

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
April 11, 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: Lynda Burkett, Douglas Kearley, David Tharp, Bunky Ralph, Harris
Oswalt, Cindy Klotz, Tilmon Brown, Cameron Pfeiffer.

Members Absent: Michael Mayberry, Robert Brown, Joe Sackett.

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

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Nick Sfakianos	Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood 41 West 165 Service Rd N, Suite 430 Mobile, AL 36608	039/04-05/CA

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the minutes as posted to the web site. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and approved.

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

MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: David and Tammy Donnelly
Property Address: 908 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 3/16/05 jss
Work Approved: Demolish non historic rear addition in order to restore house to single family dwelling.
Remove porch infill and replace porch railing to match existing.
2. Applicant's Name: Cooner Roofing Company
Property Address: 1311 Brown Street
Date of Approval: 3/17/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building with architectural shingles, charcoal grey in color.
3. Applicant's Name: John Weber and Gail Lisabeth
Property Address: 962 Augusta Street
Date of Approval: 3/17/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-paint house in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
Body: Homegrown sage green, Trim: Classical Light Buff or Classical White, Porch deck: Bellingrath green or dark black green.
4. Applicant's Name: Palmer Hamilton
Property Address: 1157 Palmetto
Date of Approval: 3/18/05 asc
Work Approved: Repaint residence in existing color scheme.
Body: Sherwin Williams Coconut Grove 2428

Trim: White; Shutters and porch floor: Bellingrath Green.

5. Applicant's Name: Diversified Roofing
Property Address: 257 South Georgia Avenue
Date of Approval: 3/14/05
Work Approved: Re-roof with 3 tab charcoal shingle.

6. Applicant's Name: June Chambliss / Sharon Brooks
Property Address: 161 S. Cedar Street
Date of Approval: 3/22/05 weh
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint in the following Behr color scheme: Body: Contemplation, 700E-3, Trim: Country Beige, 760C-2, and Door and accent: Rich Mahogany, 710B-7.

7. Applicant's Name: Bayside Remodelers
Property Address: 312 North Jackson Street
Date of Approval: 3/21/05
Work Approved: Construct front porch as per plans provided by MHDC staff. Install new windows matching existing in profile and dimension. Install triple double hung windows over sink in kitchen. Paint house in colors to be submitted at a later date.

8. Applicant's Name: W. Hunter March, Jr.
Property Address: 210 George Street
Date of Approval: April 13, 2005
Work Approved: Repair to rotten wood with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile. Paint house in existing color scheme. Treat existing metal roof with coating.

9. Applicant's Name: Suzanne Cleveland
Property Address: 957 Church Street
Date of Approval: 3/23/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair existing asbestos tile roof with materials to match existing in profile and dimension and material.

10. Applicant's Name: Yvonne Matthews
Property Address: 1054 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 3/23/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair rotten wood with new wood to match existing in profile and dimension to include siding, window sashes and window casings. Prime new wood to paint.

11. Applicant's Name: Timbes & Yeager
Property Address: 263 N. Conception Street
Date of Approval: 3/23/05 asc
Work Approved: Install new weathered wood blend timberline roof to match existing.

12. Applicant's Name: Dobson Sheet Metal & Roofing, Inc.
Property Address: 1119 Church Street
Date of Approval: 3/23/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair shingle roof, recoat flat roof and replace rotten wood on siding as necessary with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Power wash and paint to match existing.
13. Applicant's Name: Chris Conlon
Property Address: 306 George Street
Date of Approval: 3/34/05 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repaint building in the following Benjamin Moore paint Scheme, Body: HC 29, Dunmore Cream, Trim: HC-01 Brilliant White and Accent: HC41, Chrome Green.
14. Applicant's Name: Sumner Adams
Property Address: 211 Lanier
Date of Approval: 3/24/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof garage with 3tab fiberglass shingles, terra cotta in color to match color of main house tile roof.
15. Applicant's Name: Mary Lum, Owner/ Signs Now, Sign Contractor
Property Address: 460 Broad Street
Date of Approval: 3/24/05 asc
Work Approved: Erect signage, measuring 4' x 4' , double sided to total 32 sf. as per submitted sign design.
16. Applicant's Name: Precision Construction
Property Address: 52 LeMoyne Place
Date of Approval: 3/25/05 weh
Work Approved: Reconstruct deteriorated water heater enclosure as per submitted photographs. Paint to match existing.
17. Applicant's Name: Kenneth Palmertree
Property Address: 1112 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 3/25/05 jss
Work Approved: Replace rotten decking with tongue and groove. Repair columns as necessary.
18. Applicant's Name: Paul Anderson
Property Address: 1456 Brown Street
Date of Approval: 3/25/05 asc
Work Approved: Replace rear hollow core flush door with multi-lighted French wood door. Install 12' x 24' deck at rear of house with east side to have railing, the design provided by MHDC.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **035/04-05/CA** 653 Government Street
Applicant: KSM, Inc.
Nature of Request: Replace hurricane damaged green & white striped awnings along the east & west sides of building with slate blue Bahama-style shutters (14 windows). Add entry awning at Dearborn Street entrance for weather protection. Repaint building trim white.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

