

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
April 24, 2206

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. by Chair, Bunky Ralph. Ed Hooker, MHDC Architectural Engineer, called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Tilmon Brown, Douglas Kearley, Cindy Klotz, Harris Oswalt, Bunky Ralph, David Tharp., Jim Wagoner.

Members Absent: Robert Brown Michael Mayberry Cameron Pfeiffer Joe Sackett,

Staff Members Present: Ed Hooker, Anne Crutcher.

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Michael Smith	1002 Dauphin Street	057-05/06-CA
Bill Finch	1106 Savannah Street	Misc. Business

Tilmon Brown moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting as emailed. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Dee's Painting
Property Address: 511 Eslava Street
Date of Approval: 3/27/06 asc
Work Approved: Paint building in the existing color scheme. White house with unpainted brick to remain unpainted. Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension & materials.
2. Applicant's Name: Caldwell Delaney
Property Address: 12 S. Ann Street
Date of Approval: 3/28/08 weh
Work Approved: Remove existing deteriorated deck.
3. Applicant's Name: Michael Marshall
Property Address: 163 S. Georgia Avenue
Date of Approval: 3/28/06 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood on deck with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and materials. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
4. Applicant's Name: George Runyan
Property Address: 1320 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 3/28/06 weh
Work Approved: Rebuild front porch to match existing in materials, profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing color scheme.

5. Applicant's Name: George Runyan
Property Address: 1322 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 3/28/06 weh
Work Approved: Rebuild front porch to match existing in materials, profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing color scheme.

6. Applicant's Name: Tom Adkins/Building and Maintenance Company
Property Address: 1752 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 3/29/06 jdb
Work Approved: Repair/replace columns and handrails on front porch with existing materials and new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint in existing color scheme.

7. Applicant's Name: Joanne Saucier
Property Address: 1566 Blair Avenue
Date of Approval: 3/29/06 weh
Work Approved: Replace existing deteriorated wood privacy fence with new privacy fence matching existing in materials, profile and dimension.

8. Applicant's Name: Do Right Construction
Property Address: 1417 Monroe Street
Date of Approval: 3/29/06 weh
Work Approved: Reconstruct rear portion of house. Materials to match existing in profile, materials and dimensions. Roof pitch to match existing. Windows to be wood true divided lite to match existing.

9. Applicant's Name: Ray Lamb
Property Address: 110 South Catherine Street
Date of Approval: 3/31/06 weh
Work Approved: Install new architectural roof, antique slate in color.

10. Applicant's Name: Ray Lamb
Property Address: 1551 Monterey Place
Date of Approval: 3/31/06 weh
Work Approved: Install new 3 tab fiberglass shingle roof, weathered gray in color.

11. Applicant's Name: Linda Wert Olen & Michaela Lee
Property Address: 1758 New St. Francis Street
Date of Approval: 3/31/06 weh
Work Approved: Construct 16 x 16 wood tool shed as per submitted plans. Plans are a derivation of the MHDC Stock Plan. Exterior walls to be board & batten siding, gabled roof with shingles to match the main house. Paint scheme to match the main house.

12. Applicant's Name: Joanne Saucier
Property Address: 1566 Blair Avenue
Date of Approval: 3/31/06 weh
Work Approved: Construct wood deck at rear of house as per submitted

plans. Deck to be 11” high and measure 12’ deep by the width of the rear of the residence.

