

**MOBILE HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION  
CITY OF MOBILE  
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
Minutes of the Meeting  
September 8, 2003**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Acting Chair Bunky Ralph called the Architectural Review Board Meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

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

Present: Bunky Ralph, Dan McCleave, Nick Holmes III, alternate Harris Oswalt and alternate David Barr. Douglas Kearley arrived following the first agenda item.

Absent: Cindy Klotz, Jackie McCracken, Karen Carr, Bill Christian, Robert Brown, Dennis Carlisle.

A quorum was declared after the roll was called.

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

<b>In Attendance</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Item Number</b>
Laura Davis	1613 University Blvd.	Observer from Home Builders Association
John Dendy	501 Government St.	088-02/03
Carlos Williams	1058 Savannah St.	088-02/03
Felix Vereen	1750 Dauphin St.	091-02/03

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:** August 25, 2003 Meeting

David Barr moved to approve the minutes as mailed. Harris Oswalt seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**APPROVAL OF THE MID MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:**

Nick Holmes moved to approve the mid-month certificates as mailed. Harris Oswalt seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**MID MONTH APPROVALS**

1. Applicant's Name: Campbell Roofing  
Property Address: 1702 Government Street  
Date of Approval: 8/14/03 asc  
Work Approved: Re-roof flat hot tar roof to match existing in profile and dimension.
2. Applicant's Name: Pat Weiss  
Property Address: 66 S. Georgia Avenue  
Date of Approval: 8/18/03 asc  
Work Approved: Repaint house white.
3. Applicant's Name: Harvey Dinkins  
Property Address: 408 Marine Street  
Date of Approval: 8/18/03 weh  
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with new to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing color scheme.

4. Applicant's Name: Shannon Johnson  
Property Address: 67 Fearnway  
Date of Approval: 8/19/03 weh  
Work Approved: Re-roof with architectural grade shingles matching existing in color, profile and dimension.
  
5. Applicant's Name: Langan Construction Company  
Property Address: 355 South Ann Street  
Date of Approval: 8/19/03 weh  
Work Approved: Re-roof house with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, charcoal black.
  
6. Applicant's Name: Melissa Nissen and Leon Van Dyke  
Property Address: 63 N. Monterey  
Date of Approval: 8/19/03 weh  
Work Approved: Repaint house the following Behr color scheme:  
Body: Skipper 570F-5  
Base: Myan Red 190F-7  
Trim: White  
Porch Floors and Steps: Mood Indigo 570F-6  
Porch Ceiling: Skipper 570F-5
  
7. Applicant's Name: Fauver House Movers  
Property Address: 54 South Lafayette  
Date of Approval: 8/19/03 weh  
Work Approved: Repair rotted sills with materials matching existing in profile and dimension.
  
8. Applicant's Name: Suzanne Fearn  
Property Address: 1561 Monterey Place  
Date of Approval: 8/19/03 weh  
Work Approved: Repaint house in the following Benjamin Moore color scheme:  
Body: Bracken 346-3  
Trim: White  
Door, porch and steps: Gotham 346-6
  
9. Applicant's Name: Victor Stanton  
Property Address: 306 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 8/19/03 asc  
Work Approved: Repaint balcony to match existing. Install new awning cover, Sunbrela 4962 Captain Navy Regimental.
  
10. Applicant's Name: Steve Miller  
Property Address: 209 South Georgia Avenue  
Date of Approval: 8/20/03  
Work Approved: Install 10' wide concrete driveway along north property line as per submitted site plan.

NOTE: Curb Cut Permit required from Urban Development Right-of-Way Dept.

**Old Business:**

1. 058-02/03-CA 1257 Springhill Avenue  
Applicant: Heip Bui & Linda La, David Lindsay, Architect  
Nature of Request: Construct 3-tenant retail space as per submitted plans.  
Approved with conditions. Certified Record attached.

