

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
March 8, 2004

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Cindy Klotz called the meeting to order at 2:58 p.m.

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

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

Members Absent: Michael Mayberry

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

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Merry Sturdivant	161 W. Warren Street	047-03/04-CA
Douglas Helms	69 Etheridge Street	033-03/04-CA
Corinna Luce	104 Levert Avenue	046-03/04-CA
Steven Arroyo	300 N. Joachim Street	053-03/04-CA
Tish Rankin	300 N. Joachim Street	053-03/04-CA
T. Latham	51 Oakland Avenue	033-03/04-CA
Linda Snapp	30900 Wellington Ct.	033-03/04-CA
Terry Plauche	P.O. Box 81182, 36689	033-03/04-CA
Dan Elcan	P.O. Box 8326, 36689	033-03/04-CA
Ron Jackson	City of Mobile	033-03/04-CA
Greg Saad	3290 Dauphin Street	033-03/04-CA
John Vallas	3290 Dauphin Street	033-03/04-CA
Richard Olsen	City of Mobile	033-03/04-CA
E.H. Anderson, Jr.	2288 Burgett Rd., 36605	048-03/04-CA

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the minutes of February 9, 2004. The motion was seconded by Robert Brown and unanimously approved.

APPROVAL OF THE MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the mid-month COAs. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Greg Luce
Property Address: 808 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 1/27/04 jss
Work Approved: Reroof rear addition with charcoal gray asphalt shingles

2. Applicant's Name: Building and Maintenance Co.
Property Address: 218 S. Dearborn Street
Date of Approval: 1/29/04 weh
Work Approved: Repair rotten wood as necessary with new to match existing in profile and dimension.
Repaint the house in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
Body: SW2857 Peace yellow
Trim and back door: White
Shutters and porch: SW2816 Rockwood bark green

3. Applicant's Name: Carl Thomas
Property Address: 160 Charles St.
Date of Approval: 2/2/04 jss
Work Approved: Repaint in existing color scheme, white trim and black ironwork.

4. Applicant's Name: Langan Construction Company
Property Address: 601 Government Street
Date of Approval: March 18, 2004 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof flat roof with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension.

5. Applicant's Name: Joe Arrington Construction Co./Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
Property Address: 1157 Selma Street
Date of Approval: March 18, 2004/5/04 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof with Timberline, slate grey shingles. Remove existing burglar bars at windows and doors. Repair existing siding, scrape prime and paint. (color scheme to match 261 Rapier) Remove existing iron handrails and replace with new Chinese Chippendale handrails. Remove plywood form brackets at porch roof and repaint existing iron supports. Install 2 double head flood lights with shades as per submitted plans. Remove existing aluminum windows at north elevation and install new wood double hung 6 over 6 windows to fit existing openings (except at living room) front and side windows to have operable wood louvered blinds. Install French doors and wood steps with Chinese Chippendale railing from dining room. Parge existing treads of front steps with concrete.

6. Applicant's Name: Paula Flowers
Property Address: 65 N. Monterey Street
Date of Approval: 2/5/04 weh
Work Approved: Repaint house in the following color scheme:
Body: ballet white
Trim: ultra white 93-42A
Porch floor, steps and foundation: Black Forest Green 46

7. Applicant's Name: Jim Wagoner & Charles Howard
Property Address: 1805 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 2/5/04 weh
Work Approved: Install awnings over rear doors as per submitted material sample and design.

8. Applicant's Name: Fresche
Property Address: 1714 Dauphin Street.
Date of Approval: 2/9/04 jss
Work Approved: Install temporary banner under front awning above front doors. 33' high x 9' long. To be hung no more than 30 days.

9. Applicant's Name: Image Designs for Starbucks
Property Address: 205 Government Street – Government Plaza
Date of Approval: 2/10/04
Work Requested: Install signage as per submitted designs.
Government Street Elevation
Router cut 3/16" solid aluminum painted white – measuring 11.17 sf.
Blade sign mounted – radius face hung with black bracket – 6.28 sf.

Note: The application submitted included signage facing the interior of Government Plaza. This includes:
Router cut 3/16" solid aluminum painted white – measuring 16.12 sf

The application also included 2 internally lit plastic signs, one proposed to face Government Street, the other to face west beside the outside entrance. Internally lit plastic signs are not permitted under the City of Mobile's Sign Design Guidelines for Historic Districts. Therefore, approval of these signs is not included in this Certificate of Appropriateness.

10. Applicant's Name: Chad and Elizabeth Marchand
Property Address: 306 McDonald Avenue
Date of Approval: 2/10/04 weh
Work Approved: Construct shed dormer, measuring 8' tall by 17' long with shed roof, pitch to be 1 ½ and 12; 2 new wood 6-over-1 wood sash and wood lap siding on exterior of dormer. Add new 6-over-1 wood sash in rear gable; alter arched casement windows in east and north gables. The proposed new shed dormer will be hidden from the front of the residence by the main roof's cross gable.

Install 3 skylights with crickets on flat portion of main roof.

NOTE: This CoA covers a portion of work previously approved by the Board.

11. Applicant's Name: Hicks Stewart LLC
Property Address: 1206 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 2/10/04 weh
Work Approved: Install pole sign, measuring 3' x 5' double faced (30 sf), as per submitted plans.

12. Applicant's Name: Image Designs for Thompson Engineering
Property Address: 958 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 2/12/04 weh
Work Approved: Install new aluminum sign panel onto existing cement structure as per submitted design. Sign to measure approximately 16 sf.

13. Applicant's Name: Sherman & Jeffries, LLC/ Bancroft Enterprises sign contractor
Property Address: 1107 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 2/12/04 weh
Work Approved: Install pole sign, measuring 2' x 4', double sided, mounted between 2 treated posts. Total signage measures approximately 16 sf.

14. Applicant's Name: Greg Saad/Saad and Vallas
Property Address: 1500 Government Street
Date of Approval: 2/12/04 jdb
Work Approved: Demolish two-story brick hotel.