2. **036/04-05/CA** 1510 Government Street
Applicant: Saad Vallas, Developers, Owner/ Clark Geer & Latham, Architects & Engineers.
Nature of Request: Construction of a new commercial shopping center with adjacent parking.

APPLICATION WITHDRAWN

3. **037/04-05/CA** 934 Conti Street
Applicant: Chilton Powell
Nature of Request: Demolish fire-damaged structure.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

4. **038/04-05/CA** 62 Bradford Avenue
Applicant: Warren Bettis
Nature of Request: Construct front porch as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

5. **039/04-05/CA** 109 Government Street
Applicant: Goodwyn, Mills & Caywood, Architects
Mobile County Commission, Owner
Nature of Request: Demolish ca. 1959 courthouse.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. There will be a meeting to discuss guidelines on Monday, April 18th at 12:00 p.m. in the MHDC offices.
2. Wanda Cochran will be presenting a paper on Tuesday, April 12th to the APA called "Planning for Preservation." The talk will be emailed to members.

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

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

035-04/05-CA 653 Government Street
Applicant: KSM, Inc.
Received: 3/17/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: **4/30/05** 1) **4/11/05** 2) 3)

Nature of Request:

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Non - Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Nature of Project: Replace hurricane damaged green & white striped awnings along the east & west sides of building with slate blue Bahama-style shutters (14 windows). Add entry awning at Dearborn Street entrance for weather protection. Repaint building trim white.

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	Blinds, Shutters and Awnings	Install shutters and hurricane panel hardware

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change “...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district.”

STAFF REPORT

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

- A. The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.
 - 1. The main structure is a one story masonry veneer structure with aluminum storefront windows.
 - 2. The proposed shutters will be operable in order to act as hurricane-resistant coverings.
 - 3. The structure itself is a non-contributing structure.
 - 4. The Arby's to the west is also a non-contributing structure.
 - 5. The shutters are to be painted BLP Monterey Dark Blue.
 - 6. Shutters, when used, were operable and oversized to cover double or triple windows (for utilitarian purposes) or fixed as decorative elements.
 - 7. The request for painting trim was handled on a mid-month basis.

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public of city departments to read into the record. Staff explained that the shutter sample was the same as previously approved on Hunter Avenue and that the color could be BLP Monterey Dark Blue. The Board asked for clarification regarding the trim paint. Staff responded that the trim color would be placed on the eaves. The Board also asked for clarification on the awning. Staff responded that it was a standing seam metal canopy with 12 inch valance.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed and agreed to add the following fact: 8. Standing seam metal canopy with 12 inch valance to be located at the Dearborn Street entrance.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence that was presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the following facts: facts 1-7 in the staff report in addition to fact 8 added by the Board. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that based upon the facts found by the Board that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/11/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

037/04-05/CA 934 Conti Street
Applicant: Chilton Powell
Received: 3/18/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: **5/01/05** **1) 4/11/05 2) 3)**

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of the Project: Demolish fire-damaged structure.

History of the Project:

This residence was damaged by fire December 25, 2004. In March the owner was issued a Municipal Offense Ticket instructing him to either repair or demolish the structure. The applicant has an April 18, 2005 court date. The owner's insurance adjuster noted the structure as a "total loss" and Liberty Mutual Insurance settled the claim for the damages.

STAFF REPORT

Section 10 of the Preservation Ordinance prohibits the demolition or relocation of "any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such buildings will not be detrimental to the historical and architectural character of the district..." In making this determination, the Board must examine a number of factors set out in the ordinance, each of which is discussed below:

Based on the information contained in the application, Staff finds that the loss of this structure will impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

A. Historic or Architectural Significance

1. The Old Dauphin Way Historic District was created in 1984.
2. 934 Conti Street is a one story frame vernacular structure, constructed in the last quarter of the 19th century.