**New Business:**

1. 087-02/03-CA 971 Old Shell Road  
Applicant: Betty Keith  
Nature of Request: Construct rear addition as per submitted plans.  
Approved with conditions. Certified Record attached.
2. 088-02/03-CA 1058 Savannah Street  
Applicant: Carlos Williams/John Dendy, Architect  
Nature of Request: Construct rear addition as per submitted plans.  
Approved with conditions. Certified Record attached.
3. 089-02/03-CA 1260 Selma Street  
Applicant: Matt & Karen McDonald/Douglas Kearley, Architect  
Nature of Request: Renovate existing outbuilding as per submitted plans.  
Approved. Certified Record attached.
4. 090-02/03-CA 63 North Monterey Street  
Applicant: Melissa Nissen & Leon Van Dyke  
Nature of Request: Construct rear deck as per submitted plans.  
Approved. Certified Record attached.
5. 091-02/03-CA 8 St. Joseph Street  
Applicant: Mobile Revolving Fund  
Nature of Request: Install temporary fence as per submitted plans.  
Denied. Certified Record attached.

**Other Business and Announcements:**

1. Wanda Cochran reported on the minimum maintenance ordinance. With the provision written into the new ordinance, a representative of the Fire Department, Urban Development Department and MHDC surveyed the Lower Dauphin Street Historic District. Letters were written to property owners who needed to secure their buildings from the elements. These properties were resurveyed and hazard warnings were issued. Tickets were issued if properties were not brought into compliance. Judge Holmes Whiddon heard the cases. Most had complied with items mentioned on their tickets. Other cases have been reset for October.
2. Wanda also suggested that Board members refer people with complaints about issues in the districts to the Action center 208-7999.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business before the Review Board, Douglas Kearley moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**058-02/03 – CA**            1257 Springhill Avenue  
**Applicant:**            Linda La/Heip Bui  
**Received:**            8/25/03                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:** 5/29/03                            1) 6/9/03            2) 9/8/03            3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Old Dauphin Way Historic District  
**Classification:**        Non-Contributing (vacant lot)  
**Zoning:**                    B-3 Community Business

At the November 7, 2002 Mobile City Planning Commission Meeting, the Commission approved the sub-division of the Southeast corner of Ann Street & Spring Hill Avenue. This combination of lots included one lot located in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. Under current zoning law, the entire parcel is now located in the district and fall under the review of the Architectural Review Board.

**Additional Permits Required:** (4) Building, Electrical, Mechanical, Plumbing

**History of the Project:** At the June 23, 2003 meeting of the ARB, the Board Held Over the application to allow staff to work with the applicant to further explore more appropriate design options for the building. The Board also requested a complete application, including a design for the canopy, a lighting diagram and a landscaping design. Since that time, staff has worked with the architect to modify the design.

The application submitted contains all information requested by the Board.

A copy of the Certified Record from the previous meeting is attached.

**Nature of Project:**        Construct a one-story masonry structure with hipped metal roof as per submitted plans. Structure to house three individual businesses, including a service station/convenience store with gas canopy at front of lot.

The subject lot measures 155.45' on Spring Hill Avenue and 189.3' along Ann Street. There is one proposed curb cut along Ann Street – one 30' wide triple lane with two exits and one entrance. There are two curb cuts proposed for Spring Hill Avenue, each 15' wide designated one way entrance and exit.

The building is rectangular in shape, and measures 108' x 50'. The building is sited at the rear of the lot with a 76' x 26' rectangular canopy towards Spring Hill Avenue. Proposed building construction is slab on grade with aluminum storefront and stucco-covered exterior. The building material is stucco-covered masonry. A 2' –8" base of stucco covered masonry with a chamfered water table provides weight to the overall massing of the design. This band is carried through with the use of horizontal muntins in the glass storefront system. A 2' stucco sign band separates the building from the roof line. The one story façade measures 9' above finished grade, with an overall building height from finished floor to roof ridge of 23'-3". The proposed Hunter Green Standing Seam metal roof has a 5 and 12 pitch. Proposed colors for the building include varying shades of taupe, gradating from darker at the base to lighter at the sign band.

The canopy measures 26' x 76' and is 18'-6" in height. The canopy is supported by three square columns. The sign band measures 2'-6" in depth. Proposed Exxon signage is shown, however, a request for signage is not a part of this application.