13. Applicant’s Name: David McConnell
Property Address: 1605 Government Street
Date of Approval: 3/31/06 weh
Work Approved: Replace existing damaged front doors with new front doors matching original in materials, profile and dimension. Strip the door surround and stain dark walnut to match original.
14. Applicant’s Name: American Roofing Company
Property Address: 205 Dexter Avenue
Date of Approval: 4/3/06 weh
Work Approved: Install 30 year Timberline shingles, charcoal gray in color.
15. Applicant’s Name: Kitlinck Construction
Property Address: 15 North Joachim Street
Date Approved: 4/3/06 weh
Work Approved: Install new timberline shingles, onyx black in color.
16. Applicant’s Name: Cooper Roofing Company
Property Address: 1662 Government Street
Date Approved: 4/3/06 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof with fiberglass shingles, charcoal gray in color.
17. Applicant’s Name: Gump & Moore Construction
Property Address: 1112 Palmetto Street
Date Approved: 4/5/06 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten/storm damaged wood as necessary with new materials matching existing in materials, profile and dimension. Paint new materials in existing color scheme.
18. Applicant’s Name: Delta Construction
Property Address: 31 South Reed Avenue
Date Approved: 4/5/06 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten fascia boards and wood as necessary with new materials matching existing in profile, dimension and materials. Paint new materials in existing color scheme.
19. Applicant’s Name: Quick Cash Houses, LLC
Property Address: 356 Charles Street
Date Approved: 4/6/06 asc
Work Approved: Repaint house in the following Sherwin Williams Color Scheme:
 - Body – Colonial Revival Stone Green
 - Trim – Classical White
 - Accent/Shutters – Roycroft Bronze Green
 - Door – Roycroft Copper Red or wood stained
 - Porch Ceiling – light blue
 - Porch Deck – dark greenInstall banister & handrail using MHDC stock plans.

Repair roof to match existing. Install new entrance door (design to be approved at a later date) Reglaze windows as necessary.

20. Applicant's Name: Kenneth Palmertree
Property Address: 1114 Old Shell Road
Date Approved: 4/7/06 jss
Work Approved: Install new 3 tab fiberglass shingles, black in color, to match existing in color and dimension (house and shed)
21. Applicant's Name: Mike Henderson
Property Address: 206 ½ South Broad Street
Date Approved: 3/10/06 weh
Work Approved: Remove existing roof and install new decking. Install new 30 year Timberline roof, black in color. Install concrete drive in location of existing dirt drive.

NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS:

1. Name: Janelle Calla
Property Address: 1553 Fearnway
Action Taken: NOV
Date of Notice: 3/29/06
Violation: Failure to comply with ARB approval to construct a stamped, stained and heavily landscaped circular drive.
2. Name: Gene Russell
Property Address: 204 Marine Street
Action Taken: NOV
Date of Notice: 3/31/06
Violation: Installation of a frosted glass and metal front entry door without ARB approval or COA.
3. Name: James Huffman, Jr.
Property Address: 350 Charles Street
Action Taken: NOV
Date of Notice: 2/1/06
Violation: Installation of a metal exterior patio door in a fence in lieu of a gate.
4. Name: James Huffman, Jr.
Property Address: 350 Charles Street
Action Taken: MOT
Date of Ticket: 3/15/06
Court Date: 4/5/06 (held over at owner's request)
5. Name: Current Occupant (property owned by Archdiocese)
Property Address: 1408 Old Shell Road
Action Taken: NOV
Date of Notice: 4/12/06
Violation: Unapproved painting. Aluminum siding was painted white. Trim was painted purple and front door was painted lemon yellow.

6. Name: Current Occupant (property recently sold)
Property Address: 64 Bradford Avenue
Action Taken: NOV
Date of Notice: 4/12/06
Violation: Installation of a satellite dish on front of residence;
Partial demolition of original garage
7. Name: Danny L. and Amelia Perry
Property Address: 201 Michigan Avenue
Action Taken: NOV
Date of Notice: 4/12/06
Violation: Erection of a wood privacy fence exceeding 6' in height
in line with the front elevation of the residence, without
a CoA or building permit.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **055-05/06-CA** 112 Beverly Court
Applicant: Nancy Seibt, Owner/Ben Cummings, Architect
Nature of Request: Install new entry portico as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
2. **056-05/06-CA** 470 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Walker Brothers Investment, Inc.
Nature of Request: Remove solid masonry wall damaged by Hurricane
Katrina and replace with wood studs with stucco exterior
as per submitted plan.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.
3. **057/05-06-CA** 1002 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Michael Smith & Karen Carr
Nature of Request: Conduct work in two phases:
Phase 1 – Add tool room and second floor screened porch;
Phase 2 – Add 2 car garage and enclose phase 1 screened
porch and add new screened porch and room above garage.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
4. **058-05/06-CA** 20 LeMoyne Place
Applicant: Bob and Lou Keene
Nature of Request: Remove iron railing and iron columns and install wood
columns and rails. Close French doors with fixed blinds.
Relocate rear triple window to side. Install new window, door
and hood at rear.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. Bill Finch was present to discuss the appropriateness of wire fencing in the historic districts. He took exception to a remark made in a 2004 letter written to him that characterized its use as more rural than urban. He felt that it was more suburban, rather than rural, in character. Finch