15. Applicant's Name: Charlotte Lunsford
Property Address: 56 N. Georgia
Date of Approval: 2/13/04 asc
Work Approved: Repair rotten wood as necessary with new materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Add wood shutters as necessary to match existing shuttles. Repaint in existing color scheme.

16. Applicant's Name: Cory Williams
Property Address: 959 Church Street
Date of Approval: 2/17/04 weh
Work Approved: Repair rotten siding on house and rotten decking on porch floor with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing.

17. Applicant's Name: Morgan General Contractor/Phillip Cowart
Property Address: 162 Roper Street
Date of Approval: 2/17/04 weh
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood on siding and window sashes with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing.

18. Applicant's Name: Katherine Welch / Tyrus Cobb
Property Address: 202 Rapier Avenue
Date of Approval: 2/17/04 asc
Work Approved: Repaint house in the following Benjamin Moore color scheme:
Body: HC-31 Waterbury Cream
Trim: Bright White 01
Shutters, Porch Deck: HC69, dark accents
19. Applicant's Name: Thomas Neese
Property Address: 10 N. Hallett Street
Date of Approval: 2/18/04 weh
Work Approved: Repaint house in existing color scheme.
20. Applicant's Name: McAlpine Construction
Property Address: 1100 Government Street
Date of Approval: 2/18/04 jss
Work Approved: Reroof flat roof with materials to match existing in profile and dimension.
21. Applicant's Name: Ray Lamb
Property Address: 1551 Monterey Place
Date of Approval: 2/19/04 jss
Work Approved: Reroof with charcoal gray asphalt shingles. Repaint in existing color scheme. Replace rotten wood as necessary with new wood matching in profile and dimension.
22. Applicant's Name: Jimmy Faircloth
Property Address: 1415 Church Street
Date of Approval: 2/20/04 weh
Work Approved: Construct 16 x 24 storage building using MHDC stock plans. Details of storage building to match that of the main residence. Building to be painted to match the main residence.
23. Applicant's Name: Marvin Fairley
Property Address: 1010 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 2/20/04 weh
Work Approved: Install 4 ft. iron picket fence behind sidewalk. Fence to tie into existing chain link fence, extend across remainder of lot and turn along east property line.

Renewal of previous COA to include: remove asbestos shingles, replace rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile; replace concrete steps with new concrete steps. Paint exterior white with white trim.

This COA replaces COA dated 2-3-98

OLD BUSINESS:

1. **033-03/04-CA** 1500 Government Street
Applicant: Saad-Vallas, Realtors/Clark Geer Latham, Architects, Dan Elcan, Developer
Nature of Project: Construct multi-tenant shopping center as per submitted plans.
Relocate 2 existing structures as per submitted plans.
Demolish 2 existing structures.
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

2. **053-02/03-CA** 256-258 North Claiborne Street
Applicant: John Williams & Associates Architects/ Ted Pitsios, Developer
Nature of Project: Amend previous approval to construct 3 story apartment building as per submitted plans.

APPROVED Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS

1. **046-03/04-CA** 104 Levert Avenue
Applicant: Corinna Luce
Nature of Project: Turn existing detached garage into playroom. Add porch and utility area as per submitted plans.

APPROVED Certified Record attached.

2. **047-03/04-CA** 161 South Warren Street
Applicant: Merry Sturdivant
Nature of Project: Remove existing non-historic wood siding and replace with hardiplank painted to match existing residence.

DENIED Certified Record attached.

3. **048-03/04-CA** 1626 Springhill Avenue
Applicant: Ronald McDonald House/ E.H. Anderson, Jr.
Nature of Project: Construct 12' x 24' storage building as per submitted plans.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS & ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Rick Olsen of the Urban Development Department announced that the Historic District Overlay Zoning Ordinance will be coming before the Planning Commission on Thursday March 18th at 2:00 p.m. He asked that members of the Board be there in support of the ordinance. The ordinance does not include Mid-town Historic District, a National Register

Historic District which is not designated a local historic district. Mid-town residents will have to ask to be included under this ordinance.

Bunky Ralph made a motion to adopt a resolution in support of the ordinance. David Tharp seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Bunky Ralph will attend the meeting on behalf of the ARB.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:18 p.m.

An analysis of the drawings submitted for the December 22, 2003 meeting prepared by ARB staff and provided to the Committee prior to the meeting.

The Mobile City Council overruled the ARB's denial of the project's site plan. For this reason, the Board's main responsibility is to determine the appropriateness of building design, including materials, massing and scale, as well as landscaping to the historic district.

Given the fact that the only difference in the plans presented at the January 12, 2004 meeting and the plans presented for review at the March 8, 2004 meeting is minor changes in façade design, the initial staff analysis will stand. However, staff has made the following observations of the most recently submitted plans. Please note that the drawings are stamped "*For Review Only – Not for Construction*" and "*Preliminary – For Review Only*". Therefore, any Board recommendations or conditions should be part of the final approval by the ARB.

STAFF ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Due to the complexity of this project, and numerous previous reviews, the following staff analysis is a combination of facts, staff narrative and staff recommendations. Also due to the complexity of this project, it should be noted that it was not the staff's intent to redesign the project, but to simply bring attention to, for the Board and the applicant, important points relating to the building design.

1. LANDSCAPING for the SHOPPING CENTER PARCEL:

- A. Perimeter landscaping calls for live oaks, nuttall oaks, magnolias and bald cypress.
- B. Increased interior island landscaping calls for nuttall oaks as overstory trees, with a combination of dwarf sasanqua, grass and lawn for understory.
- C. A 4' evergreen hedge is proposed to screen parked cars on the Catherine Street elevation.
- D. A 5' vegetative screen is proposed to screen cars along the rear of the outparcel facing Government Street.
- E. A combination of cherry trees and evergreen azaleas is proposed along the existing retaining wall along Government near Etheridge.
- F. Crepe Myrtles are proposed along the lawn space between the building and the parking lot.
- G. Landscaping for the outparcel other than perimeter planting is not called out.

