

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
May 23, 2005

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. by Chair, Cindy Klotz.

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

Members Present: Lynda Burkett, Michael Mayberry, David Tharp, Bunky Ralph, Cindy Klotz, Tilmon Brown, Cameron Pfeiffer.

Members Absent: Douglas Kearley, Harris Oswald, Robert Brown, Joe Sackett.

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

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Amy Hamilton	1157 Palmetto	054-04/05-CA
Eleesha and Thomas Neese	254 Stocking`	047-04/05-CA

David Tharp moved to approve the minutes as mailed. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Git-R-Done
Property Address: 100 North Ann Street
Date of Approval: 4/25/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building with timberline shingles, charcoal in color.
2. Applicant's Name: Fremin's Home Improvement and Remodeling LLC
Property Address: 261 N. Joachim St.
Date of Approval: 4/27/05 jdb
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood on siding, windows, shutters and privacy fence with new materials to match existing in profile, material and dimension. Repaint house in existing color scheme. Replenish gravel in parking area and drive with material to match existing.
3. Applicant's Name: Deborah Forest
Property Address: 204 South Dearborn Street
Date of Approval: June 2, 2005
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with new wood matching existing in profile and dimension. Repaint in

existing color scheme. Reconstruct front steps and construct handrails to match the design of the front porch rail. THIS COA REPLACES COA DATED OCTOBER 22, 2002.

4. Applicant's Name: McDonald's Restaurant
Property Address: 658 Government Street
Date of Approval: 4/28/05 weh
Work Approved: Demolish non-historic McDonald's Restaurant

5. Applicant's Name: Ruby Tadlock
Property Address: 107 Bradford Avenue
Date of Approval: 4/28/05 weh
Work Approved: Construct 12' x 12' storage building per MHDC stock plans. Either board and batten or lap siding exterior.

6. Applicant's Name: Katie Jernigan
Property Address: 27 Hannon Avenue
Date of Approval: 4/29/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair storm-damaged garage with new materials to match existing in profile, material and dimension. Paint new materials and house to match existing color scheme.

7. Applicant's Name: Ernest Boykin
Property Address: 1156 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: 4/29/05 weh
Work Approved: Repair or replace damaged or missing materials with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repair windows. Replace roof with materials matching existing in profile, color and dimension.

8. Applicant's Name: John Hamilton
Property Address: 1014 Caroline Avenue
Date of Approval: 5/2/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair rotten wood as necessary with new wood matching existing in profile and dimension. Paint the following colors:
Body – pale yellow
Trim – white
Porch deck – dark green

9. Applicant's Name: Clint Rose & Eleanor Hollis
Property Address: 1719 Laurel
Date of Approval: 5/2/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair to any rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile. Replace lattice work as necessary. Paint exterior using the following Benjamin Moore colors:
Body – Philadelphia Cream
Trim – White
Porch deck - Gray
10. Applicant's Name: Tierce Construction
Property Address: 12 North Lafayette Street
Date of Approval: 5/3/05 weh
Work Approved: Remove porch infill. Restore porch door based on historic photographs. Restore porch rail using MHDC stock design and historic photographs.
11. Applicant's Name: DoRight Construction
Property Address: 1317 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 5/4/05 jss
Work Approved: Repair flat roof and rotten wood with new materials to match existing in profile, materials and dimension.
12. Applicant's Name: Penny Howell Contractor
Property Address: 1709 Laurel Street
Date of Approval: 5/4/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof house with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, charcoal in color.
13. Applicant's Name: Katie Jernigan
Property Address: 27 Hannon Avenue
Date of Approval: 5/4/05 weh
Work Approved: Extend concrete drive to add room for basketball goal.
14. Applicant's Name: Richard and Cynthia Weaver
Property Address: 1601 Monterey Place
Date of Approval: 5/4/05 weh
Work Approved: Replace sliding glass door with wood French door; replace 2 metal windows with custom wood windows milled to match existing. Repair front porch columns with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Replace rotten wood on

residence with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Install corner trim to match existing. Paint house the following colors:

Lower Body – SW 6074 – Spalding Gray
Upper Body - SW 6072 – Versatile Gray
Timbers – SW 6401 – Super White
Doors – SW 2864 – Stratford Blue
Porch and steps – SW 2838 Polished Mahogany or SW 2842 – Roycroft Suede

15. Applicant's Name: Clifton Sons
Property Address: 1419 Brown Street
Date of Approval: 5/4/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair water damaged windows to match original in material, profile and dimension. Repair broken asbestos shingle siding. Paint house (color to be submitted separately).

16. Applicant's Name: Coast Construction Company
Property Address: 200 South Catherine Street
Date of Approval: 5/5/05 jss
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, gray in color.

