

**CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**
Minutes of the Meeting
August 8, 2005

CALL TO ORDER

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

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

Members Present: Lynda Burkett, Douglas Kearley, David Tharp, Bunky Ralph, Harris Oswalt, Joe Sackett, Tilmon Brown, Cameron Pfeiffer.

Members Absent: Michael Mayberry, Cindy Klotz, Robert Brown.

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

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
No applicants, their representatives or members of the public were present.		

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Board members will be emailed revised minutes of the July 25, 2005 meeting for approval at the next meeting.

APPROVAL OF THE MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Bill Smith
 Property Address: 66 Bradford
 Date of Approval: 7/14/05 weh
 Work Approved: Install new asphalt fiberglass shingles, onyx black in color.

2. Applicant's Name: Skip Shira
 Property Address: 204 Dexter Street
 Date of Approval: 7/14/05 weh
 Work Approved: Paint house the following colors:
 Body – Rookwood blue green
 Trim – Classical white
 Accent – Rookwood shutter green

3. Applicant's Name: Cooner Roofing, Contractor/ Keith Jarvis, Owner
 Property Address: 1057 Church Street
 Date of Approval: 7/14/05 weh
 Work Approved: Re-roof residence to match existing in color, profile and dimension. Remove remains of damaged chimney.

4. Applicant's Name: Lafayette and Government Properties, LLC
 Property Address: 1412 Government Street
 Date of Approval: 7/15/05 asc

- Work Approved: Repair roof with materials to match existing in color and materials. Replace rotten wood with new matching existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint trim white and accents black. Unpainted brick to remain unpainted. Repair or replace windows as necessary.
5. Applicant's Name: Briley and Karen Shira
Property Address: 911 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 7/18/05 weh
Work Approved: Construct 2 car garage at rear of property following MHDC stock plan. Garage to match details and materials to match existing residence.
 6. Applicant's Name: Cooner Roofing Co.
Property Address: 159 South Warren Street
Date of Approval: 7/19/05 asc
Work Approved: Replace storm damaged fascia boards as necessary with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint new materials with existing color scheme. Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, charcoal gray in color.
 7. Applicant's Name: Brian Dorgan
Property Address: 1708 McGill Avenue
Date of Approval: 7/19/05 asc
Work Approved: Paint exterior in the following colors:
Body – Winchester (dark gray)
Trim – white
Porch deck - black
 8. Applicant's Name: Melissa Callier
Property Address: 1561 Eslava Street
Date of Approval: 7/19/05 jdb
Work Approved: Construct storage shed/outbuilding per submitted photos. Setbacks to be 8' from the property line.
 9. Applicant's Name: The American Legion/John Tyson, Sr.
Property Address: 607 Government Street
Date of Approval: 7/20/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof with shingles to match existing in color, profile and dimension. Repair rotten soffit & fascia with materials matching existing in profile and dimension.
 10. Applicant's Name: David Ayers and Paul Landry
Property Address: 205 George Street
Date of Approval: 7/20/05
Work Approved: Repair front shutters with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Install side shutters to match front shutters in materials, profile and dimension. Repair water damaged area at rear of residence with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Replace fence damaged by Hurricane Ivan in rear with

new fence matching existing in profile and dimension. Install 3' high picket fence, painted white, in front yard as per submitted site plan. Install new screen door on rear door as per submitted design.

11. Applicant's Name: Rachel Dumas
Property Address: 114 North Julia Street
Date of Approval: 7/20/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof flat roof to match existing in material, profile and dimension.

12. Applicant's Name: Golden Gate Properties
Property Address: 357 Regina Avenue
Date of Approval: 7/21/05 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repaint house in existing color scheme, trim: white.

13. Applicant's Name: Golden Gate Properties
Property Address: 214 North Dearborn Street
Date of Approval: 7/21/05
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint house in existing Sherwin Williams Color Scheme – Trim – white, body – tavern green, shutters and porch deck – plantation brown.

14. Applicant's Name: C & P Construction
Property Address: 413 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 7/22/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair storm damaged roof with new materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.