2. LANDSCAPING for the RESIDENTIAL PARCELS:

- A. Proposed overstory trees on Etheridge are nuttall oaks. Proposed understory trees include cherry and crepe myrtle
- B. Low shrubs are proposed for placement in the front yards of the relocated residences.

3. FAÇADE MATERIALS:

A. Roofing:

In initial design committee meetings with the realtors and architects, ARB staff proposed the use of different roofing materials to break up the massing of the structure. This suggestion was made when there was discussion regarding the undulation of the building façade: i.e. the storefronts stepping back and projecting forward. Since this design element was not utilized, the need for 2 types of roofing materials (standing seam and terra cotta tile) is no longer successful. **In order to maintain an overall design, staff recommends using a standing seam in a neutral color in keeping with the historic district.**

B. Fenestration:

Previous elevation drawings depicted the use of a traditional storefront, including a bulkhead, storefront and transom.

- a. The most recent submission has eliminated the bulkhead from the speculative rental units.

Staff recommends the replacement of the bulkhead along this elevation.

- b. The storefront glazing of the Dollar Tree elevation pierces the bulkhead.

Staff recommends the windows end at the top of the bulkhead.

- c. The Office Depot elevation has retained its bulkhead under the storefront.

C. Cornice Line:

1. Previous elevation drawings depicted arches over sections of the lower storefronts. These have changed to pediments. The long central storefront has a small pediment that appears to be out of scale with the rest of the development.

Staff recommends the cornice line between the two pediments be kept straight.

D. Façade Decorative Relief:

1. Previous elevation drawings depicted recessed panels above all canopy areas, including a combination of circular and rectangular recesses. These have been minimized. However, 2 pair of 2' diameter EIFS spheres remain. These no longer relate to similar flat façade elements and are now out of context.

Staff recommends the deletion of the EIFS spheres.

E. Office Depot Front Elevation:

1. Previous elevation drawings depicted the breaking up of the massing of the largest retailer utilizing different colors of split faced concrete block and brick. This has been eliminated in the current proposal.

Staff recommends that in order to decrease the massing of this elevation, some degree of design, whether through the addition of panels or the change of materials, should be used.

F. Catherine Street Elevation:

1. In previous discussion with the architect, and at the Board meeting, the importance of the Catherine Street façade was discussed. Current renderings note the canopy wrapping the corner with 3 windows.

Staff recommends in order to maintain the neighborhood-friendly character of this elevation, the storefront and canopy system should be expanded to the second building bay.

G. Relocated Buildings:

1. Currently the only historic structure on the west side of Etheridge Street has a substantial setback of approximately 60 + feet. However, the buildings on the east side vary in setback from approximately 10 feet to approximately 30 feet. The proposal for the relocation of the two historic houses places the more southerly house approximately 25 feet from the sidewalk, and the other house approximately 30 feet from the sidewalk. With the various setbacks on the street, this staggered effect blends the two relocated buildings with the historic houses and the new development. Set within this context, the setbacks appear to be appropriate.
2. It should be noted that any exterior changes to the relocated historic buildings should be reviewed by either ARB staff or the Architectural Review Board.

H. Other Required Information:

1. Fencing design along northern property line.
2. Wall design along Etheridge Street
3. A “For Construction” set of plans for a file copy.
4. Signage Package – while a monument sign is noted on the site plan, no application for signage for this property has been made.
5. Information on sidewalk material.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Prior to accepting public testimony, Chair Cindy Klotz requested that legal counsel, Wanda Cochran, explain the status of the application and the scope of Board responsibility in the review. Wanda Cochran explained that the Board’s denial of the site plan had been appealed to City Council and overturned. The Board should review the remainder of the project, however the project footprint cannot be changed.

Doug Helms, an Etheridge Street resident, spoke in opposition to the project. Although he was not opposed to commercial use at the site, he brought up three points of concern: 1) that the Zoning Ordinance requires a 5 ft. green space before a 3 ft. high brick buffer wall can be installed; 2) Etheridge Street is prone to flooding, so half of the trees proposed for the Etheridge side of the development should be eliminated in order to prevent drains from being completely blocked by leaves; and 3) that the relocated two story house should be set further back in line with the east wall of the commercial development.

Ed Hooker explained that staff had met with the Urban Forester to review the proposed tree plan. A summation of these findings was presented at the meeting and is attached to the Certified Record.

Ron Jackson, Urban Forester, reported on his informal review of the plan. There are 24 more proposed trees on the site than required by the Tree Ordinance. The Ordinance will require all the trees so designated to be planted on Etheridge. Seven trees are required on the Government Street frontage. Since there are several trees on Government that are not in good health, overstory trees are requested. It was suggested the proposed cherry trees be relocated on the lot. There is a tree that must be removed in order to place the access drive in its current location, however, no application for its removal has been made to the Tree Commission. The application deadline for the next Tree Commission meeting is next Tuesday, March 16th. Mr. Jackson also spoke to the species of oak that was selected by the landscape architect. Nuttall trees are in the Red Oak family, are deciduous (without leaves for 2-3 months of the year), and do not provide dense foliage. Should any of these trees be under power lines, the ordinance requires that they be Live Oaks, whether that is on Catherine, Government or Etheridge Street. The proposed landscape plan submitted to the Urban Forester must have utilities indicated.

Rick Olsen with the Urban Development Department reported that a PUD must be obtained in order to have shared access between the current development and the outparcel. Traffic and Engineering will also have to review the plan so that, in the end, the location of the driveway on Government Street might change.

Additional items must be indicated on the final plan—the six foot high wall on the east side of the development. Lynda Burkett questioned whether the outparcel will be landscaped at this time. Since it is a separate lot of record, it will not be landscaped. Greg Saad stated that it would be sodded.