- a. foundation – slab-on-grade, with false water table constructed of solid, stucco-covered masonry
- b. façade – stucco covered masonry
- c. doors – aluminum storefront
- d. windows – aluminum storefront
- e. roof – standing seam metal with 5/12 pitch

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Guidelines for New Commercial and Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts*

<b><u>Sections</u></b>	<b><u>Topic</u></b>	<b><u>Description of Work</u></b>
4	Design Standards for New Construction	Construct new strip mall/convenience store
4,I	Placement and Orientation	
4,II	Massing and Scale	
4,III	Façade Elements	
4,IV	Materials and Ornamentation	
4, 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**

**4,I**

**I. Placement, Orientation and Special Considerations:**

- A. The Guidelines state that new commercial construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings, maintaining a visual line created by the fronts of the buildings along a street.
  - 1. Setbacks for commercial buildings in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with deeper setbacks and paved parking in front.
  - 2. The property is located on the southeast corner of Springhill Avenue and Ann Street.
  - 3. This intersection is one of the major gateways into the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
  - 4. The property directly to the east is a one story professional office with a setback of approximately 15’.
  - 5. The property directly to the west across Ann Street is a one story historic service station, sited askew on the lot.
  - 6. The properties on the north side of Spring Hill Avenue are predominantly commercial in nature, and are surrounded by asphalt and concrete parking lots.
- B. The Guidelines state that new commercial buildings should not disrupt residential blocks and should reflect neighborhood building forms, materials and scale.
  - 1. Commercial Buildings are scattered throughout the historic districts.

2. The proposed location is on a corner at the entrance to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
3. Adjacent historic housing stock is modest in design, mostly one-story wood frame Victorian cottages.
4. Adjacent historic and non-historic commercial buildings are predominantly one story masonry.

C. Franchises: Restaurants, Service Stations, Drug Stores, Dry Cleaners, Laundromats, Banks, ATM Canopies, etc.

The Guidelines state that the quality and visual environment in the historic districts should not be eroded by inappropriate designs and signage.

1. The number and size of the curb cuts should be kept to a minimum.
  - a. Traffic Engineering reviewed the site plan and will only allow one curb cut each on Springhill Avenue and Ann Street
2. The edge of the property should be defined through plantings and walls
  - a. The proposed site plan meets the minimum landscape requirements
  - b. The proposed site plans notes an 8' wood privacy fence separating the subject property from adjacent residential.
3. Specialty structures, such as pump shelters and ATM kiosks, should be custom-designed to reflect the context of the new construction.
  - a. The proposed canopy is simple in design, measuring 2' - 6" deep, with two stripes.
4. Excessive lighting of the facility is not appropriate in the historic districts.
  - a. The proposed lighting diagram calls for 12 lights, each 250 watts.
  - b. A foot-candle chart was provided.

#### 4,II

### II. **Building Proportions: Massing, Scale, Foundations, and Roofs:**

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
  1. Adjacent historic and non-historic commercial buildings are typically one story in height.
  2. The proposed building is one story in height with 9' from slab to underside of sign band.
- B. The Guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
  1. Adjacent historic and non-historic commercial buildings are constructed on slabs at grade.
  2. The proposed building is to be constructed at grade.
- C. The Guidelines state that often commercial roofs of metal, rubber or asphalt, either hipped, gabled or flat, were concealed behind some type of parapet wall above the cornice. New commercial construction may consider, where appropriate, roof shapes and pitches similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings. The use of parapet walls may contribute to the compatibility of new commercial structures within the historic districts.
  1. A variety of roof shapes can be referenced on commercial properties in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
  2. The proposed roof has a 5 and 12 pitch and measures 12' -3" in height.

3. The proposed roof massing is out of character with adjacent historic and non-historic commercial buildings.
4. The proposed roof color is hunter green.

#### **4, IV**

### **III. Materials and Ornamentation:**

- A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
  1. Stucco-covered masonry is considered comparable to brick veneer construction.
- B. The guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
  1. The proposed design has minimal decorative elements, which include a water table, banding around stucco elements, and a paneled sign board.
  2. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

That the architect submit a cross-section of the proposed building material.

That an application requesting signage be made by the owners to the Board.

That a design for the fence on the rear property line be submitted for review.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

There were no questions or additions to the application.