17. Applicant's Name: Morrie's Home Repair
Property Address: 961 Savannah Street
Date of Approval: 5/5/05 jss
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood on house and glass in windows with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint house in existing color scheme. Repair roof with materials matching existing in profile, dimension, material and color.

18. Applicant's Name: Paul Dagenais
Property Address: 58 South Julia Street
Date of Approval: 5/9/05 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repaint house in the following color scheme:
Body – Narcissus
Trim – White
Shutters and accent - Five Needle Pine
Porch Ceiling – Sky Blue

19. Applicant's Name: Diamond, Hasser and Frost, Attorneys
 Property Address: 1325 Dauphin Street
 Date of Approval: 5/9/05 asc
 Work Approved: Repair exterior to include: remove Masonite siding and replace with smooth Hardiplank siding. Repair/replace windows as necessary with new vinyl clad wood windows to match existing. Repaint building in the existing color scheme and reinstall shutters.
20. Applicant's Name: Summers Roofing Company
 Property Address: 151 Dauphin Street
 Date of Approval: 5/9/05 jss
 Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, cedar blend in color. Re-roof flat built-up roof section with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **052-04/-5-CA** 223 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Mary and Bill Monahan
Nature of Request: Take out glass storefront/display area and replace with restaurant seating.

APPROVED with conditions. Certified Record attached.

2. **053-04/05-CA** 112 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: Robert Drew
Nature of Request: Construct 6' wood privacy fence as per submitted site plan. Fence to have 2x8 ridge cap with 1x4 front cap below.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

3. **054-04/05-CA** 151 South Ann Street
Applicant: All Saints Episcopal Church
Nature of Request: Construct ground lit, stone and stucco monument sign. Sign to be placed perpendicular to Government Street. Sign to have individual cast metal letters.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

4. **055-04/05-CA** 203 Marine Street
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
Nature of Request: Construct new residence as per submitted plans.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

5. **056-04/05-CA** 210 Rapier Avenue
Applicant: Steve Guerin
Nature of Request: Construct 2 story rear addition and rear porch as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

1. The Chairman noted that Moda street furniture had recently been installed on downtown streets. She felt that these installations should have been reviewed by the ARB. Staff commented that installations were in the right of way and perhaps ARB review was not necessary.
2. Staff polled the Board to see whether meeting minutes should be emailed or sent via the post. Board members expressed a preference for email.

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

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

052-04/05 – CA 223 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Mary and Bill Monahan
Received: 5/09/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 6/24/05 1) 5/23/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Nature of Project: Take out glass storefront & replace with eating area, as per submitted plans.

History of the Project and Current Condition:

223 Dauphin Street, the Sangrouber Building, was designed by architect W. H. Hammond and was constructed ca. 1899.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Design Guidelines

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
4	Rehabilitation/Restoration Guidelines for Existing Buildings	Reconstruct storefront

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

Building Condition Example 3: Original Design Significantly Altered

“These buildings generally have a plain front with no ornamentation or detail, and fail to relate well to adjacent historic buildings. For a situation in which the original detail has merely been hidden by a covering, the guidelines encourage removal of the covering and restoration of the original design. Where detailing has been removed, an entirely new design compatible with older adjacent buildings or a façade reconstruction based on photo-documentary evidence is encouraged. If removal of an applied modern storefront will damage the underlying historic fabric of the facade, or the newer facade has achieved historic status (50 years or older), then removal is discouraged.”

1. The original storefront is no longer extant.

2. The existing storefront dates from ca. 1930.
3. The proposed alteration calls for the removal of existing glass retail display areas and the removal of the carrara glass bulkhead and columns framing the display opening.
4. Carrara glass is an important historic material and there are few remaining examples of intact carrara glass storefronts from this period.
5. Leaving the glass would not impact the proposed design.
6. The proposed new construction calls for a pair of 42" high eating counters constructed on a 6" thick stucco bulkhead, separated by a 5' wide ingress/egress opening. Bulkhead to have operable wood and glass shutters similar to those installed on Hero's Sports Bar.
7. The proposed new construction would provide interaction at the pedestrian scale.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted with the condition that the carrara glass remain.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. There were no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Board members asked staff to explain the importance of retaining Carrara glass. Staff reported that it is a type of glass that was popular in the 1920s and 1930s and that there are not many examples in the district. This example is represented on a 1930s redo of the storefront. Carrara glass cannot be removed and reused since it breaks during removal. While the glass is still manufactured today, it is very expensive. In the case of this building, the Carrara glass can be found in the transom area and at the front of the columns, although it does not wrap the columns. David Tharp found the 42 inch height of the proposed bar area out of character, since it is much higher than the bulkhead it will replace.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed adding facts to the staff report. They modified fact #2. The existing storefront dates from ca. 1930 and has achieved historic significance; and added fact #8. The current floor pattern at the entry has achieved historic significance.

