended to landscape in front of the fence with a 3' high landscape buffer.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Nick Holmes, III found fault with staff comment 2c regarding the placement of a cap on privacy fences. He noted that the Board commonly approves fences without caps. Holmes also found fault with staff comment 4c regarding the requirement of awnings to have straight valances. He noted that the Board commonly approved awnings with dentil and scalloped valances.

Dennis Carlisle noted that if the existing fence were set back further from the corner of the house, its effect on the neighborhood would be minimized. He noted that other existing fences are set back from the front edge. It was determined that this fence is recessed 12" – 18" from the front line of the house.

Carlisle also noted that the wood fence was in conflict with the brick residence.

FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Dennis Carlisle made a motion to require the applicants to move the fence to the halfway point of the house and paint the fence dark green. Buffy Donlon seconded the motion. The motion failed 4-2.

Dennis Carlisle and Buffy Donlon voted in favor of the motion. Nick Holmes, III, Douglas Kearley, Cindy Klotz and Robert Brown voted against the motion.

Nick Holmes, III made a motion to approve the fence in its existing location with the condition that the fence be painted dark green and that a design for the gates be submitted to staff. Robert Brown seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Douglas Kearley moved to deny the request to erect an 8' fence along the east property line, and to approve the awnings as submitted. Buffy Donlon seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the erection of a 6.5' wood privacy fence along the east property line to match that fence already existing on the property. Nick Holmes, III seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Buffy Donlon moved to table the request to install exterior lighting fixtures. Nick Holmes, III seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote. The applicants were requested to submit a scaled drawing of the front elevation showing the proposed fixtures relating to the front door and awning.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

043-02/03 – CA 6 North Joachim Street
Applicant: Centre for the Living Arts/ Saenger Theater
Received: 2/28/03 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/15/0 1) 3/24/03 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4: General Business
Additional Permits Required: (1) Demolition
Nature of Project: Remove existing marquee sign as per submitted application.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Design Guidelines

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
6-A	Miscellaneous Provisions: Signage	Remove existing sign

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on information contained in the Application, in Staff’s judgement:

1. The Guidelines state that sign materials should compliment the façade materials of the building. Simple designs are most effective and encouraged.
 - a. The existing sign dates from the mid-20th century.
 - b. Under current Sign Design Guidelines, the existing sign is inappropriate for display in the historic district.
 - c. The removal of the sign would not materially impair the integrity of the structure or the district.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dennis Carlisle noted that the building should be patched where the sign was removed. The Board noted that designs for a replacement sign should be submitted for review and approval.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Douglas Kearley moved that based on the facts presented in the application, the Board finds staff comments 1, a, b & c to be acceptable as finding of fact. Dennis Carlisle seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Committee Members voting on the application: Robert Brown, Buffy Donlon, Cindy Klotz, Dennis Carlisle, Nick Holmes, III, Douglas Kearley

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/24/04