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

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board had no questions regarding the application.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

Dan McCleave moved to find the facts in the staff report with conditions. The motion was seconded by Nick Holmes and unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Nick Holmes moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that a sign request be submitted for review as well as the design of the rear fence. The motion was seconded by Dan McCleave and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/8/04

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**087-02/03 – CA**            971 Old Shell Road  
**Applicant:**            Mrs. Betty Keith  
**Received:**            8/25/03                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:** 10/09/03                            1) 9/08/03    2)                            3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Old Dauphin Way Historic District  
**Classification:**        Contributing  
**Zoning:**                R-1, Single Family Residential  
**Additional Permits Required:** (4) Building, Mechanical, Plumbing, Electrical  
**Nature of Project:**     Construct rear addition, measuring 36’ x 24’ as per submitted plans. Re-roof entire structure with materials matching existing in profile and dimension.

The proposed addition measures 36’ x 24’. The proposed foundation is of brick piers with framed lattice infill to match existing. Exterior sheathing is to be wood lap siding to match existing. New paired wood 4-over-1 windows to match existing. Roof pitch to match existing, with matching fiberglass shingles. The east elevation has 2 pair of new wood 4-over-1 windows, size matching existing. A recessed entry is located at the junction of the existing structure and the new addition. The recess is to accommodate the retention of the existing driveway. The entry is 6’ wide, recessed 3’-3”, with a single 3’ entry door. The south elevation has a pair of new wood 4-Over-1 windows, size matching existing. The west elevation has no fenestration. All corner boards, soffit, eave, fascia, window and door architraves to match existing in profile and dimension.

**Existing Conditions:**    The subject lot measures 50’ x 176’. The existing structure measures 28’10’ wide x 44’-1” long. Originally there was a rear porch inset under the end gable roof. Currently the south elevation has inappropriate aluminum windows, aluminum storm screen door concrete steps with brick cheek walls.

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

<b><u>Sections</u></b>	<b><u>Topic</u></b>	<b><u>Description of Work</u></b>
3	General	
3	Piers, Foundations and Foundation Infill	Construct addition
3	Exterior Materials and Finishes	
3	Doors and Doorways	
3	Windows	
3	Porches and Canopies	
3	Roof	

**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

### General

- A. The Guidelines state that “The standards listed and shown...illustrate elements that contribute to the architectural character of the buildings in Mobile’s historic districts. These define the architectural style of the buildings and establish a repetition of forms and details, which create harmony and character of the historic districts.
1. The existing structure is a one-story wood frame residence with vernacular bungalow detailing.
  2. The form of the proposed addition continues the massing of the original residence.
  3. The line of the addition follows the line of the existing residence on the east and is recessed 5’-2” on the west to meet the required 8’ side setback.

### Work Item 1 –Rear Addition

- A. Piers, Foundations and Foundation Infill: The Guidelines state that “foundation screening should be recessed from the front of the foundation piers.”
1. The existing foundation is brick pier with lattice infill.
  2. The proposed addition is brick pier with framed lattice infill, matching existing.
- B. Exterior Materials: The Guidelines state that “ Replacement...must match the original in profile and dimension and material.”
1. The existing exterior sheathing is wood lap siding.
  2. The proposed exterior sheathing for the addition is wood lap siding.
- C. The Guidelines state that “ Original doors and door openings should be retained along with any mouldings, sidelights and transoms.”
1. Proposed plans call for the removal of the existing rear door.
  2. Proposed plans call for the installation of a new four panel wood entry door.
- D. The Guidelines state that “The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
1. Windows in the historic residence are a combination of wood 3-over-1 and 4-over-1 double hung.
  2. Windows in the main area of the addition are proposed to match the existing in profile, light configuration, and dimension.
- E. The Guidelines state that “...historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained.”
1. The predominant roof form is hipped.
  2. The roof for the proposed addition continues the pitch of the existing end gable on the east and is recessed on the west as a result of meeting the required 8’ side setback.

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

### BOARD DISCUSSION

There was discussion about the lack of fenestration on the west wall. Ed Hooker stated that the applicant has agreed to install a diamond shaped window on the west wall. There was also discussion regarding the character of the exterior doors on the building. Since the building is a bungalow, it was felt that wood doors with 5 horizontal panels would be the most appropriate.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

Douglas Kearley moved to find the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Dan McCleave and unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Douglas Kearley moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness with the conditions that a diamond shaped window be added in the bathroom on the west elevation and that wood exterior doors with 5 horizontal panels be used on the rear and side. The motion was seconded by Dan McCleave and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/8/04

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**088-02/03 – CA**            1058 Savannah Street  
**Applicant:**            Carlos Williams/ John Dendy, Architect  
**Received:**            8/25/03                    **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:** 10/09/03                    1) 9/08/03    2)                    3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Oakleigh Garden Historic District  
**Classification:**        Contributing, ca. 1879  
**Zoning:**                R-1, Single Family Residential  
**Additional Permits Required:** (1) Building, Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing  
**Nature of Project:**     Construct rear addition, measuring 48' x 53' as per submitted plans.