15. Applicant's Name: Cooner Roofing Company
Property Address: 1208 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 7/22/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, charcoal gray in color.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. 074-04/05-CA 1605 Government Street
Applicant: Richard Dorman
Nature of Request: Construct stone wall on side lot to match main house as per submitted plans.

APPLICATION WITHDRAWN

2. 075-04/05-CA 109 Beverley Court
Applicant: Jake Epker
Nature of Request: Construct screened porch as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

3. 076-04/05-CA 505 Eslava Street
Applicant: Dharam Pannu
Nature of Request: Add 5 dormers to existing roof as per submitted plan.

APPROVED with conditions. Certified Record attached.

4. 077-04/05-CA 1107-1109 Government Street
Applicant: Sims Family Limited Partnership
Nature of Request: Install wood privacy fencing as per submitted site plan.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

5. 078-04/05-CA 1000 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Mark and Lynn Davidson
Nature of Request: Remove addition at west side, reconstruct rear porch based on historic photograph; paint exterior; restore interior.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

1. Members interested in attending the Traditional Building Conference in New Orleans must contact Ed to confirm attendance.
2. Anyone interested in a trip in November to Charleston to see the Charleston Review Board should contact Ed as soon as possible. Staff will research air fares to South Carolina.
3. Please review the design guideline draft and get comments to Ed or a member of the committee. The committee will meet and incorporate the changes into the guidelines.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

075-04/05-CA 105 Beverly Court
Applicant: Jake Epker
Received: 7/12/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 9/23/05 1) 7/25/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single family residential
Nature of Project: Construct screened porch 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	Porches	Construct screened 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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the proposed work 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, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
1. The main structure is a ca. 1940 one and a half story red brick veneer residence.
 2. The proposed screened porch is to be located on the left side of the residence towards the rear, behind an existing glassed in porch.
 3. The proposed porch measures 9' x 22' and is divided into 3 equal screened bays.
 4. The roof pitch of the proposed porch is 3 and 12.
 5. The detailing – columns, railing, etc. matches that of the front porch.
 6. Two non-original panes of glass on the west elevation of the glassed-in sunroom will be removed and replaced with a pair of wood French doors.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak for or against 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

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence that has been presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board adopts the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously 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 Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 08/08/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

076-04/05 – CA 505 Eslava Street
Applicant: Dharam Pannu
Received: 7/12/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 9/23/05 1) 8/08/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Non – Contributing (new construction)
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of the Project: Install dormers on east, west and south elevations as per submitted plans.

STAFF REPORT

Section 10 of the Preservation Ordinance prohibits the demolition or relocation of “any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such buildings will not be detrimental to the historical and architectural character of the district...” In making this determination, the Board must examine a number of factors set out in the ordinance, each of which is discussed below:

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the work requested will not impair the historic integrity of the district.

- A. 505 Eslava Street is a non-contributing structure constructed ca. 1997.
- B. The residence has a large hipped roof with an offset front gable containing a triple window, the center of which is topped with a Palladian half-round window.
- C. There are 5 dormers proposed to be added to the roof – one on the south elevation, two on the east elevation and two on the west elevation.
- D. The proposed dormers measure 4’-4” wide by 7’ -9” tall.
- E. Windows in the proposed dormers are to be operable wood double hung with a Palladian half-round transom above.
- F. Dormers will be stuccoed, painted to match existing trim.
- G. Dormers are a traditional way of adding space in attic areas.
- H. The proposed dormers are in keeping with existing roof details.

Based on the above facts, Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted contingent on clarification of window/style configuration.

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. Board members wanted to make certain of the construction date of the house and the reason for requesting the dormers.

Staff reminded the Board that the residence was constructed in 1997 and that the dormers will have an overall dimension of 4'-4" by 7'-9". There will have operable windows in order to ventilate the attic. The original portion of the house has multi-lighted windows, so, since no window criteria was included in the application, staff recommended 6/6 or 1/1.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional 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 adopts the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved that the lack of window information impairs the adjacent historic district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditional upon the windows being 6/6 wood sash. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 08/08/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

077 -04/05-CA 1107-1109 Government Street
Applicant: Sims Family Limited Partnership
Received: 7/12/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 9/23/05 1) 7/25/05 2)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-3
Nature of Project: Install 6’ wood dog-eared privacy fence 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	Alter existing elevations

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 work requested will not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district.