B. Importance to the Integrity of the District

1. Old Dauphin Way is significant as Mobile's earliest suburban neighborhood dating largely from the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Building in the district began in the 1830s with development along major thoroughfares such as Dauphin Street, Old Shell Road and Springhill Avenue. An increase in building construction appeared in the 1870s and 1880s as a result of the establishment of a horse-drawn trolley, which permitted residential living outside the city's core. The presence of the automobile and a general boom period at the turn of the 20th Century spurred construction in the district west of Ann Street.
2. Most buildings are small scale residential structures, most often 1 or 1 ½ stories in height, with similar setback from the street throughout the neighborhood, creating a feeling of homogeneity.
3. 934 Conti Street is a modest 1 story vernacular Victorian residence constructed around the end of the 19th Century.

C. Ability to Reproduce Historic Structures

1. The type and quality of the materials used in the construction of 934 Conti Street are no longer readily available.
2. The structure dates from the last quarter of the 19th century, before the introduction of nominal dimension lumber. Components include old growth pine structural members and siding, historic windows, doors and interior decoration, etc. Replacement material would have to be garnered from salvage yards or specially milled.
3. In the event that reconstruction was attempted, the cost to reproduce 934 Conti Street would be prohibitively expensive.

D. Proposed Redevelopment Plans for the Site

1. Applicant states that there are no plans for the vacant lot once the structure is removed.

E. Effect of Proposed Project on the Old Dauphin Way Historic District

1. The removal of 934 Conti Street would create a void in the streetscape.

F. Content of Application

1. Property information:
 - a. The property was purchased by the applicant's mother in 1980.
 - b. The property is now in an estate, with the applicant as trustee.
2. Alternatives Considered
 - a. The applicant has stated that no other alternatives to demolition have been considered.
3. Sale of Property by Current Owners
 - a. Information presented in the application notes that the property has not been listed for sale.
 - b. The property has been used as residential rental for over 20 years.
4. Financial Proof
 - a. No information on financial proof was presented.

G. Other Information:

1. Demolition/materials salvage has occurred without a permit and precludes the Review Board from being able to ascertain the post-fire condition of the building.
2. There is a public easement between 944 Conti Street, Chilton's Frame Gallery, and 934 Conti Street, the subject property.

Staff recommends the complete demolition be approved with the following conditions:

1. That the building be completely removed from the site including the concrete steps.
2. That the salvaged materials be removed from this and any adjacent lots.
3. That the property be appropriately landscaped with sod.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

Board members asked when the fire had occurred. Staff explained that the fire occurred on Christmas day 2004. Looking at the property, staff concluded that the fire appeared to have contained to the front of the house. However, since that time, materials have been salvaged from the house and stacked on the lot. In response to concerns from the Board that this lot might become a parking lot, staff explained that there is an access easement between this

property and Chilton's frame shop that would probably preclude combining both lots into one. The lot is zoned R-1 so it cannot be used for parking. Board members asked if punitive action would be taken. Wanda Cochran explained that any action would be a city action and that Board members could call the Action Center.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board expressed concern about a demolition request submitted only after the owner had salvaged materials from the house making its restoration impractical.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence that has been presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the following facts: A-G in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board that the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued with the following conditions:

1. That the building be completely removed from the site including the concrete steps.
2. That the salvaged materials be removed from this and any adjacent lots.
3. That the property be landscaped with sod.

The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved with Tilmon Brown and David Tharp voting in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/11/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

038-04/05-CA 62 Bradford Avenue
Applicant: Warren Bettis
Received: 3/28/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: **5/12/05** 1) **4/11/05** 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Construct front porch as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES AND DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Porches	Construct new front porch

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change “...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district.”

STAFF REPORT

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

- A. The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.
 - 1. The main structure is a one story asbestos veneer structure with a pair of picture windows flanking an extruded entry.
 - 2. There is an existing concrete stoop with ceramic tile surface.
 - 3. There is evidence that a porch did exist at one time.
 - 4. The new porch is in keeping with the character of the historic dwelling.
 - 5. The following materials are appropriate for use in the historic districts:
 - foundation: Brick veneered concrete block with lattice infill
 - porch deck: wood tongue & groove 5/4 x 6 decking
 - porch columns: combination of square box columns and Doric columns
 - roof: shed roof with gable section over entry, shingled to match existing.