Cindy Klotz reviewed for the developers additional information that would be required prior to obtaining final approval: 1) paint colors; 2) fence details, 3) lighting placement on site and information regarding the lumens emitted by the lights, 4) dumpster enclosure and 5) sign package.

Linda Snapp, commented that much of this information had been assembled but not submitted. Signage was always intended to be a separate submission.

T. Latham commented on the drainage: there is already a French drain on the Catherine Street side of the development; there will be a catch basin behind Office Depot into which water from the residential lots on Etheridge will drain.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Board members had questions concerning a variety of issues: a modern column detail that did not include a capital on the column, the color of glazing and flashing, altering the cornice line, reducing the height of the Office Depot elevation, reinstalling bulkheads and having the Catherine Street elevation less of a continuous, un-perforated wall. Ms. Snapp explained that the storefronts would be dark bronze with clear glazing. The developer prefers not to alter roofing types indicated. Cornice flashing will match the color of the stucco and tile will be Spanish clay tile. The bulkhead as shown in the first set of submitted drawings would be reintroduced and the windows raised that intrude on the bulkhead. The architect preferred not to eliminate the EFIS spheres since that element will be used in the monument sign and also did not wish to alter the cornice line. Decreasing the height of the Office Depot elevation would also not be possible since the business stacks inventory and the height must be retained. Latham interjected that the parapet also served to screen mechanical equipment. Flexibility had been introduced into the construction method on the Catherine Street side so that additional storefront could be introduced providing it was a request of the eventual tenant.

Following a failed attempt to table the application for lack of information, the Board created a list of conditions that developers should meet in a final submission.

1. All trees on Government Street to be Live Oaks.

2. All trees on site to be 3 inch caliper and all landscaping protected.
3. The outparcel to be sodded.
4. That a revised landscape plan including the size and species of magnolia along with a lighting plan and the dumpster enclosure be submitted.
5. That the storefront be dark bronze with clear glazing and that the bulkhead be reintroduced.
6. That the cornice line be straight between pediments or match the other two pediments.
7. That the storefront and canopy be extended 2 full structural bays on the Catherine Street elevation.
8. That the two story house on lot 3 have its porch located 35 ft. from the property line. Any materials damaged in the relocation of the two Catherine Street houses be repaired with matching materials.
9. That the applicant return with finalized plans.

FINDING OF FACTS

Following lengthy discussion and numerous motions, the Board found the following facts:

1. LANDSCAPING for the SHOPPING CENTER PARCEL:
 - A. Perimeter landscaping calls for live oaks, nuttall oaks, magnolias and bald cypress.
 - B. Increased interior island landscaping calls for nuttall oaks as overstory trees, with a combination of dwarf sasanqua, grass and lawn for understory.
 - C. A 4' evergreen hedge is proposed to screen parked cars on the Catherine Street elevation.
 - D. A 5' vegetative screen is proposed to screen cars along the rear of the outparcel facing Government Street.
 - E. A combination of cherry trees and evergreen azaleas is proposed along the existing retaining wall along Government near Etheridge.
 - F. Crepe Myrtles are proposed along the lawn space between the building and the parking lot.
 - G. The outparcel will be sodded; the frontage trees on Government Street to be Live Oaks.
2. LANDSCAPING for the RESIDENTIAL PARCELS:
 - A. Proposed overstory trees on Etheridge are nuttall oaks. Proposed understory trees include cherry and crepe myrtle
 - B. Low shrubs are proposed for placement in the front yards of the relocated residences.
3. FAÇADE MATERIALS:
 - A. Fenestration:

Previous elevation drawings depicted the use of a traditional storefront, including a bulkhead, storefront and transom.

 - a. The most recent submission has eliminated the bulkhead from the speculative rental units.
 - b. The storefront glazing of the Dollar Tree elevation pierces the bulkhead.
 - c. The Office Depot elevation has retained its bulkhead under the storefront.

B. Cornice Line:

1. Previous elevation drawings depicted arches over sections of the lower storefronts. These have changed to pediments. The long central storefront has a small pediment that appears to be out of scale with the rest of the development.

C. Catherine Street Elevation:

1. In previous discussion with the architect, and at the Board meeting, the importance of the Catherine Street façade was discussed. Current renderings note the canopy wrapping the corner with 3 windows.

D. Relocated Buildings:

1. Currently the only historic structure on the west side of Etheridge Street has a substantial setback of approximately 60 + feet. However, the buildings on the east side vary in setback from approximately 10 feet to approximately 30 feet. The proposal for the relocation of the two historic houses places the more southerly house approximately 25 feet from the sidewalk, and the other house approximately 30 feet from the sidewalk. With the various setbacks on the street, this staggered effect blends the two relocated buildings with the historic houses and the new development. Set within this context, the setbacks appear to be appropriate.
2. It should be noted that any exterior changes to the relocated historic buildings should be reviewed by either ARB staff or the Architectural Review Board.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved to issue an approval conditional upon the developer satisfying the following 9 points:

1. All trees on Government Street to be Live Oaks.
2. All trees on site to be 3 inch caliper and all landscaping protected.
3. The outparcel to be sodded.
4. That a revised landscape plan including the size and species of magnolia along with a lighting plan and the dumpster enclosure be submitted.
5. That the storefront be dark bronze with clear glazing and that the bulkhead be reintroduced.
6. That the cornice line be straight between pediments or match the other two pediments.
7. That the storefront and canopy be extended 2 full structural bays on the Catherine Street elevation.
8. That the two story house on lot 3 have its porch located 35 ft. from the property line. Any materials damaged in the relocation of the two Catherine Street houses be repaired with matching materials.
9. That the applicant return with finalized plans.

The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.

Prior to a Certificate of Appropriateness being issued, the following information must be supplied:

Other Required Information:

1. Fencing design along northern property line.
2. Wall design along Etheridge Street.
3. A "For Construction" set of plans for a file copy.

