

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
August 9, 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, Robert Brown, Joe Sackett, Tilmon Brown.

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

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Jim Farris	1801 Dauphin St.	079-03/04-CA

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the minutes as mailed. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved.

MID MONTH APPROVALS

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the mid-months as approved by staff. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved.

1. Applicant's Name: Stauter Construction
Property Address: 256 Rapier Avenue
Date of Approval: 7/15/04 weh
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary on porches and siding with new materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
2. Applicant's Name: Ross Holliday
Property Address: 609 Conti Street
Date of Approval: 7/19/04 weh
Work Approved: Install additional 5' chain link gate in existing chain link fence as per submitted site plan.
3. Applicant's Name: Millie Dorman
Property Address: 201 Rapier Avenue
Date of Approval: 7/20/04 weh
Work Approved: Replace existing fence with new fence to match existing in materials, profile and dimension.
4. Applicant's Name: Jackson Street Partners/Do Right Construction
Property Address: 7 N. Jackson Street
Date of Approval: 7/21/04 weh
Work Approved: Repair/replace existing deteriorated wood work with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Reinforce rear balcony by adding supports at 4' intervals.
Prime and paint to match existing.

5. Applicant's Name: Jana Faye Carney
Property Address: 215 S. Cedar Street
Date of Approval: 7/22/04 asc
Work Approved: Minor wood repair with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile;
Paint exterior in the following Sears colors: body-Fossil White; trim- Lamplight; porch deck-dark gray; door-dark blue.

6. Applicant's Name: David Powers
Property Address: 959 Charleston Street
Date of Approval: 7/22/04 weh
Work Approved: Install handrails on sides of front steps using MHDC stock handrail design, matching existing porch railing.
Construct 4' x 8' shed addition to existing previously-approved storage building as per submitted plans.

7. NOTICE OF VIOLATION
Issued To: Michael P. Kahalley
Address: 22 South Reed Avenue
Violation: Installation of satellite dish in front yard

8. Applicant's Name: Ross Holliday
Property Address: 609 Conti Street
Date of Approval: 7/26/04 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with new materials to match existing materials in profile and dimension. Repaint new materials to match existing color scheme.

9. Applicant's Name: First Federal Bank
Property Address: 313 George Street
Date of Approval: 7/26/04 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint in existing color scheme.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. **005-03/04-CA** 451 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Paul Christopher
Nature of Request: Remove deteriorated canopy cited under the Minimum Maintenance Ordinance.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **079-03/04-CA** 1801 Dauphin Street
Applicants: Jim Farris and Chad Johnson
Nature of Request: Construct wood privacy fence across side yard, connecting newly constructed masonry fence to residence, as per submitted plans.
APPROVED

2. **080-03/04-CA** 1565 Blair Avenue
Applicants: Justin and Danielle Hovey
Nature of Request: Construct wood privacy fence as per submitted plans. Replace existing picket fence with new picket fence matching existing as per submitted plans.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

3. **081-03/04-CA** 361 Marine Street
Applicants: Douglas Kearley, Architect; William Carroll, Contractor
Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund, Owner
Nature of Request: Install picket fence at front and 6' high wood privacy fence at sides and rear, all as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

4. **082-03/04-CA** 6-8 St. Emanuel Street
Applicants: Douglas Kearley, Architect; The Cybil Smith Charitable Trust/Ann Bedsole, Owner
Nature of Request: Rehabilitate existing historic Franklin Fire Station as per submitted plans. Construct new two story masonry structure site of the old Masonic Temple as per submitted plans.

HELD OVER UNTIL MEETING OF AUGUST 23, 2004.

5. **083-03/04-CA** 1509 Monroe Street
Applicant: John Van Hook
Nature of Request: Install 6' wood privacy fence along east property line as per submitted site plan.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. While the ARB voted to change the meeting time to 4:00 p.m., there will be a charge for the room if the meeting runs past 5:00 p.m. To avoid the charges, the Board rescinded its motion. Another motion to change the meeting time to 3:30 was made by Bunky Ralph and approved. The time change will be effective the first meeting in October.
2. Lynda Burkett announced that there will be an ODWA fund raiser at Blacksher Hall on August 19th.
3. Bunky Ralph announced that progress has been made on the rules and that there would be another meeting of the Rules Committee at the end of next week.

Douglas Kearley moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:05 p.m. The motion was seconded and approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

005-03/04 – CA 451 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Paul Christopher
Received: 10/06/03 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/20/03 1) 10/20/03 2) 8/9/04 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: Remove deteriorated canopy and place painted plywood over area left exposed by removal of canopy.

The building is sited on the southwest corner of Hamilton and Dauphin Streets.

The Mobile City Ordinance entitled “Historic Preservation” requires that Demolition plans for either character-defining elements or entire structures be submitted with time lines.

Current Conditions: The canopy is currently being supported by a brace constructed of 2x4s on the sidewalk.

Additional Information: The ordinance requires that the Architectural Review Board review all mothball plans.

