

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
April 25, 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, Cindy Klotz, Michael Mayberry, David Tharp, Bunky Ralph, Harris Oswald, Tilmon Brown, alternate Andrew Martin.

Members Absent: Robert Brown, Joe Sackett Cameron Pfeiffer.

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

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
John Vallas	2308 Ashland Place Ave.	042-04/05-CA
Paul Frankl	Radcliff & Assoc.	044-04/05-CA
Ronnie Taylor	TAG Architects	044-04/05-CA

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the minutes as posted on the web. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.

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

MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Michael Duff Construction
Property Address: 1156 Church Street
Date of Approval: 3/29/05 weh
Work Approved: Repair handrail on the front porch with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Replace rotten siding on dormers. Repaint to match existing.
2. Applicant's Name: Enoch Aguilera
Property Address: 50 South Ann Street
Date of Approval: 3/29/05
Work Approved: Move historic Bellingrath garage to new site on government street.
3. Applicant's Name: Enoch Aguilera
Property Address: 1114 Government Street
Date of Approval: 3/29/05 weh
Work Approved: Move historic Bellingrath garage to new site on government street. Locate property as per site plan approved by ARB.
4. Applicant's Name: Fred South
Property Address: 1050 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 3/28/05 jss

- Work Approved: Repair/replace garage siding as necessary. Paint garage body to match house, white trim.
5. Applicant's Name: Tom Karwinski, AIA
Property Address: 17 South Lafayette Street
Date of Approval: 3/29/05 weh
Work Approved: Construct sidewalk and extend drive as per submitted site plan.
 6. Applicant's Name: Arthur Clarke
Property Address: 156 State Street
Date of Approval: 3/29/05 asc
Work Approved: Install metal 5-v crimp or standing seam silver metal roof.
 7. Applicant's Name: James W. Carter
Property Address: 200 South Washington Avenue
Date of Approval: 3/29/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair or replace windows to match existing in profile, material and dimension. Replace rotten wood with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint to match existing color scheme. Install four panel doors on front façade. Install wood shutters to properly fit window openings. Paint shutters black.
 8. Applicant's Name: Victor Stanton
Property Address: 462 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 3/29/05 weh
Work Approved: Reconstruct masonry and frame wall to repair hurricane damage as per submitted plans.
 9. Applicant's Name: Tierce Construction
Property Address: 1310 Chamberlain Avenue
Date of Approval: 3/29/05 weh
Work Approved: Repair rafters and re-roof from hurricane damage.
 10. Applicant's Name: John Green Jr.
Property Address: 160 Roberts Street
Date of Approval: 4/1/05 weh
Work Approved: Install 30' of fencing to connect existing fencing. Install gate across drive. Construct deck measuring 12' x 20' at a height no greater than 16" off the ground.
 11. Applicant's Name: Trinity Construction Company
Property Address: 108 Bush Avenue
Date of Approval: 4/4/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof house with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, black in color.
 12. Applicant's Name: Springhill Medical Center
Property Address: 1551 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 4/3/05 weh

Work Approved: Re-roof medical building with materials matching existing in color, profile and dimension.

13. Applicant's Name: Allphase Roofing Company
Property Address: 962 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 4/5/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair damaged valley of roof to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
14. Applicant's Name: Brian Dorgan
Property Address: 1708 McGill
Date of Approval: 4/6/05 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
15. Applicant's Name: Adolphus Mitchell
Property Address: 52 South Catherine Street
Date of Approval: 3/6/05 weh
Work Approved: Pour concrete drive in location of existing dirt drive.
16. Applicant's Name: Ellsworth Foods, Inc./ Quality Sign Company
Property Address: 1500 Government St., Suite 1
Date of Approval: 4/11/05 asc
Work Approved: Install aluminum reverse channel neon letters and logo totaling 45 square feet per submitted design.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **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

2. **040/04-05/CA** 1750 Hunter Avenue
Applicant: Kenneth Merrill
Nature of Project: Construct a brick and iron fence around perimeter of property; construct solid masonry wall on north property line as per submitted plans.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

3. **041-04/05-CA** 214 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. E.L. McCafferty III
Nature of Project: Remove existing metal garage door and construct wood wall with central pair of wood French doors and fixed wood paned windows; replace narrow doors on the side with wood windows.

TABLED Certified Record attached.

4. **042-04/05-CA** 2308 Ashland Place Avenue
Applicant: John Vallas
Nature of Project: Install 6' chain link fence, powder coated green, along rear of alley and north property line as per submitted site plan.

APPROVED Certified Record attached.

