

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
May 22, 2006

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair, Bunky Ralph.

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

Members Present: Robert Brown, Tilmon Brown, Douglas Kearley, Cindy Klotz, Michael Mayberry, Harris Oswalt, Cameron Pfeiffer, Bunky Ralph, David Tharp, Jim Wagoner.

Members Absent: Joe Sackett.

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

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Steven Crenshaw	210 Government	065-05/06-CA
Warren Butler	114 Lanier Ave.	064-05/06-CA
Rusty Reid	412 Dauphin Street	001-05/06-CA

Cindy Klotz moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting as emailed. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt 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: Western Mobile Roofing
Property Address: 54 Bradford Avenue
Date of Approval: 4/24/06 weh
Work Approved: Install new 3 tab fiberglass shingles, black blend in color.
2. Applicant's Name: Dobson Sheet Metal and Roofing
Property Address: 111 South Royal Street
Date of Approval: 4/24/06 weh
Work Approved: Replace terne coated stainless steel on cupola. Paint to match in existing color scheme.
3. Applicant's Name: Building and Maintenance Company
Property Address: 312 South Monterey Street
Date of Approval: 4/25/06 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with materials matching existing in materials, profile and dimension. Repaint building in existing color scheme.
4. Applicant's Name: Kenneth Palmertree
Property Address: 1114 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 4/25/06 weh
Work Approved: Reconstruct roof system damaged by Hurricane Katrina to match existing in materials, profile and dimension.

5. Applicant's Name: Phyllis Boyd
Property Address: 110 Bush Avenue
Date of Approval: 4/27/06 weh
Work Approved: Repair or replace rotten wood on house and garage with materials matching existing in materials, profile and dimension. Repaint house in existing color scheme. Level foundation on both house and garage. Repair roof on house and garage with materials matching existing in materials, profile and dimension. Replace retractable awning on rear of residence.

6. Applicant's Name: Applied Marine Design
Property Address: 308 Congress Street
Date of Approval: 4/28/06 weh
Work Approved: Install 3' x 3' double faced sign, white with black letters, as per submitted information. Continue installation of framed lattice fence along rear property line as per submitted information.

7. Applicant's Name: Burrough's Roofing Company
Property Address: 263 Marine Street
Date of Approval: 4/28/06 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, black in color.

8. Applicant's Name: Haston Construction Company
Property Address: 1201 Springhill Avenue
Date of Approval: 5/1/06 weh
Work Approved: Paint exterior handrails to match existing color scheme.

9. Applicant's Name: Hoffman Furniture/Perry Coleman
Property Address: 661 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 5/1/06 asc
Work Approved: Install new black 3 tab asphalt shingle roof.

10. Applicant's Name: Rentz Home Maintenance
Property Address: 23 Lafayette Street
Date of Approval: 5/1/06 asc
Work Approved: Install new 3 tab fiberglass roof, black or charcoal blend in color.

11. Applicant's Name: Liberty Roofing Company
Property Address: 1565 Blair Avenue
Date of Approval: 5/1/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof with 30 year architectural grade shingles, charcoal in color.

12. Applicant's Name: Laura Clarke
Property Address: 10 South Catherine Street
Date of Approval: 5/2/06 weh
Work Approved: Install new Timberline roof, weathered wood in color.

13. Applicant's Name: Emanuel Gazzier
Property Address: 153 South Monterey Street

Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Repaint building. Paint colors to be submitted at a later date.

22. Applicant's Name: Betty Gibbons
Property Address: 18 South Ann Street
Date of Approval: 5/9/06 weh
Work Approved: Repaint exterior in existing color scheme. Remove fallen tree stump in back yard. Repair any fence damage resulting from tree root removal.

NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS:

No NoVs or MoTs were written during this time period.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. **001-5/6-CA** 412 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Real Source Holdings, Inc.
Nature of Request: Phase 2 of main project. Convert rear building into 3 residential units. Redesign front and west elevation doors and windows.
TABLED Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **064-05/06-CA** 114 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Warren Butler
Nature of Request: Addition to increase size of existing laundry room at rear of residence as per submitted plans.
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

2. **065-05/06-CA** 210 Government Street
Applicant: Sign Pro/ Springhill Medical Center
Nature of Request: Install signage as per submitted plans.
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. Remember the Baltimore Trip - July 27-30, 2006
2. Cindy Klotz reported that a U-shaped drive had been installed without approval on Dauphin Street. Staff stated that it was already aware of the violation.
3. Staff explained that only two designs were submitted by AIA members for the guard building in Bienville Square. As a stop gap measure, the existing building will be painted, and window boxes and planters added to make it more compatible. In the meantime, one of the submitted designs that was modeled after the existing Bienville Square bandstand, has been given to Building and Grounds to provide a cost estimate for its construction. Board members are encouraged to visit Bienville Square to look at the modifications to the existing guard shack.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:15p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

001-05/06 – CA 412 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Joseph Cleveland Architects/Real Source Holdings, Inc.
Received: 5/08/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 6/27/06 1) 10/17/05 2) 5/22/06 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Conflicts of Interest: Tilmon Brown and David Tharp recused themselves from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of the Project: Phase 2 of main project. Convert rear building into 3 residential units. Redesign front and west elevation doors and windows.

STAFF REPORT

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…”

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work is in compliance with the *Design Review Guidelines* and the *Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Design Guidelines*.

Part 1 – Convert Rear Building into 3 residential units.

- A. FAÇADE ALTERATIONS – Windows** - The *Design Review Guidelines* state that “The type, size, and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.
1. This area was originally constructed as a storage and warehouse facility for the main building. Currently there are 2 windows and one door on the south elevation and one garage door opening on the west elevation. The north and east elevations are solid brick.
 2. Plans call for the installation of double hung windows and doors.
- B. FAÇADE ALTERATIONS – Doors** – The *Design Review Guidelines* state that “Original doors and openings should be retained along with any mouldings, transoms, and sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building.”
1. The existing building’s primary façade faces west onto Hamilton Street.
 2. The proposed design respects the age and style of the building.
- C. ROOF ALTERATIONS – Parapet Wall and Sloped Roof** – The *Design Review Guidelines* state that “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained.”
1. The existing roof is flat concealed behind a horizontal brick parapet.
 2. The proposed roof has sloped end parapets and a steeply pitched shingled roof.

Staff recommends approval of this portion of the application as submitted.

Part 2 – Redesign Front and West Elevation Windows

Project Background:

The ARB approved plans for this project in October 2005. At that time, 10’ wood and glass doors with tall transoms above were proposed for the Dauphin Street elevation. During the course of construction, a large steel beam supporting the masonry above the first floor was discovered. This beam limits the height of the first floor doors and does not allow for a transom. The contractor installed 8’ wood multi-light doors with narrow transoms above. The scale was determined inappropriate for the building and presented a material impairment to the structure and the district.

The applicants are now requesting permission to install 10’ wood and glass doors with stucco panels above. Ironwork from the previous application will remain the same. The proposed design emphasizes the verticality of the original building elements, which is a significant character-defining feature of the building.

Staff Recommendation:

Due to Staff’s involvement with the applicants on this issue, Staff has no comment or recommendation, other than to defer to the Board for the determination of appropriateness.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tilmon Brown submitted a written statement explaining that Rusty Reid would be present to answer questions. He stated that the staff report was correct with regard to the rear building. He further explained the rationale for altering the first floor doors of the main building and explained that the staff report was incorrect when it mentioned the installation of 10 ft. rather than 8 ft. tall wood and glass doors.

Staff explained that 412 Dauphin is listed as a contributing building in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District. The rear building, fronting N. Hamilton Street, was not included in the district but, as a result of re-subdivision of the parcel, the rear building is now part of the district. The rear building consists of 4 walls and a slab.

Board members expressed difficulty understanding the drawings. No dimensions are noted and the drawings do not appear to accurately reflect the proposed materials. On the rear building, for example, window lintels and sills are drawn as stone.

Board members also questioned the proportion of the windows on the west wall and whether the gabled windows on the north and south walls were projecting or recessed.

Rusty Reid explained that the east and west walls of the rear building will be stucco as will be the window lintels and sills. The water table will be concrete. He also explained that the coping would be galvanized steel coping. In addition, skylights indicated on the drawing may not be used. The gabled windows in question will project slightly.

Board members were concerned that a great deal of water would be directed onto the sidewalk and courtyard and wondered what storm water management provisions such as gutters and downspouts had been made.