4. Signage Package – while a monument sign is noted on the site plan, no application for signage for this property has been made.
5. Information on sidewalk material.
6. Information on dumpster enclosure.
7. Parking lot lighting, building lighting including placement, colors, lumens.
8. Sodding of outparcel.
9. Revised landscape plan showing outparcel and tree changes after all other approvals by Traffic Engineering, Tree Commission, UDD, etc.

ATTACHMENT 1

**MEETING MINUTES
URBAN FORESTRY DEPARTMENT
DISCUSSION OF LANDSCAPE PLAN – 1500 GOVERNMENT STREET**

Existing Live Oaks:

The tree on the corner of Etheridge and Government has been struck by lightning
The tree one in from the corner of Etheridge and Government suffered damage in
Hurricane Frederick
Urban Forestry predicts that these trees are dying and will need to be removed
within 10-15 years

The 14” caliper live oak called for removal for the drive off Government is in
perfect health. Removal of this tree has not been approved by the Mobile Tree
Commission.

The 48” caliper live oak on Catherine Street is protected by the Planning
Commission. Due to the fact that the footprint of the building is proposed to be
located under the canopy of the tree, Urban Forestry must issue a disturbance
permit and monitor construction around the root system.

Proposed Trees:

Nuttall Oaks – deciduous tree, member of the red oak family - tall and airy, even
with full leaf coverage – bald 3-4 months out of the year. Originally planted for
wildlife because of its large nut/fruit. In the wild reach a height of 60’-80’ and
1’ – 3’ in diameter. However, in this application, the parking lot trees will be
constrained and dwarfed by the islands.

Bald Cypress –deciduous conifer of slender, pyramidal
habit. It displays reddish brown, fibrous bark; good for wet areas. Reaches a
height of 50’-75’. Also bald 3-4 months out of the year.

Magnolia – evergreen – depending on variety (not specified) can reach a height of
35’-60’+ at maturity.

Urban Forestry Recommendations:

Confirmation of the curb cut along Government – currently the curb cut is shown
accessing both the newly-created large parcel and the outparcel.
Request copies of drawings with “Preliminary” removed, and have new drawings
stamped & sealed.
Request information on magnolia trees – what type & variety
Require that all trees have a standard 3” caliper. This will protect the trees under
the Landscape Ordinance and give Urban Forestry the authority to require any
diseased or dead trees to be replaced.

Require all trees on Government to be live oaks
Substitute all bald cypress trees on Etheridge with live oaks
Substitute all nuttall oaks with willow oaks
Move cherry trees proposed for perimeter at Government Street to the first row if parking islands in the place of proposed nuttall oaks.
Require more complete landscape design with size & type of all landscaping to be called out.

Existing Conditions:

- District Resources:** 219 South Catherine Street – two story frame, ca. 1909
Classification: Contributing
(proposed to be relocated to Lot 4, Etheridge Street)
- 217 South Catherine Street – one story frame bungalow, ca. 1909
Classification – Non-contributing
- 213 South Catherine Street – one story frame bungalow, ca. 1924
Classification – Contributing
(proposed to be relocated to Lot 3, Etheridge Street)
- 211 South Catherine Street – one story masonry structure, post 1940
- 1500 Government Street - Former Ramada Inn Hotel, ca. 1959

General Site Conditions:

The subject property is located at the northwest corner of Government and Etheridge Streets. The property includes 5 separate parcels which were re-subdivided into two parcels and rezoned to LB-2 and R-1. A new application is being made to create another R-1 lot at the rear of the property. The property covers approximately 5.50 acres. At the rear/north of the property, along Etheridge Street, 2 residential lots measuring 90' x 233' and 70' x 233' are being created to accommodate the two historic structures currently facing South Catherine Street.

Mobile City Code requires 1 parking space per 300 sf of floor area for retail. For this project, the minimum required spaces would be 142. The proposed parking area contains 204 parking spaces, 61 more than required.

Project Analysis

I. Placement and Orientation

- A. The Guidelines state that “New construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings. New buildings should not be placed too far forward or behind the traditional "façade line", a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the façade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape.”
1. The proposed setback is approximately 320' from the southeast corner of the building to the sidewalk at Government Street. The proposed side setback is approximately 50' from the east wall of the building to the sidewalk at Etheridge Street. The proposed setback is approximately 60' from the west wall of the building to sidewalk at South Catherine Street. All storefronts face south towards Government Street.
 2. Currently, the corner parcel is occupied by a Firestone Store. The building is set back approximately 35' from the sidewalk along Government Street, and features a partial hexagon which addresses the corner.

3. Currently, the existing hotel facility is set back approximately 70' at the porte-cochere (southwest corner) and 60.55 at the southeast corner, for an average setback of approximately 65'.
4. Currently, the houses along South Catherine Street have an average setback of approximately 18'.
5. As a comparison, in terms of large structures along Government Street, Blacksher Hall, 1056 Government Street, one of the deepest, has a setback of approximately 80'. The building immediately to the west, Kingdom Hall, 1060 Government Street, one of the nearest, has a setback of approximately 18'. The Bay-Haas Building, 1150 Government Street, has a setback of approximately 30' with front lawn, and perimeter and rear parking.
6. The proposed setbacks are not compatible with setbacks along Government Street.

II. Massing and Scale

- A. The Guidelines state that "Building mass is established by the arrangement and proportions of its basic geometric components. Similarity of massing helps create a rhythm along a street, which is one of the appealing aspects of historic districts. Therefore, new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings."
 1. The proposed structure is massed into 3 attached components:
 - One anchor store measuring approximately 120' x 142', containing 17, 076 sf.
 - One anchor store measuring approximately 136' x 88.25', containing 12,000 sf.
 - A rectangular section measuring 85' x 160', containing 13,600 sf (to be divided among multiple tenants)
 2. The total length of the building is approximately 341'. The depth telescopes from 160' at the east end to 85' at the west end.
 3. The overall massing and building footprint give the impression of a "strip" center.
- B. The Guidelines state that "The foundation, the platform upon which a building rests, is a massing component of a building. Since diminished foundation proportions have a negative effect on massing and visual character, new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings."
 1. All adjacent non-historic commercial structures, including the Firestone, The Ramada Inn, The Winn-Dixie, and the Dollar General, are built utilizing slab-on-grade construction.
 2. All adjacent historic residential structures are constructed on crawl spaces and vary in height from 2' to 5' above grade.
 3. The proposed new construction is proposed to be slab-on-grade construction.
- C. The Guidelines state that "the main body and wings are the most significant components. A building's form, or shape, can be simple (a box) or complex (a combination of many boxes or projections and

indentations). The main body of a building may be one or two stories. Secondary elements, usually porches, or wings, extend from the main building. These elements create the massing of a building. Interior floor and ceiling heights are reflected on the exterior of a building and should be compatible with nearby historic buildings.”