The proposed addition measures 48' x 53'. The proposed foundation is of brick piers with brick lattice and framed wood lattice infill to match existing. Proposed exterior sheathing is wood lap siding to match existing. New wood 6-over-6 windows to match existing. New wood single and double French doors, single panes topped with divided lite transoms. Roof pitch to match existing, with matching fiberglass shingles.

The south, or front elevation, currently has a 4 bay front porch under the main hipped roof, supported by 5 square wood box columns. The addition occurs at a point 38'-10" back from the main elevation, and at a point 52' from the front elevation the hipped roof rises 4'-6" higher than the ridge of the existing residence. Fenestration for the proposed south elevation of the addition is two false windows with fixed louvered blinds, and one 6-over-6 wood double hung window with operable louvered blinds. The profile of a large dormer on the west elevation will be visible from the front. The east elevation measures 36'-10" and currently has two 6-over-6 wood window sash and one 1-over-1 wood window sash. Plans call for the removal of the 1-over-1 window sash, siding to be feathered in to match existing. The proposed addition on the east side measures 48' in length and has a porch under the main roof, supported by square wood columns matching the front porch columns in profile and dimension. Porch railing also matches the front porch railing. Fenestration includes a false window with wood louvered blinds, single and double French doors with single, full-length glazing, and 3 6-over-6 wood double-hung windows grouped together. The proposed north elevation measures approximately 48' and features a 10' deep porch. Fenestration for the addition includes two single 6-over-6 wood double-hung windows with operable wood louvered blinds. The west elevation is currently 38'-10" long, and has two single 6-over-6 wood double hung windows with operable louvered blinds. Fenestration for the addition includes four single 6-over-6 wood double hung windows with operable louvered blinds, and a large gabled dormer with a single 6-over-6 wood double hung window and operable blinds on the hipped roof. All new corner boards, soffit, eave, fascia, window and door architraves to match existing in profile and dimension.

A courtyard-style fence, 6'-8" in height, is proposed to enclose the sides and rear yard. The proposed fence would begin at the southwest corner of the house, and run east approximately 25'-8" to the east property line. A double gate would be located at the driveway. Along the east property line, the fence would run north to the corner of the property, then turn west and run across the north property line a distance of 100', then turn south and run along the west property line, then turn east and run 21' - 3 3/8", ending at the west wall of the residence.

The proposed fence is constructed of pressure treated wood, capped, and installed between brick piers. Brick to match that of the existing residence's foundation.

**Existing Conditions:** The subject lot measures 100' x 120'. The existing structure measures 32' wide x 36-10" long, with a wing approximately 35' x 16'. The plans call for the removal of this wing in order to construct the addition. The square footage of the existing structure is approximately 1,862 sf. The square footage after the proposed addition will be 3,728 sf. The lot-to-building ratio will be 30.8%. 35% lot coverage is allowed by city code.

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**

*Chapter 44, Article IV, Mobile City Code Entitled "Historic Preservation"  
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*

<b><u>Sections</u></b>	<b><u>Topic</u></b>	<b><u>Description of Work</u></b>
2	Definitions	"Material Change"
3	General	
3	Piers, Foundations and Foundation Infill	Construct addition
3	Exterior Materials and Finishes	
3	Doors and Doorways	
4	Windows	
4	Porches and Canopies	
4	Roof	
3	Fences, Walls and Gates	

**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**

**Material Changes**

- A. The Historic Preservation Ordinance defines "Material Change" as "... a change in appearance that will affect either the Exterior Architecture or Environmental Features of a Historic Property or any building, structure, site, object, landscape feature, or work of art within a Historic District, including but not limited to: Reconstruction, alteration of the size, shape or elevation of a Historic Property...."
1. The massing of the proposed addition is larger than the original structure.
  2. The proposed addition extends beyond the main residence approximately 6'-4 1/4" on the west elevation and approximately 15'-0 3/4" on the east elevation.
  3. The roof of the proposed addition extends up past the existing roof ridge approximately 4'-6".
  4. A large dormer on the west elevation will be highly visible from public view.
  5. The proposed material changes would make the building ineligible for certification as a historic structure.
  6. The proposed material changes would classify the structure as non-contributing based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

