

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
July 26, 2004

CALL TO ORDER

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

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

Members Present: Lynda Burkett, Douglas Kearley, Michael Mayberry, David Tharp, Bunky Ralph, Harris Oswald, Cindy Klotz, Joe Sackett, Tilmon Brown.

Members Absent: Robert Brown

Staff Members: Ed Hooker, Anne Crutcher, Devereaux Bemis

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Richard Olsen	Urban Development Dept.	076-03/04-CA
Debbie Roper	600 Governement St.	077-03/04-CA

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

APPROVAL OF THE MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:

Douglas Kearley moved to approved the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Linda Burkett and unanimously approved.

MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Hasep E. Kahalley
Property Address: 68 Fearnway
Date of Approval: 6/30/04 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof house with dimensional shingles, Terra cotta color.

2. Applicant's Name: John Gengo
Property Address: 109 South Monterey Street
Date of Approval: 6/30/04 weh
Work Approved: Construct carport at rear of property as per submitted application. Carport to measure 24' x 30', design based on MHDC stock plan. All details, siding, cornice, soffit, eaves, to match that of the main house in profile, materials and dimension. Paint to match main residence.

This CoA replaces CoA issued 11/13/03, at the request of Urban Development, due to the fact that the carport was moved 11" on the site plan to have an equal distance between the new garage and the residence.

3. Applicant's Name: John Prince Contractor
Property Address: 109 Gilbert St.
Date of Approval: 7/1/04 jdb

- Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials matching existing in profile materials and dimension. Re-roof with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and color.
4. Applicant's Name: Barry and Stevi Gaston
Property Address: 359 Chatham Street
Date of Approval: 7/2/04 jss
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with new materials matching existing materials in profile and dimension. Repaint house in the following Sherwin Williams paint scheme:
Body: Shore 8115
Trim: White
Accent: Barn Red 8380
 5. Applicant's Name: Sign-A-Rama
Property Address: 100 North Catherine Street
Date of Approval: 7/7/04 weh
Work Approved: Install 8' x 2' wall sign, 16 sf, to right of entry door on brick wall. Background to be dark green, lettering to be mustard, as per submitted color samples.
 6. Applicant's Name: Sign-A-Rama
Property Address: 100 North Catherine Street
Date of Approval: 7/7/04 weh
Work Approved: Install 3' x 4', double sided monument sign on existing monument base, totaling 24 sf., to right of entry door on brick wall. Background to be dark green, lettering to be mustard, as per submitted color samples.
 7. Applicant's Name: W. E. Shaw
Property Address: 454 Charles Street
Date of Approval: 7/7/04 weh
(This COA replaces COA dated April 30, 2001)
Work Approved: Repair rotten roof rafters with materials to match existing materials in profile and dimension. Re-roof with 3 tab charcoal gray shingles. Repair windows: replace rotten wood with new materials matching existing materials in profile and dimension. Repaint house exterior trim white. (Body color to be submitted later)
 8. Applicant's Name: Peter Green
Property Address: 250 Dexter Avenue
Date of Approval: 7/7/04 weh
Work Approved: Reduce existing 8' wood privacy fence to 6'. Place cap on top.
*NOTE – this fence replaced an existing deteriorated 6' wood privacy fence

9. Applicant's Name: Kathy L. Gifford
Property Address: 156 Roberts
Date of Approval: 7/8/04 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof garage to match house shingles, black. Repaint garage white.

10. Applicant's Name: Mark A. Williams
Property Address: 18 S. Julia Street
Date of Approval: 7/9/04 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof house with 30 year GAF fiberglass timberline shingles, Slate gray in color.

11. Applicant's Name: Michael Duff
Property Address: 103 Etheridge Street
Date of Approval: 7/9/04 jss
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood on windows, fascia and siding as necessary with new materials to match existing materials in profile and dimension. Repaint existing color scheme.

12. Applicant's Name: O. C. Wiggins
Property Address: 1558 Monterey Place
Date of Approval: 7/9/04
Work Approved: Re-roof house with 20 year fiberglass shingles, satin black in color. Repair eaves with new materials to match existing materials in profile and dimension.