stated that he was going to write about the material. He stated that it was a historic material, was used in Mobile and doesn't interfere with the architecture it surrounds. He noted that, while the material is approved in the Guidelines, he sought something prescriptive that could be quoted in his upcoming article. He presented to the Board a summary of his research on the fence type noting that he would like to use it at his residence on Savannah Street and that it was only available by mail currently. The Board complimented Mr Finch on his research and thanked him for the resource.

Board members agreed that wire fencing with a variety of post materials and styles was a historic material. However, the Board reviews each application on a case-by-case basis and the fencing pattern, style, configuration, supports posts and gates might not be approved in all proposed applications. Because of the case-by-case requirement of review, there is no design that could be considered prescriptive. The Board also informed Mr. Finch that his questions regarding fencing setback and height should be addressed to the Right of Way department and Traffic Engineering. Lastly, this general discussion of wire fencing does not substitute as an application for fencing of this type at his home.

2. Devereaux Bemis announced that there will be a design competition for the Bienville Square guard house. A \$500 prize will be offered for the best design.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor a representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else 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 whether the building was contributing to the district and whether the proposed stoop would alter its status. The Board also asked whether the stoop was at grade and if the iron stair railing was original. Staff responded that the stoop is at or near grade, that the proposed stoop is designed to leave the existing architectural element over the door in place. As for the railing, Staff did not know if it is an original feature. Staff offered that the proposed stoop will not alter its contributing status.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

David Tharp moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cindy Klotz 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 David Tharp and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/24/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

056-05/06 – CA 470-476 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Walker Brothers Investment, Inc./James and Woodrow Walker
Received: 4/10/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 5/25/06 1) 4/24/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Nature of the Project: Demolish existing historic east end load bearing masonry wall damaged by Hurricane Katrina and reconstruct a new wall using wood studs sheathed with stucco as per submitted plan.

STAFF REPORT

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

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 ANALYSIS

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

- A. The Guidelines state that “The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period...Particular care should be taken with masonry...Bricks and mortar should match the original in color, finish (strike) and thickness.”
1. The ca. 1854 Swain (Tobin) Building is a contributing structure within the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District.
 2. The building has been vacant since prior to 1992.
 3. The 2 ½ story solid masonry gable end and parapet showed signs of possible failure prior to damage by Hurricane Katrina.
 4. Winds of the hurricane blew out approximately 4’ – 7’ of the end gable.
 5. This wall was never an exterior wall as evidenced by the mortise pockets and remains of chimneys visible on the east elevation.
 6. The existing wall was always an interior party wall and until the building to the east was demolished, was not visible from public view.
 7. The applicants are requesting to dismantle the wall down to the foundation and construct a new wall in its place.
 8. The proposed new wall is to be constructed of wood studs with metal lath and stucco finish.
 9. This building is a Type 3B construction constructed directly on the property line.
 10. Type 3B construction requires a 2 hour fire rating at this location.
 11. The proposed wall construction only provides a 1 hour fire rating at this location.
 12. Adding additional layers of gypsum board can negate this issue.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else 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 the wall and whether it was load bearing. Staff responded that he was informed that the joists run north and south, so there is no weight on the wall. The Board questioned the instability of the front wall when the existing east wall is taken down to be rebuilt and noted that the fire rating of the proposed wood and stucco wall was only 1 hour when a 2 hour wall is required by code. Since most of the wall is intact, Board members considered that the existing masonry wall could be saved and rebuilt. Board members noted an identical situation that existed at 462 Dauphin Street when the west wall was damaged by Hurricane Ivan. That masonry wall was successfully rebuilt.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Cindy Klotz, with the approval of the Board, added fact 13. Most of the wall remains and is intact. Cindy Klotz moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report in addition to fact 13 as stated above. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cindy Klotz 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 the application be denied. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