The Board discussed proposed changes to the openings on the first floor of the main building. Although the design of the upper floors had been previously approved, the Board had lingering questions concerning whether certain elements that were to be duplicated were even present. For example, ghosts of circles on the façade were once made of wood but would be duplicated in fypon.

The proportion of the stucco panels was discussed and the Board felt panels should more rectangular than square. The Board also wanted more information on the precise location of the beam that prevented the installation of transoms over the doors. Previous plans by Watermark were compared to the proposed plans. The Watermark drawings showed that the firm had no knowledge of the beam since the

beam was discovered only when opening the wall. Cindy Klotz stated that she had worked on the building for Watermark and the beam was not visible. Responding to a Board question regarding the fire escape on the main building, Staff responded that it was an original feature and will be repaired. 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

The Board discussed tabling the application for additional information since the Board did not feel it could evaluate the application without additional information.

FINDING OF FACT

There was no finding of fact.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cindy Klotz moved that, based upon a lack of information, that the application be tabled. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved. The Board enumerated items about which it sought clarification:

Rear building:

1. Plans that include dimensions and materials including the water table.
2. Submittal of a site plan showing the fence with fence details.
3. Information on guttering and downspouts.
4. Information on the skylights.
5. Better design on the west elevation windows that appear squat.
6. Information on the central window on the south elevation—is it recessed or projecting?

Main building:

7. Information on the beam in the front and west elevations.
8. Match the design of the front and west elevations.
9. Information on 3rd floor lintels.
10. Confirm that stucco panels will match existing.
11. Information on material and design of circles—painted or 3 dimensional?

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

064-05/06-CA 114 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Warren Butler
Received: 4/26 /06 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 6/04/06 1) 5/22/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Increase size of existing laundry room at rear of residence as per submitted plans.

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.

1. The 1926 Wheeler House is a two story frame residence.
2. The subject structure is a contributing element within the Ashland Place Historic District.
3. The subject structure is located on a prominent corner, at the intersection of Lanier Avenue and DeLeon Avenue.
4. The applicants are proposing to extend an existing laundry room by squaring off the northeast corner of the residence.
5. The proposed addition will measure approximately 5'-7" wide by 8'-11" deep.
6. An existing wood casement window currently located in the kitchen and facing east will be relocated to the proposed north wall.
7. A 12" high by 3' wide fixed wood transom will be located in the proposed east wall.
8. Wood siding will be feathered in to match existing and painted to match existing.
9. A shallow pitched shed roof will slope from west to east, and shingles will match those on the existing roof.
10. The 3-d perspective of the rear of the residence depicts a shed roof over the addition running from south to north. However, the applicant has sketched in an alternate roof which runs from west to east.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Butler was present to discuss the application. He stated that he believed that squaring up the house and removing the lattice work would improve the look of the house. The roof shown in the submitted perspective is incorrect and will actually slope perpendicular to the house.

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

The Board discussed altering facts in the staff report as follows: 10. The 3-d perspective of the rear of the residence depicts a shed roof over the addition running from south to north. However, the applicant has amended the application to a roof that runs east to west.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown 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 with fact 10 amended as above. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and approved. Douglas Kearley abstained since he was not present for the testimony portion of the hearing.

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 David Tharp and approved with Douglas Kearley abstaining.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 05/22/07.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Stephen Crenshaw representing Springhill Memorial Medical Clinic was present to discuss the application. He stated that the preferred sign is option 4 which is internally lit. This option will provide the greatest visibility. He explained that while the clinic will be initially open limited hours, it has the capability of being a 24 hour facility thus making good visibility of the sign important. Mr. Crenshaw noted that channel letters would not be possible due to the thinness of the sign.

The Board questioned the applicant regarding proposed lighting for the sign. Mr. Crenshaw stated that the lighting solution had not been determined. He was concerned that lighting from above with spotlights might make the painted sign very reflective and hard to read. One method of lighting that he was considering was installing a fluorescent light at the base of the sign to shine upward.

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

The Board removed facts 7 and 8 from the staff report since neither option is available to the clinic.

FINDING OF FACT

Douglas Kearley moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds facts 1-6 in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by David Tharp 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 district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for the sign (option 1 or 2) conditioned upon Staff approving the method of lighting. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved. *Certificate of Appropriateness to be issued when method of lighting is approved by Staff.*