5. **043-04/05-CA** Southeast Corner of Cedar and Dauphin Streets
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund/ Douglas Kearley, Architect
Nature of Project: Construct four townhouses as per submitted plans.

APPROVED Certified Record attached.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

1. Ronnie Taylor with The Architects Group appeared before the Board to introduce a project adjacent to Lyons Pipes & Cook on Royal and Dauphin Streets. The project will involve the construction of a six level parking garage with attached commercial/retail space. The Board directed the staff to work with the architect as the project developed.
2. Board members are concerned that signs are disappearing from properties with applications before the Board limiting public notice.
3. Lynda Burkett suggested that, with the election of a new mayor, the Board should consider making its policies and fees in line with the Planning Commission and Board of Zoning Adjustment. A discussion on this topic will be handled by the Rules Committee composed of Bunky Ralph, David Tharp and Tilmon Brown.
4. Harris Oswald requested a copy of the latest ARB membership appointment roster. The most recent appointment list will be mailed to all members.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:04 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

040/04-05/CA 1750 Hunter Avenue
Applicant: Kenneth Merrill
Received: 3/14/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 5/07/05 1) 4/25/05 2)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Construct a brick and iron fence around perimeter of property; construct solid masonry wall on north property line 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	Fences, Walls & Gates	Install iron fence resting on brick foundation around perimeter of property. Erect masonry courtyard wall on north property line.

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 two story American Foursquare with an enclosed glass and vinyl sided front porch, and new brick veneer
 - 2. The proposed iron fence is 6’ in height – 2’ high brick knee wall with 4’ high iron fence on top with 14 ½” square piers spaced at 8’ intervals.
 - 3. There will be a matching iron gate across the drive facing Hannon Avenue.
 - 4. The fence will be black in color.
 - 5. A brick sample, matching that of the house’s veneer, was provided.
 - 6. A brochure of the ironwork and associate details was provided.
 - 7. The applicants are requesting the fence in order to contain their Dobermans.

Staff recommends approval of the application 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. Bunky Ralph asked how the masonry wall will be capped. Staff responded that it will be brick. Staff explained that the sample brick proposed for use on the perimeter wall matched the brick veneer on the north and west sides of the house.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Board members were concerned that no adjacent properties had 6 ft. fences in the front yard. Fences in the front yard in the area were generally 3 ft. picket fences with privacy fences restricted to the rear and side yards.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved to find the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence of record, that the proposed perimeter fence would impair the structure and the adjacent district according to the guidelines and the facts set forth in the staff report. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved. Douglas Kearley moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned upon the perimeter fence being no more than 4 ft. in height with any brick base not to exceed 8 in. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/25/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

041/04-05/CA 214 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. E.L. McCafferty, III
Received: 3/14/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 5/07/05 1) 4/25/05 2)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Remove deteriorated garage door and construct infill wall with new wood French doors and windows, and exchange side door for window, 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	Accessory Structures	construct infill wall with new wood French doors and windows, and exchange side door for window, as per submitted plans.

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 two story English Tudor Revival residence.
 - 2. This is an original garage, and is listed as a contributing element in the Ashland Place Historic District National Register Nomination.
 - 3. The garage is situated at the rear of the drive at the rear of the property.
 - 4. Closing in of garages in this manner is a typical treatment for turning garages into interior conditioned spaces.
 - 5. The materials are compatible with the existing house.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board felt that an elevation drawing must be part of the application in order to properly assess whether the proposed work would or would not impair the integrity of the property or the adjacent district.

FINDING OF FACT AND DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved to table the application until additional information was submitted on the garage elevation. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

042/04-05/CA 2308 Ashland Place Avenue
Applicant: John P. Vallas, Jr.
Received: 4/12/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 5/27/05 1) 4/25/05 2)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Install a 3’ high wood picket fence in front yard along sidewalk on south and west property lines. Install a 5-6’ high green powder coated chain link fence in rear of property along alley and along north property line. Vegetation to be planted to conceal fence.

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	Fences, Walls & Gates	Install picket fence install powder coated chain link fence.

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 picket fence construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.
 - 1. The main structure is a large two story residence with bungalow detailing, resting upon a high foundation.
 - 2. The proposed picket fence is 3’ in height and is to begin at the northwestern most corner of the residence , then turn north and run to the property line.
 - 3. There will be a matching iron gate across the drive facing Hannon Avenue.
 - 4. The fence will be painted white.
- B. The proposed chain link fence installation is not in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.
 - 1. Regular silver chain link fencing is not allowed according to the Design Review Guidelines.
 - 2. The proposed fencing material is powder coated green chain link.
 - 3. The location of the proposed fence is along a rear service alley and along the north property line, which has heavy vegetation.