**General**

- A. The Guidelines state that “The standards listed and shown...illustrate elements that contribute to the architectural character of the buildings in Mobile’s historic districts. These define the architectural style of the buildings and establish a repetition of forms and details, which create harmony and character of the historic districts.
1. The existing structure is a one-story wood frame late-Victorian with classically-inspired detailing.
  2. The form of the proposed addition continues the massing of the original residence, but on a larger scale.

### **Work Item 1 –Rear Addition**

- A. Piers, Foundations and Foundation Infill: The Guidelines state that “foundation screening should be recessed from the front of the foundation piers.”
1. The existing foundation is brick pier with brick lattice and framed wood lattice infill.
  2. The proposed addition is brick pier with brick lattice and framed lattice infill, matching existing.
- B. Exterior Materials: The Guidelines state that “ Replacement...must match the original in profile and dimension and material.”
1. The existing exterior sheathing is wood lap siding.
  2. The proposed exterior sheathing for the addition is wood lap siding.
- C. The Guidelines state that “ Original doors and door openings should be retained along with any mouldings, sidelights and transoms.”
1. Proposed plans call for the removal of the existing rear door.
  2. Proposed plans call for the installation of two single wood French doors with full-length glass, and three pairs of double wood French doors with full-length glass, all topped by divided lite transoms
- D. The Guidelines state that “The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
1. Windows in the historic residence are wood 6-over-6 double hung
  2. A window on the east elevation, part of a later remodeling, is to be removed.
  3. Windows in the addition are proposed to match the existing in profile, light configuration, and dimension.
- E. The Guidelines state that “...historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained.”
1. The predominant roof form is hipped.
  2. The roof for the proposed addition matches the original in pitch and shingle material.
  3. The ridge line of the addition is approximately 4’-6” higher than the existing roof ridge and extends to the west 6 ½’ and to the east 15’ beyond the current roof line.
- F. 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 residence is a one story wood frame vernacular late-Victorian with a recessed front porch and hipped roof.

2. The proposed fence is solid wood panels mounted between brick piers, designed to compliment the residence.
- G. The Guidelines state that “The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.”
1. The height of the proposed fence is 6’-8”.
  2. All adjacent property is zoned R-1, single family residential.

Staff recommends denial of the application due to the fact that the addition, as proposed, will materially impair the historic integrity of a contributing structure.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

John Dendy, speaking in favor of the project, stated that the house sits in the middle of a double lot, that the historic portion of the house dates from 1879. However, the rear portion of the house is comprised of three or four additions that are poorly constructed and detailed. The 32 ft. width of the existing building is not sufficient for the client’s needs, and so the addition was split with an equal amount on each side. The 4 ft. difference in ridge height occurs some 50 or 60 ft. back, so the elevation exaggerates the difference in height. The addition will enhance the historic building and be distinctive enough so that it will not create a false sense of history. The window to be removed was an addition and poorly detailed. John Dendy also noted that the fence would be 6 ft. in height and stained to match the house. Mr. Williams stated that the original house was only 4 rooms and that he was trying to have an addition that unified the house.

There was no one to speak in opposition to the project.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Dan McCleave suggested that the proposal took a small house and made it into a large house that was substantially taller and wider. Douglas Kearley and Nick Holmes did not feel that the difference in the roof height was substantial since it occurred well behind the façade. There was discussion about the dormer. John Dendy suggested that it could be reduced. There was also discussion regarding the proposal vis a vis the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Ed Hooker commented that the standard that dealt with the creation of a false sense of history would be the applicable standard in this case.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

Douglas moved to find the facts in the “Material Changes” portion of the report changing number 4. to read...“A large dormer on the west elevation will be visible from public view.” and striking numbers 5 and 6. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and approved. Dan McCleave opposed the motion. Nick Homes moved to accept the staff report on “Work Item 1- Rear Addition” with the change in G. 1 that the fence be 6 ft. in height and stained to match the color of the house. David Barr seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Dan McCleave moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions: that the dormer be eliminated, moved to the rear or scaled down in size. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/8/04

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

089-02/03 – CA            1260 Selma Street  
**Applicant:**            Matt & Karen McDonald/ Douglas Kearley, architect  
**Received:**            8/25/03                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:** 10/09/03                            1) 9/08/03    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:**     Renovate existing outbuilding as per submitted plans.