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

The Board questioned staff about evidence that supported adding a porch. Staff responded that there was physical evidence that there was a porch over the stoop but not across the entire façade. No photographs exist to show the original condition. Windows on the façade have also been altered.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that based upon the evidence that has been presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the following facts: A 1-5 in the staff report with the change in 1. The main structure is a one story asbestos veneer structure with a pair of picture windows flanking an *extended* entry. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that based upon the facts found by the Board that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved with David Tharp voting in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/11/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

039/04-05/CA 109 Government Street
Applicant: Goodwyn Mills & Caywood, Architects/ Mobile County Commission, Owners
Received: 3/18/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: **5/01/05** **1) 4/11/05 2) 3)**

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Non - Contributing (less than 50 years of age)
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Nature of the Project: Demolish existing ca. 1959 Courthouse

STAFF REPORT

Section 10 of the Preservation Ordinance prohibits the demolition or relocation of “any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such buildings will not be detrimental to the historical and architectural character of the district...” In making this determination, the Board must examine a number of factors set out in the ordinance, each of which is discussed below:

Based on the information contained in the application, Staff finds that the loss of this structure will NOT impair the *historic integrity* of the structure and the district since the building has not reached 50 years of age..

- A. Historic or Architectural Significance
 - 1. The Church Street East Historic District was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1974.
 - 2. 109 Government Street is a three story masonry veneer Modernist structure, constructed from 1957-1959.
 - 3. Due to its age, the old Courthouse building is not a contributing structure within the district.
- B. Importance to the Integrity of the District
 - 1. The Church Street East Historic District contains the primary governmental, religious, educational, commercial and residential buildings which have provided a focus for the activities of the city from the nineteenth century to the present day.
 - 2. Buildings vary in size from 10 story mid-rise offices to one story shotguns.
 - 3. 109 Government Street is an imposing masonry veneer structure, and has served as the Mobile County Courthouse from 1959 until the present.
- C. Ability to Reproduce Historic Structures
 - 1. The type and quality of the materials used in the construction of 109 Government Street are readily available, however, the craftsmanship to reproduce some elements such as the mosaic murals, and sculptural elements is not readily available.
 - 2. The structure dates from the second half of the twentieth century.
- D. Proposed Redevelopment Plans for the Site
 - 1. Applicant states that there is to be a park dedicated to Mardi Gras developed on this site.
- E. Effect of Proposed Project on the Church Street East Historic District
 - 1. The removal of 109 Government Street would create a void in the streetscape.
- F. Content of Application
 - 1. Property information:
 - a. The property was constructed by the Mobile County Commission in 1959.

b. The property is currently owned by the Mobile County Commission.

2. Alternatives Considered

a. The applicant has stated that no other alternatives to demolition have been considered.

3. Sale of Property by Current Owners

a. Information presented in the application notes that the property has not been listed for sale.

b. The property has been used as the offices of the Mobile County Probate Court, Revenue and Board of Registrars since 1959.

4. Financial Proof

a. No information on financial proof was presented.

G. Other Information:

Staff has examined the park plans submitted as conceptual drawings with the demolition request. Staff finds several elements of the plan inappropriate to a historic urban setting.

1. Surrounding 95% of the perimeter of the park with trees is inappropriate for an urban setting. It shields the central lawn from public view, creating an area that many would consider unsafe. Generally successful urban parks utilize lower plantings and larger trees as site features.
2. The recreation of the historic watch tower along side the modern courthouse would create an inappropriate juxtaposition of styles and would create a false sense of history.
3. It is recommended that the park designers investigate successful urban parks in the southeast and incorporate a design which would enhance the historic character of the district and the National Historic Landmark across Royal Street.

Staff recommends the complete demolition be approved.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Nick Sfakianos, AIA appeared on behalf of the owner. Drawings for the court house annex and the park are not complete. He explained that the application is for demolition and site work only. Demolition will include the court house and retaining walls. During demolition a slatted chain link barrier will be installed near the sidewalk. Following demolition, the site will be regraded to 14 ft. to the crown of the hill and sodded and the fence will be relocated toward the crown.

Demolition of the court house will begin in 1-1 1/2 months and the demolition will take approximately 2 months. It will be an additional 7-8 months prior to the beginning of the annex construction.

The Board questioned why the old court house was not being rehabilitated. It was explained that the 1950s court house had serious abatement issues and that the current annex was designed to be expanded.

There was discussion concerning the retention of existing trees. Although the applicant has not appeared before the Tree Commission, it is the intent of the applicant to save a significant 32" oak on the Church Street side for reuse in the park. It is possible that other trees on the site may be saved, however, Bradford Pears are not heritage trees and will not be reused.

The applicant was asked about the permits that are being sought. The applicant responded that land disturbance, demolition and perhaps tree permits are being sought.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Board members decided to add a number of facts to the staff report. The facts include:

H. Historic artifacts from the court house will be salvaged and reused in the park.

- I. The site will be graded to a 14 ft. height.
- J. The owner has photographed the site.
- K. There are existing contract documents for the courthouse in County records.
- L. There will be a slatted construction fence 6 ft. in height.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence that has been presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the following facts: A-G in the staff report in addition to H-L. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/11/06.