- A. The Guidelines state that fences should “complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with the their relationship to the Historic District.”
1. 1109 Government Street is a two story vernacular frame residence divided into multiple apartments.
 2. Currently there are 3 types of fencing on the property – (1) a 6’ wood shadow box fence partially along the east property line, (2) a solid wood dog-eared fence partially along the west property line and (3) a 3’ wire fence partially separating the lots at 1107 and 1109 Government Street.
 3. The proposed fence is to begin where the wood shadow box fence stops, and is to run approximately 60’ from east to west, with a 10’ gate to match; then run north to south to extend the existing shadow box fence 105’, then turn and run 46’ across the southern end of the property.
 4. A 100’ portion is proposed for the west property line, beginning at the edge of the garage and running south 100’.

Based on the above facts, 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. Lynda Burkett asked if the wire fence would be removed and if there was access from Church Street.

Staff responded that the wire fence is existing and will not be changed. The property has access from Church Street. There is a duplex facing Church Street that is part of this property. Staff also explained that the parking lot for the building to the west is on the property line and that the fence extension on the west was intended to provide a buffer from the adjacent commercial property.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board adopts the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Harris Oswalt moved that based upon the facts found by the Board that the application does not impair the historic building or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 08/08/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

078 -04/05-CA 1000 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Mark and Lynn Davidson
Received: 7/25/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 9/23/05 1) 7/25/05 2)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-1, Neighborhood Business
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Remove addition at west side, reconstruct rear porch based on historic photograph; paint exterior; restore interior.

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	Alter existing elevations

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 work requested will not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district.

The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.

- A. The main structure is a two story wood frame Greek Revival residence, ca. 1854 with ca. 1884 and ca. 1920s alterations.
- B. The property is a contributing structure within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
- C. Plans call for alterations of the north (rear), south (front), east (right side) and west (left side) elevations.
- D. Alterations to the north elevation:
 - 1. Relocate full-length double hung wood window in bedroom from left side to center of the second floor elevation to allow for a closet on the interior.
 - 2. Remove door in new kitchen. Feather siding as necessary.
 - 3. Install new attic vents in gable ends.
 - 4. Remove door in rear hall and replace with reused casement window.

- E. Alterations to the south elevation:
1. Remove existing front door and install new two panel wood door.
- F. Alterations to the east elevation:
1. Remove existing casement windows and blinds in double parlor and replace with new six-over-six wood sash to match existing.
 - a. existing casement windows are not original to the structure
 - b. proposed new windows are more in keeping with the original appearance of the structure
- G. Alterations to west elevation:
1. Remove non-original addition.
 - a. according to MHDC files, this addition was constructed as a porch in 1884 and was enclosed around 1920
 2. Install two new six-over-six wood windows in location of removed non-original addition.
 - a. proposed new windows are more in keeping with the original appearance of the structure
 3. Reconstruct rear porch based on historic photographs
 - a. the proposed reconstruction of the rear porch includes glassing in both the first and second floors for interior circulation
 4. Construct rear deck with railing matching that on the second floor balcony of the front elevation.
 - a. a rear deck is a modern interpretation of a traditional porch form
 - b. therefore, allowing the deck as designed and access through the doors of the reconstructed rear porch does not impair the essential form and integrity of the historic property
- H. Facts D-G are in compliance with numbers 2 and 10 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, as follows:
1. Number 2 –
The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alterations of the features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
 2. Number 10 –
New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Based on the above facts, 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. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Various Board members asked questions regarding the present zoning of the property and whether the property will be used commercially or residentially.

Staff explained that the property is currently zoned B-1 but that it will be used as a residence. This is phase 1 of the project; phase 2 will involve landscaping. Regarding questions concerning the basis for the restoration of the porches, staff reported that a photograph from the 1950s was used.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the application and the evidence presented during the public hearing, that the Board adopts the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously 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 according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 08/08/06.