Staff recommends approval of the 3’ wood picket fence as submitted.
Staff defers the appropriateness of the powder coated green chain link fence to the Board.

Applicant is advised that a Banner & Shield will not be granted to any structure with a chain link fence even if it was approved by the Architectural Review Board.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

John Vallas appeared before the Board. He explained that he had 4 children, 3 under the age of 7. His request was based upon security issues since he wanted neighbors to be able to see through the chain link into the backyard. He explained that the fence will be installed where the vegetation is thick and that it will not be visible from Lanier or Ashland Place Avenue. The fence will meander with the knee wall in areas and additional vegetation will be planted in front of the fence. He corrected the staff report which stated that the application was for a 4 ' high fence; in reality he would like it to be 5-6 ft. high. He also corrected Item A.3. saying that it did not refer to his property, but a property on Hannon Avenue.

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

Douglas Kearley reminded the Board that a similar application was submitted for another property some years ago.

FINDING OF FACT

Douglas Kearley proposed that fact C. Chain link fence proposed to be 5-6 ft. in height be added to the facts. The motion was seconded by Andrew Martin and approved
Tilmon Brown moved to find the facts in the staff report and the fact that the fence would be 5-6 ft. in height. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved that, based upon the evidence of record, that the proposed work does not materially impair the structure or the district according to the guidelines and the facts set forth in the staff report and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and approved with Bunky Ralph opposing the motion.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/25/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

043-04/05-CA Southeast corner of Cedar and Dauphin Streets
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund/ Douglas Kearley Architect
Received: 3/18/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 5/01/05 1) 4/25/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (new construction)
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Construction of four new townhouses as per submitted plans.

The building site is located on the south side of Dauphin Street between Cedar and Lawrence Streets, behind Barton Academy.

The building faces north towards Dauphin Street, and the front building line is on the sidewalk. The three easternmost units are to be constructed out of Carolina brick. Foundation is floating slab. The ground plan is rectangular in design. All roofs are gabled with parapet ends and party walls. Doors are wood, French. The three identical units have pairs of batten blinds and a pair of classically-inspired dormers on the roof.

The end/corner unit has a battered recessed entry, a full two story brick façade and a cantilevered iron porch on the second floor.

Each unit has a rear courtyard and one parking space accessed off an alley in the middle of the block.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation – floating concrete slab
- b. façade – Carolina Brick veneer
- c. doors – wood with glazing, wood with panels
- d. windows –six-over-six and nine-over-nine wood sash
- e. wood blinds, batten and louvered
- f. roof –side gable with parapet walls

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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Design Standards for New Construction	Construct new townhouses
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. Buildings in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District are mainly commercial in nature and are predominantly built at the sidewalk.
- B. The proposed setback is approximately zero feet based on the plans.

3,II

2. Massing and Scale:

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. There are a few remaining examples of residential structures right at the sidewalk, including the Chighizola House (ca. 1852) and the Elkus House (ca. 1854) in the Church Street East Historic District. There are numerous ones between the Lower Dauphin Street Historic District and the DeTonti Square Historic District.
 - 1. The proposed buildings are 1 ½ to 2 story brick veneer structures.
- B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. Most modern commercial structures adjacent to this site have slab-on-grade foundations. However, most historic structures have similar finished floor levels as those proposed.
 - 2. The proposed foundation is a floating concrete slab.
- 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 Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District, but the most common are flat roofs behind a parapet and end gables with parapets.

3, III

III. Façade Elements:

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. The use of pairs of wood French doors with batten blinds, wood windows with louvered blinds, rooftop dormers and cantilevered cast iron balconies replicate similar adjacent historic designs.

3, IV

IV. Materials and Ornamentation:

- A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
 - 1. There are a number of commercial brick veneer structures in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.

- B. The guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found in the design of nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
1. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends approval of the application 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 the fact that there were multiple entrances onto the sidewalk. Staff reported that the door arrangement was not unusual for a townhouse. Right of Way will have to give permission for the stairs to encroach on the right of way. Staff also indicated that there are two alternate roof forms indicated and that the balcony roof will be imitation slate. There were questions concerning an alleyway and responsibility for maintaining it. Although the city owns the alleyway, it does not maintain it. It was concluded that maintenance of the alleyway was not germane to the Review Board process.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved to find the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Linda Burkett and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence of record, that the proposed work does not materially impair the district according to the guidelines and the facts set forth in the staff report and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/25/06.