1. The largest mass of the development occurs at the east end of the development, and is essentially a rectangle in footprint, with a 3 bay facade measuring 30’ tall at the entry parapet, stepping down to 22’ on each side. The second largest mass occurs directly to the west of the largest mass, is rectangular in footprint, and also has a 3 bay facade measuring 22’ tall at the parapet, stepping down to 18’ on each side. The third portion of the development has a rectangular footprint with a 5 bay facade, the center of which measures 18’ in height, and is flanked by a pair of arched parapets, which are flanked by straight-topped parapets.

D. The Guidelines state that “ A building's roof contributes significantly to its massing and to the character of the surrounding area. New construction may consider, where appropriate, roof shapes and pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings. The use of built-up or flat roof systems hidden behind parapet walls may be used in new commercial construction.”

1. The proposed main roof system is a flat roof occurring at different levels, and concealed behind parapet walls.
2. The three attached structures are tied together with a continuous sidewalk covering, constructed using Spanish Tile and Standing Seam roofing materials.
3. While providing covering for pedestrians, this feature reinforces the appearance of a strip shopping center.

E. The Guidelines state that “The size of a building is determined by its dimensions - height, width, and depth - which also dictate the building's square footage. SCALE refers to a building's size in relationship to other buildings - large, medium, small. Buildings which are similar in massing may be very different in scale. To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.”

1. Nothing of this magnitude has been proposed or constructed within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The Weinaker Shopping Center (which pre-dates the historic district), across South Catherine Street to the west, is the closest in terms of scale and property size. However, the proposed development is substantially larger in terms of building footprint and parking lot coverage. The Storage Max is the most similar in terms of scale on Government Street.

III. Façade Elements

- A. The Guidelines state that “The number and proportion of openings - windows and entrances - within the façade of a building creates a solid-to-void ratio (wall-to-opening). New buildings should use windows and entrances that approximate the solid-to-void ratio of nearby historic buildings. Windows and entrances should also be arranged in a manner consistent with nearby historic buildings. In addition, designs for new construction should also incorporate the traditional use of window casements and door surrounds. Where a side elevation faces a side street, proportion and placement of its elements may have an impact upon the visual character of the side street.”

1. The proposed storefronts vary in terms of design and materials, but all have the same components – bulkhead, storefront, and transom. This design is consistent throughout the façade.
2. A covered canopy runs the length of the front of the building, reinforcing the effect of a strip shopping center.
3. The masses are differentiated from each other by changing building materials. The east portion is shorter in length than the other two, which helps break up the massing. However, there is not enough differentiation on the ground plane or in elevation to break up the massing between the two elements.
4. The building does not address South Catherine Street.

IV. Materials and Ornamentation

- A. The Guidelines state that “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but not to create a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples. The choice of materials and ornamentation for new construction is a good way for a new building to exert its own identity. By using historic examples as a point of departure, it is possible for new construction to use new materials and ornamentation and still fit into the historic district.”
 1. A variety of building materials can be found throughout the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The predominant wall material for commercial, institutional and educational structures is masonry.

Proposed Building Materials:

Parking Surface –	Asphalt with concrete curbing
Building Exterior -	Split Face Concrete Block Brick Veneer True Stucco
Glazing -	Anodized aluminum metal storefronts
Roofing -	Sidewalk Coverings - Spanish Tile, barrel-vaulted Standing Seam Metal Main Buildings – flat roofs behind parapets

Staff recommends the following conditions be placed on any approval for the project:

1. Placement: The building should be relocated closer to Government Street, perhaps forming an “L” configuration.
2. Orientation: The building should address both Government and South Catherine Streets, but should not ignore Etheridge Street.
3. Massing: The massing of the building should be more varied in order to create a complex more in keeping with the neighborhood.
4. Scale: As a commercial building, emphasis should be placed on other aspects since it would be extremely difficult to have the scale match that of the surrounding residential resources.
5. Façade Elements: Historically, display windows were part of commercial buildings. Where possible, these elements should be utilized.

6. **Materials and Ornamentation:** A variety of materials and detailing would help break up the massing and scale.

Items Not Addressed:

1. **Landscaping:** Most buildings along Government Street present a front lawn. This should be considered in any landscaping plan.
2. **Landscaping** along South Catherine Street should be addressed.
3. **Parking** – There is an abundance of parking which should be minimized from the public right-of-way.
4. **Pedestrian Access** – There should be safe and convenient access for the pedestrian from both Government and South Catherine Streets.
5. **Colors & Materials Samples** should be submitted with a formal application.

**Report from the Design Committee
22 December, 2003**

Following the regularly-scheduled meeting of the ARB December 22, 2003, The Design Committee of the Architectural Review Board met with the developer's representative and the architect to discuss preliminary site plan and elevations.