History of the Project:

In October 2003, the owner submitted plans for stabilization of the canopy. Under separate cover the ARB received a letter requesting to remove the canopy. The applicant noted in this letter that he intended to construct a two story balcony at a later date.

The Review Board denied the request to remove the canopy because of lack of information. At the same time the Board approved the repair of the canopy (CoA attached). No building permit has been purchased to undertake the approved work, nor has any work been done to the canopy. A temporary support system has been installed on the sidewalk.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District Design Guidelines

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
4,A	Rehabilitation/Restoration Guidelines for Existing Buildings	Remove canopy

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…”

- A. High Priority Principles:
1. Respect the original character of the building.
 - a. The canopy is an integral part of the building façade and has achieved significance whether original or a later addition.
 2. Preserve and repair original materials.
 - a. The proposed plans call for removal of the canopy.
 - b. The proposed plans call for the installation of painted plywood over the area where the canopy is removed.
 - c. Currently a stucco band runs along the building delineating the division of first and second floor. This band stops at the canopy.
 - d. Painted plywood is not allowed by the Guidelines for this application.

Staff recommends that the canopy be retained and repaired as per the original submitted plan. Should the Board determine that the removal of the canopy is appropriate, the condition that the stucco band continue along the area where the canopy is removed.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the original decision on the application. Staff explained that the application had been denied for lack of information and that drawings were requested that would show how the building would be treated should the canopy be removed. The current elevation drawings are a response to that request. In addition a CoA for repair of the canopy was issued on November 7, 2003. No permits were obtained nor was any work done on the canopy as a result of that approval. Robert Brown pointed out that this plan would remove drains that would be necessary to channel rain water and that new leaders should be installed. Douglas Kearley pointed out that there is a built in scupper in the cornice.

FINDING OF FACTS

- Douglas Kearley moved to find the facts in the staff report and also the following additional facts:
- e. Canopy has further deteriorated due to no action since October of 2003.
 - f. water run-off from removal of the leaders should be handled according to City codes.

The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for removal of the canopy with the following conditions:

- 1) that rain leaders should be repaired/replaced and extended in accordance with City codes;
- 2) that all additional work indicated on the submitted elevation drawings be completed to include:
the patching and repairing of existing stucco and painting of existing storefront columns and trim.
- 3) that the plywood be changed to a stucco band and that the band and paint colors be submitted to staff for approval.

The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved. Tilmon Brown, David Tharp and Mike Mayberry voted in opposition to the motion.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/9/05.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

079-03/04 – CA 1801 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Jim Farris and Chad Johnson
Received: 7/21/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 8/4/04 1) 8/9/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence
Nature of Project: Construct 8’ high wood fence measuring 29’ as per submitted plan.

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 a two story frame American Foursquare residence.
 2. The proposed fencing is 8’ high wood dog-eared fence matching that at the rear of the property.
 3. Typically, the Design Guidelines limit wood privacy fences to 6’ in height, however, 8’ high fences and walls have been approved for areas along busy streets such as Springhill Avenue, Old Shell Road and Dauphin Street.
 4. In terms of scale in relationship to the adjoining residential structure and the 8’ stucco-covered masonry wall, an 8’ fence would not be inappropriate for this location.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Jim Farris was present to discuss the application. While staff presented a wood fence with a cap, Mr. Farris stated that his intention was to construct a dog eared fence that would be 8ft. in height and remain unpainted. He clarified that any other fencing on the site would be 6 ft. in height, however, in this location it will visually connect to the 8 ft. masonry wall on the adjacent lot.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion on the application.

FINDING OF FACTS

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Joe Sackett and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/9/05.

FINDING OF FACTS

Bunky Ralph moved to find the facts in the staff report adding A.5:

1. The main structure is one story frame vernacular residence.
2. The deteriorated wood picket fencing will be replaced with materials matching existing.
3. The proposed fencing is 6' high wood privacy fence.
4. Typically, the Design Guidelines limit wood privacy fences to 6' in height.
5. The existing picket fence which is located in the 25 ft. setback area from the street and goes from 3 ft. to 4 ft. in height.

The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness conditioned upon the height of the picket fence meeting UDD guidelines.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/9/05.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

081-03/04 – CA 361 Marine 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: 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: Construct 6’ high wood fence with cap along sides and rear of property as per submitted site plan. Construct 3’ wood picket fence around front yard as per submitted site plan.

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 not 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 wood privacy fencing is 6’ high wood with a cap.
 3. The proposed wood Gothic picket fencing is 3’ in height.
 4. 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

Lynda Burkett questioned the mid-month approval granted by staff and questioned why it had not come before the Board. Cindy Klotz suggested that in the future in the interest of clarity, that the Board would like to review a project this involved.

FINDING OF FACTS

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/9/05.

FINDING OF FACTS

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness conditioned upon the 6 ft fence beginning behind the 25 ft. front setback area. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved. Bunky Ralph was in opposition to the motion.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/9/05.