057-05/06-CA 1002 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Michael Smith & Karen Carr
Received: 4/10/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 5/25/06 1) 4/24/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-1, Buffer Business
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Construct addition in two phases:
Phase 1 – construct tool shed with screened porch above.
Phase 2 – construct two car garage with studio & screened porch above,
All as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District Guidelines

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, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

1. The 1913 Nettles House is a contributing structure within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
2. The proposed Phase 1 of the project is to construct a two story addition with a tool shed at grade level and a screened porch above.
3. The proposed addition will measure 17’-4” wide by 12’ long.
4. The first floor will be covered in Dutch lap wood siding to match that on the main house.
5. A column and railing system consisting of square wood columns and simple wood handrail is proposed for the second floor porch.
6. Bronze screen in a pressure treated 2x2 frame is proposed to enclose the second floor porch.
7. Windows will be fixed single sash with nine lites.
8. Doors will be four panel wood with transom above.
9. Roof is proposed to be asphalt shingle to match that existing on the main house.
10. The proposed Phase 2 of the project is to construct a two car garage with a screened porch above.
11. The proposed garage will measure 23’ x 24’.
12. The first floor will be covered in Dutch lap siding to match that on the main house

- and Phase 1 of the addition.
13. 2 pair of garage doors are proposed for both the east and west elevations.
 14. It appears that the columns, railing and screen constructed during Phase 1 will be reused for the screened porch in Phase 2.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Owner Michael Smith was present to discuss the application. He explained that, although he described the project as occurring in phases, dependent on project costs, the project may be completed all at once. He explained that the site plan had changed to create a courtyard with the garage building being sited 11 ft. to the west in order to preserve a Magnolia tree. Mr. Smith also explained that he owned the vacant lot to the east and the lot behind.

There was no one else 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 DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

The Board found an additional fact:

15. The site plan had been modified to move the garage building 11 ft. to the west to preserve a magnolia tree and create a courtyard.

Cindy Klotz moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board find the facts in the Staff report with the addition of fact 15 as stated above. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp 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 Tilmon Brown and approved unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/24/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

058-05/06-CA 20 LeMoyne Place
Applicant: Bob and Lou Keene
Received: 4/10/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 5/25/06 1) 4/24/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Remove iron columns and iron railing from front porch and install new wood columns and rails. Close existing French door with fixed louvered blinds. Relocate rear triple window to side. Install new window, door and hood at rear.

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

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, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

- A. The Guidelines state that “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture...Particular attention should be paid to handrails...posts, columns, proportions and decorative details.”
1. The subject property is a one story wood frame bungalow with a monolithic end gable and smaller gable over the porch and entry.
 2. The existing front porch elements are of decorative metal, and consist of L-shaped columns, brackets and balustrade.
 3. These existing elements are not typical of the bungalow architectural style, and are probably not original to the structure.
 4. The proposed replacement columns are square wood paneled columns.
 5. The proposed replacement handrail is a simple wood rail with handrail, square pickets and bottom rail.
- B. The Guidelines state that “Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
1. Currently there is an original porch that was enclosed at some time in the past.
 2. The applicants are requesting to alter this area to be a more appropriate and sympathetic porch enclosure.
 3. The applicants are requesting to relocate an existing triple wood double hung window from the rear to the side.

4. The applicants are requesting to install a pair of new wood double hung windows on the rear elevation.
 5. Both the rear and side elevation are secondary elevations and have been previously altered.
- C. The Guidelines state that “Original doors should be retained along with any mouldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building.”
1. The existing rear door is not original to the structure nor is it in its original location.
 2. The applicants are requesting to remove this door and feather in the siding to match the existing.
 3. The applicants are proposing to install a new back door in the center of the rear elevation covered by a wood frame hood supported by wood brackets.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted. The applicants are also requesting to repaint the entire structure, however no paint colors were submitted. This request can be handled by staff on a mid-month basis.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else 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 DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

David Tharp moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Cindy Klotz and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cindy Klotz 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 Jim Wagoner and approved unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/24/07.