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 facts in the staff report in addition to the modification of # 2. and the addition of #8. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board that the application DOES impair the historic integrity of the structure according to the Guidelines, and that a

Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the following conditions: 1) that the Carrara glass be retained in its current location; and 2) that the tile in the vestibule be retained intact and visible.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 05/23/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

053/04-05/CA 112 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: Robert Drew
Received: 4/27/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 6/11/05 1) 5/23/05 2)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Construct a 6' high wood privacy fence as per submitted site plan. Fence to have a 2x8 ridge cap with a 1x4 front cap below.

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	Construct wood 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 construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.
 - 1. The main structure is a one story Classical Revival wood frame residence with 3 bay recessed front porch.
 - 2. The proposed wood fence is 6' in height.
 - 3. The fence is to have a 2x8 cap with a 1x4 face board underneath, all wood treated and left to weather.
 - 4. The proposed fence is to be located at a distance of approximately 95'-6" from the sidewalk on the south side of the residence, then run east 50' to the end of the alley, then north 31' to behind a wooden playhouse, as per submitted site plan.

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. Staff commented that the fence will not be visible and that it backs up to the alley. A gate across the drive is an existing condition. Fence will be left natural to weather. The fence will be finished toward the inside and have a horizontal brace toward the neighbor and the alley.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that based upon the evidence presented in the application and at the public hearing, that the Board find the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.

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 Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 05/23/06.

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Amy Hamilton appeared on behalf of the church and had no additions to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. The Board questioned that the lettering was in lower case. The representative did not know, but staff clarified that the current pole sign is also done in lower case.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

David Tharp moved that, based upon the evidence that has been presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph 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: 05/23/06.

- 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
Placement and Orientation**

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. Setbacks in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District range from buildings constructed near the sidewalk to buildings with 25’ setbacks.
 - 2. The proposed setback is approximately 10’.

**3,II
Massing and Scale**

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. There are multiple examples of vernacular cottages in the Historic Districts.
 - 2. The proposed structure is wood frame with hardiplank siding.
- B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. Adjacent residential buildings, both frame and brick veneer, have pier foundations.
 - 2. The proposed foundation is a floating slab with continuous brick veneer at a height of 36” above grade.
- C. The guidelines state that new construction should consider roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings.
 - 1. A variety of residential roof shapes exist in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
 - 2. This proposed design has a gable to the side.

**3, 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 six-over-six wood windows and four panel wood doors is compatible with similar adjacent historic structures.
2. Porches are a regional characteristic found on almost every residence in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
 - a. All surrounding historic structures have front porches.
 - b. The proposed plan has a front porch across the width of the front of the residence.
3. The use of a traditional front porch with wood box columns helps achieve compatibility.

3, IV

Materials and Ornamentation

- A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
 1. There are a number of residential wood sided structures in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
 2. The proposed siding is Hardiplank, which replicates wood siding and is allowed in new construction.
- 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 but recommends that a window be added to the stair dormer to break up the massing.

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 add into the record. Staff reminded the Board that the house design is from drawings found in the Historic American Buildings Survey. The house was located in downtown Mobile at Hamilton and Conti Streets, but has long been demolished. The Board had questions regarding tree removal in the rear yard. There was discussion concerning the dormer window recommended by staff and the fact that the glass in this location will have to be tempered.

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 facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown 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 with the following conditions: 1) that the tree removal be approved by the Tree Commission; and 2) that a 6/6 light window be added to the dormer.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 05/23/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

056-04/05-CA 210 Rapier Avenue
Applicant: Steve Guerin
Received: 5/10/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 6/24/05 1) 5/23/05 2)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Construct rear addition 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	Additions	Construct rear addition

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 wood frame American Foursquare with a three bay front porch, and a monolithic hipped roof.
 - 2. The proposed addition occurs across the rear of the residence.
 - 3. The proposed one story addition continues the rear of the residence 20’ on the first floor, and closes in a second floor rear porch.
 - 4. A 10’ deep recessed porch is supported by 4 - 12” square wood box columns matching the front porch columns in design.
 - 5. The Materials List and Design Details are appropriate for this structure.
 - a. siding to match existing;
 - b. brick piers with framed lattice infill to match existing;
 - c. wood box columns;
 - d. cornice, soffit, fascia, corner boards to match those of the main house;
 - 6. The southwest corner of the addition will be approximately 7’ – 10” from the property line, following the existing line established by the main house.
 - 7. The Historic District Overlay Ordinance will compensate for this narrow setback.

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Don Williams appeared on behalf of the applicant. He had no additions to the application.

The Board questioned him regarding the reuse of existing windows. He responded that the existing windows will probably not fit the new openings; the doors do not fit in the new locations, so they will not be reused.

There was no one else 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

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 facts in the staff report. 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 and that a Certification of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 05/23/06.