Design Committee Members: Cindy Klotz, Dan McCleave, David Barr
Developer's Representative: John Vallas, Saad Vallas Realty
Architect: Linda Snapp, Clark Geer & Latham
Staff: Anne Crutcher, Ed Hooker

The Committee had the following comments and concerns:

New Development:

- Setback of the proposed development from Government and Catherine Streets
The Committee questioned why the building could not be moved closer to Government and Catherine Streets to maintain the setbacks established by existing buildings. The developers' representatives stated that the placement of the building at the rear of the parcel was tenant-driven. The Committee noted that tenant desires should not drive the appearance of the historic district.
- Landscaping on the perimeter and interior of the parking lot
The Committee noted that most buildings along Government have lawn-type settings with landscaping, and that this development should try to repeat that landscape theme. The developer's representatives stated that landscaping plans had not yet been developed but the intent was to leave the existing berm at Government Street, and to have heavily landscaped islands within the parking area. The retention pond on Catherine Street will not be required as previously proposed, so that area will become green space. The Committee felt that the internal areas in the parking lot designated as planting areas were not large enough. The Committee noted that effective landscape design can aid in creating/maintaining the streetscape and noted a landscape plan was required for review.
- Extent/size of the parking lot
The Committee noted the excess number of parking spaces and recommended utilizing those spaces as landscaping areas. The developer's representatives stated that the number of parking spaces shown was also in part a requirement of the tenants. The Committee suggested that possibly the additional spaces be alternative paving. The developer's representatives stated that alternative paving had not proven to be successful for retail use. They also stated that Parcel 1, facing Government Street, may be the site of a new restaurant, and parking to accommodate that use would be shared by the parking proposed for this development. Perhaps a low brick wall around the parking should be investigated.
- The proposed development's addressing of Catherine Street
The Committee noted that a blank wall was proposed to face Catherine Street. The Committee requested that the architect present some type of storefront or window pattern to wrap the corner.
- Better pedestrian access from Government and Catherine Streets. A blank wall is unacceptable because there is no dialogue with Catherine Street.

- The Committee noted that the only planned pedestrian access was from Catherine Street. However, access from Government Street should be accommodated for people using public transportation as well approaching the development either on foot or by bicycle.
- Breaking up the massing of the development to read as individual buildings
The Committee noted that the architect had attempted to break up the massing of the building using different materials and design elements. However, the Committee noted that the elevations still read as strip-like. They suggested preparing perspective sketches to bring to the Review Board Meeting to provide a better interpretation of the elevation. How the project will relate to the street should be illustrated.
- Streetscape
The Committee noted this project removed the established streetscape at Government and Catherine Street and does not replace it. The view from both streets is now paved parking. This design exacerbates the poor design of the Weinaker's Shopping center directly across the street.

Existing Structures:

- Proposed relocation plans for existing historic structures
The Committee noted that more information should be provided on the relocation of the two historic structures from Catherine Street to Etheridge Street. This information should include setbacks similar to those established along Etheridge Street and show any site improvements.
- Buffering of the existing residential from the proposed commercial development
The Committee noted that plans for separating the use of residential and commercial should be more detailed in terms of fence and wall design, and the use of landscape elements as part of the buffer.

The Developer's Representative and Architect plan to bring additional drawings, including a perspective and more detailed landscaping plan, to the Review Board meeting.

AMENDED REQUEST

Massing reduced from 3 story to 2 story; gable fronts replaced with hipped roof; front planters excluded except the area around the entry; double doors replaced with wood double hung windows; door hoods excluded; casement windows replaced with wood double hung; pre-cast, non-structural lintels added over all openings.

Copies of the original elevations are included to compare.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Guidelines for New Commercial and Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts

	<u>Sections</u> <u>Work</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of</u>
3	Design Standards for New Construction		Construct new apartment building
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 DeTonti Square range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with a 5’-10’ setback.
 - B. This setback matches the existing side setback of the recently-constructed two-story masonry building located directly to the north, at the corner of Claiborne and Congress Streets.
 - C. There are two apartment buildings constructed within the last 5 years, constructed by this applicant. They utilize 3’high and 5’deep planters located at the sidewalk to give the effect of a zero lot line construction and provide a planting buffer between the pedestrian and the building face. This design is similar to the what is proposed for this project.
 - D. There are no new or existing buildings located on either side of the proposed construction site.

E. The proposed setback for this building is 5'-10" from the sidewalk/property line.

3,II

II. **Massing and Scale:**

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. the building is designed to resemble two historic buildings connected at the rear, similar to the Hanna House on Conception Street and the Malaga Inn on Church Street.
 - 2. 3 bay facades are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District
 - 3. 2 and 3 story masonry structures are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
 - 4. The proposed building is a 2 story stucco-covered masonry building with two projecting three-bay fronts.
- B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. Historic buildings in DeTonti Square are constructed on piers, or are elevated above grade by a continuous foundation wall at a height of 2'-3', and some even taller given the topography of the lot.
 - 2. Property covenants require new construction to be 2'-6" above grade.
 - 3. The proposed foundation is 3' above 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 roof shapes exist in the DeTonti Square Historic District, but the most common are simple end gables and hips.
 - 2. Side gabled roofs with parapets are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
 - 3. The proposed roof design is hipped.

3, III

III. **Façade Elements:**

The guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.

- A. Six-over-six wood double hung windows are typical in the DeTonti Square Historic District.

3, IV

IV. **Materials and Ornamentation:**

- A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
 - 1. There are very few historic stucco-covered masonry buildings remaining in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
 - 2. One of the two recently-constructed apartment buildings, 300 North Jackson Street, has a painted stucco-covered masonry exterior.
 - 3. Stucco-covered masonry is considered comparable to brick veneer construction.

- B. The guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
1. Examples of historic ornamentation include window hoods, decorative ironwork, articulated cornices, jib doors and walk-through windows.
 2. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Architects for the project , Steven Arroyo and Tish Rankin, were in attendance. There was no public comment in support of or in opposition to the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Douglas Kearley asked about the gravel parking area. Steven Arroyo explained that the gravel parking was proposed in order to protect a 22 inch sycamore on the site. Gravel parking will require a variance from the Board of Adjustment.