NEW BUSINESS

1. **076-03/04-CA** 10 South Catherine Street
Applicant: Laura J. Clarke
Nature of Request: Remove existing decorative cast iron front porch and construct new more historically-correct front porch including round columns and wood steps, all as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

2. **077-03/04-CA** 600 Government Street
Applicant: Goodyear Tire & Rubber/Debbie Roper, Manager
Nature of Request: Paint existing painted exterior surfaces to match current Goodyear Gemini color scheme as per submitted illustrations.

APPROVED with conditions. Certified Record attached.

3. **078-03/04 CA** 351 Charles Street
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
Nature of Request: Construct 6 ft. high wood fence with cap along a 15 ft.

Section of sidewalk facing Savannah Street. A set back variance is required in order to construct the fence.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Rules and Regulations

The Committee will meet at a time to be arranged and bring back additional recommendations to the full Board.

2. Henry Aaron Loop Conservation District

Devereaux Bemis discussed the possibility of establishing a conservation district comprising those areas of the Henry Aaron Loop that are not already within the boundaries of a historic district. There was discussion regarding how design review of this district would be structured. Several options were discussed: 1) that it would come under the purview of a separate board with separate guidelines or 2) that there would be separate, less stringent guidelines administered by the ARB. Devereaux explained that this would be a 2-3 year process that would require approval by Council. It was agreed that it is important to have some design control in the area since infill development appears to be imminent. The general consensus of the Board was to have the new guidelines administered by the ARB.

3. Incentives for historic restoration

David Tharp suggested that there should be incentives offered for residential development in the historic districts such as the forgiving of permit fees. Tharp also suggested that the application fee of \$5.00 could be increased for residential projects. Commercial projects fees could be greater than those for residential projects.

4. Change of meeting time

Lynda Burkett made the motion that the meeting time be changed to 4:00 p.m. in order to better accommodate the public. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved.

Since notification of the time change is an important issue and changes must be made on the web site and other places where the agenda is advertised, it was decided that the time change would go into effect the first meeting in October.

5. Public Policy Committee

David Tharp Tilmon Brown and Cindy Klotz will meet to discuss issues that impact the historic districts such as driveway widths, etc. It was suggested that MHDC members be included on this committee.

There being no further business, Douglas Kearley moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded and approved with the Board adjourning at 4:12 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

076-03/04 – CA 10 South Catherine Street
Applicant: Laura J. Clarke
Received: 7/12/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 8/6/04 1) 7/26/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Street Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Remove existing second generation cast iron front porch columns, concrete slab at grade, and concrete steps. Reconstruct new Colonial Revival three bay front porch as per submitted plans.

Additional Information:
The second generation recessed front porch is comprised of a concrete slab at grade, concrete steps, and re-used cast iron decorative supports .

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

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The Guidelines state that “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts, columns, proportions and decorative details.
 - 1. The main structure is a one story frame vernacular Colonial Revival residence ca. 1905.
 - 2. Sanborn Fire Insurance maps suggest that the footprint of the original porch, prior to its removal, matches that proposed.
 - 3. The replacement porch was slab at grade with concrete steps leading up to the front door, with decorative cast iron columns supporting a recessed portion of the monolithic hipped roof.

- B. The Guidelines state that “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance. Materials should blend with the style of the building.”
 - 1. The proposed porch is 3 bays wide and spans the width of the front of the residence.
 - 2. A new porch deck, supported by a continuous brick foundation to match existing foundation, and designed in the Classical Revival style is proposed.

3. A set of concrete steps is proposed to be located at the north end of the porch, and is to be constructed between two brick cheek walls with concrete caps.
4. Tapered Doric columns, (12” base to 10” capital”) are proposed to support the roof. These are used in triplicate at the corners and singularly in the middle of the porch façade. Single pilasters are proposed for each front corner.
5. Evidence of residual paint outlines verify the existence of identical pilasters at these locations.

C. All new materials to be painted to match corresponding elements on main residence.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Richard Olsen appeared on behalf of the applicant. Lynda Burkett questioned how the iron work decoration would be reused. Rick Olsen responded that it would be recycled in some manner. There was no additional testimony in favor of or in opposition to the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACTS

Joe Sackett moved that based upon the evidence that has been presented in the application and during the public hearing, the Board finds that the proposed work is appropriate according to the guidelines. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved for the application. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 07/26/05.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

077-03/04 – CA 600 Government Street
Applicant: Goodyear Tire Center
Received: 7/12/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 8/5/04 1) 7/26/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-2 General Business
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Nature of Project: Paint previously- painted surfaces in corporate Goodyear color scheme.

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	Exterior Materials and Finishes	Paint previously-painted surfaces using corporate logo color scheme

STANDARD OF REVIEW and STAFF REPORT

- A. 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. . .
1. The subject building is a mid 20th century structure constructed using Old Mobile brick.
 2. Currently the painted surfaces of the structure are painted white with blue accents, and serve as background elements.
 3. In 2000, the Review Board approved the installation of corporate logo signage utilizing the proposed paint colors.
 4. The addition of the proposed paint colors would bring attention to a current background building.
 5. The current corporate logo signage is adequate to convey the corporate image.

Staff recommends approval of the application with the following conditions:
Should the building require repainting, repaint in the existing color scheme.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Debbie Roper was present to discuss the application. She explained that the paint scheme would reflect the Goodyear corporate logo colors. The area currently painted white will be blue and the ironwork in the sign band will be painted yellow. The entire sign band would be bordered in yellow. There was no additional public testimony in favor of or in opposition to the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the large amount of signage on the building, and asked whether the pole sign had been installed. Staff responded that the amount of signage has been grandfathered in and signage showing the new logo colors has been installed, however, there was no pole sign since the illustration was presented for colors only. Board members also discussed the fact that ironwork is normally seen painted black, green or white. The Board also felt that placing a yellow border around the sign band would indicate that the entire sign band was a sign exceeding their signage limit.

FINDING OF FACTS

Lynda Burkett moved to amend the facts in the staff report to read as follows:

1. The subject building is a mid 20th century structure constructed using Old Mobile brick.
2. Currently the painted surfaces of the structure are painted white with blue accents, and serve as background elements. The ironwork is painted blue, the sign is yellow.
3. In 2000, the Review Board approved the installation of corporate logo signage utilizing the proposed paint colors.
4. The ironwork is to be painted yellow.

The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness conditional upon the sign band and scrollwork being painted blue. Douglas Kearley seconded the motion which passed 6 to 3.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/26/05.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

078-03/04 – CA 351 Charles Street
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
Received: 6/28/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 6/18/04 1) 7/12/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Non - Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Construct 6’ high wood fence with cap along a 15’ section of the sidewalk facing Savannah Street as per submitted plan.

Additional Information: The applicants have requested that the Board approve the design, location and construction of the fence as per submitted plans.

A variance is required from the Board of Zoning Adjustment to allow the construction of the fence along the sidewalk. The Board of Adjustment will not hear the case until the September meeting. However, the owners are planning on closing on the house early August.

The Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund has agreed to abide by the ruling of the Board of Zoning Adjustment, and has provided this statement in writing by Palmer Hamilton, head of the Revolving Fund.

The applicant understands should the variance not be granted, or have conditions with regard to the placement of the fence, that the Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund will bring the fence into compliance within 30 days of the BZA ruling.

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

- A. The Guidelines state that Fences “should compliment the building and no detract from it. Design, scale, placement, and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
 1. The main structure is one story frame vernacular residence.
 2. The proposed fencing is 6’ high wood with a cap.

- Typically, the Design Guidelines limit wood privacy fences to 6' in height

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board questioned where the fence would begin and end and why only a section of the lot would be fenced. Staff explained that there are existing sections of fence and that the remainder of the lot would probably be enclosed with a picket fence. The requested 6 ft. fence would terminate between the two front windows on the Savannah Street elevation. There was also discussion regarding the appropriateness of constructing a fence next to the sidewalk and near to the corner. Lynda Burkett suggested that there were numerous examples of similar in the Oakleigh Garden District. There was also discussion regarding whether the fence would be painted or allowed to weather since it was not indicated on the plans.

FINDING OF FACTS

Lynda Burkett moved to find the facts in the staff report and added the fact that there were other similar fences in the district. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and passed.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts and with the conditions that a setback variance be obtained from the Board of Zoning Adjustment and that the fence remain unpainted, that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Michael Mayberry and failed 4/4.

David Tharp moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued based upon the facts and conditioned upon the fence being approved by the Board of Zoning Adjustment. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and passed.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 07/26/05.