FINDING OF FACTS AND DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved to find the facts in the staff report and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness subject to the approval of the gravel parking surface by the BOA. David Tharp seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/8/04

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

046-03/04 – CA 104 Levert Avenue
Applicant: Corinna Luce
Received: 2/15/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 3/01/04 1) 3/8/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1 Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence
Nature of Project: Alter existing detached garage to accommodate play room and laundry room.

The existing one car brick veneer garage measures 17’ x 24’, and has an attached 6’ x 9’ side shed addition.

Proposed alterations include the removal of the existing garage door and single entry door and replacement with a 6’ wide double wood French door. A porch/utility room addition, measuring 14’ – 10” x 12’. Gable roof to match existing in profile and dimension. Wood built-up columns to match those on main residence.

Construct 12’ long x 6’ high privacy wall along west elevation as per submitted site plan.

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	Alter existing garage for use as playroom

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 one story brick veneer minimal traditional house with an end gable roof.
 2. The existing garage is a one story brick veneer structure with an end gable roof.
 3. The proposed alterations repeat the design elements of both the existing residence and the existing garage.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Douglas Kearley discussed the appropriateness of having 3 materials—brick, reverse board and batten and stucco on such a small building. However, the construction of a stuccoed wall with brick cap was considered to give a more uniform look to the outbuilding.

FINDING OF FACTS

Bunky Ralph 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. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/8/04

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

047-03/04 – CA 161 South Warren Street
Applicant: Merry Sturdivant
Received: 2/15/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 3/31/04 1) 3/8/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1 Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence
Nature of Project: Remove existing wood siding and replace with Hardiplank. Paint new material to match existing color scheme.
Request also to construct a flat cut front porch rail from Hardiplank.

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	Exterior Materials & Finishes Porches	Remove & Replace existing siding Remove & Replace existing porch balustrade

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 exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension, and material.”
 - 1. The subject structure is an existing one story frame residence constructed ca. 1900.
 - 2. The house was completely restored in 1983, including replacement of a majority of the wood siding, the addition of insulation on the outside walls
 - 3. According to the applicants, no air space was placed in the walls to allow the house to breathe.

4. The owners have replaced sections of siding as needed since 1983.
 5. While the Guidelines state that existing material should be replaced with matching in profile and dimension, any replacement wood siding will continue to deteriorate without a vapor barrier.
 6. Hardiplank is an approved material for new construction.
 7. The Guidelines, and the discretion of the Review Board, typically do not allow wholesale replacement.
- B. The Guidelines state that “Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect the period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative elements.”
1. The existing porch balustrade dates from 1983 and is constructed of mahogany turned balusters and treated top and bottom rails. Some balusters are rotted at the base, but not all balusters are affected.
 2. The applicant is requesting to install a flat porch rail cut from Hardiplank, a design more closely related to the Italianate period.
 3. The turned late-Victorian baluster is a more appropriate design for the subject residence.
 4. A system of fypon (fiberglass polymer) balusters with treated top and bottom members may be an appropriate solution, however, this system was not discussed with the applicant.

Staff defers comment on this request and strongly suggests the Board review the evidence and determine an appropriate action.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Merry Sturdivent was present to explain that the house does not have much of a roof overhang which contributes to the problem of rot and mildew. When the house was restored in the mid 1980s, no vapor barrier was installed behind the siding. Since its initial restoration, most of the siding has been changed out. Some wood on the garage has already been changed to hardiplank. She also explained that the porch railing has been replaced several times over the years and she would like to replace it with a hardiplank railing.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The lack of a vapor barrier is the primary contributor to the wood rot on Ms. Sturdivent’s house. There is no evidence to show that Hardiplank would solve the problem with rot. Without a vapor barrier, there will be a continuing moisture problem causing the interior studs to rot. Proper installation would entail removing the existing siding, installing a vapor barrier and reinstalling new wood siding to match the existing siding.

With regard to the railing, Hardiplank is not available to create the bottom and top rail. These elements would have to be built from wood. A flat cut baluster is found on houses of the 1870s and inappropriate for a turn of the century house. The proposed changes would materially impair the historic building.

FINDING OF FACTS AND DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved to adopt the facts in the staff report and based upon the facts and material impairment of the historic structure, to deny the application. Robert Brown seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

048-03/04 – CA 1626 Spring Hill Avenue
Applicant: Ronald McDonald House/ E.H. Anderson, Jr.
Received: 3/1/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/14/04 1) 3/8/04 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 outbuilding measuring 12’ x 21’-4” as per submitted drawings.

Building to be constructed of wood frame, crawl space foundation, with reverse wood board and batten siding. Roof to be hipped with asphalt shingles to match those on the main structure. Small 4’ x 8’ front porch with pedimented roof supported by built-up 4”x4” wood columns. Continuous concrete block foundation.

Building to be located adjacent to an existing parking lot, inset into an existing fence. Only the first 2’ of the building face will be visible from public view.

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 outbuilding

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 brick veneer Colonial Revival house with hipped roof.
 2. The proposed storage building is proposed to be reverse board and batten with a pair of metal six-panel doors and a hipped roof.

Staff recommends approval of the application with the following conditions:

- Use of batten strips over the reverse board & batten to resemble a true board & batten exterior.
- Use of wooden doors instead of metal.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Anderson was present at the meeting. He reported that since the building will be placed adjacent to an existing fence, the reverse board and batten siding was felt to be a compatible material. However, he would be willing to alter the application to use a rough sawn cedar lap siding to match the main building. Although metal doors are preferred to deter theft, wood doors were an option.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Douglas Kearley requested clarification on the finish treatment for the concrete block foundation and hardiplank skirt board. Mr. Anderson responded that they would be painted.

There was discussion concerning metal versus wood doors. Board members had no objection to using metal doors on a storage building that will not be visible from the street.

FINDING OF FACTS

Douglas Kearley found the facts in the staff report. Robert Brown seconded the motion that was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness conditional upon the exterior finish being plywood with batten strips or rough sawn cedar, the doors being either metal or wood and the foundation and skirt board being painted. The motion was seconded by Robert Brown and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/8/04