Rotate existing window at rear bath from vertical to horizontal to accommodate shower. Add operable decorative shutters. Add 4' x 8' porch at second floor. Remove existing window and install door to new porch.

NOTE: A mid-month approval was issued by staff to allow work to begin.

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

	<b><u>Sections of Work</u></b>	<b><u>Topic</u></b>	<b><u>Description</u></b>
3	Accessory Structures		Alter/renovate existing outbuilding
3	Windows		
3	Porches and Canopies		

**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...”

*General*

- A. The Guidelines state that “ The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should compliment the design and scale of the main building.”
  - 1. The main residence is a two story wood frame structure, with classical revival detailing.
  - 2. The existing two story accessory structure is two story wood frame with minimal detailing.



## **Work Item 1 – Rehabilitate Accessory Structure**

- F. The Guidelines state that “ Original doors and door openings should be retained along with any mouldings, sidelights and transoms.”
3. Proposed plans call for the addition of a door onto the new wood balcony..
- G. The Guidelines state that “The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
4. Windows in the historic residence are wood 3-over-1 double hung
  5. A vertical casement window on the west elevation is to be turned 90 degrees, and placed horizontally in the wall to accommodate a shower.
- H. The Guidelines state that “...historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained.”
4. The predominant roof form is end gable.
  5. The roof for the proposed porch matches the original in pitch and shingle material.
- D. The Guidelines state that “ Porch materials should blend with the style of the building.”
1. The columns on the existing first floor stoop are wood 4”x4” posts with simple capitals and bases.
  2. The columns on the proposed porch are solid 4”x4” wood posts.
  3. The proposed porch railing is horizontal 1” x 4” wood.

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

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

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no discussion on the application.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

David Barr moved to find the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

David Barr moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Dan McCleave and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/8/04

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

090-02/03 – CA            63 North Monterey Street  
**Applicant:**            Melissa Nissen & Leon Van Dyke  
**Received:**            8/25/03                    **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:** 10/09/03            1) 9/08/03    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) Building  
**Nature of Project:**     Construct rear deck, measuring 9’ x 15’ as per submitted plans.

**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**

<b><u>Sections</u></b>	<b><u>Topic</u></b>	<b><u>Description of Work</u></b>
3	Accessory Structures and Site Considerations	Construct Deck

- A. The Guidelines state that “ The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should compliment the design and scale of the main building.”
1. The main residence is a two story wood frame structure, with classical revival detailing.
  2. The porch of the main residence features fluted columns with ionic capitals and slender turned pickets on the second floor balustrade.
  3. The proposed deck rail is a replication of the second floor porch balustrade.
  4. The proposed deck is located at the rear of the residence and will not be visible from the street.

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

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

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no discussion on the application.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

David Barr moved to find the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

David Barr moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Nick Holmes and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/8/04



- B. The Guidelines state that “The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.”
1. The height of the proposed fence is 8’ – 0”.
  2. All adjacent property is zoned B-4, General Business.

Staff defers comment on the application, given the fact that this is a staff design, initiated for a committee of the Mobile Historic Development Commission.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Felix Vereen spoke in favor of the application. He stated the location was commercial and the fence would be in place from 1 month to 3 years. It would be more aesthetically pleasing than a board fence.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Dan McCleave questioned whether approval of the fence would endorse chain link fencing. Nick Holmes cited several previous cases in which chain link had been denied—Pete Vallas on Government Street and Paul Thompson at a lot belonging to Wells Fargo in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District. While the first denial was in a residential setting, the Wells Fargo case was in a commercial location. Nick Holmes suggested that a board fence be installed that conformed to the guidelines and noted that the chain link fence at the Kulakowski residence that had been approved as a temporary installation had been in place for 25 years. An alternate solution would be the installation of bollards and landscaping. Douglas Kearley suggested that merely sinking posts would prevent people from illegally parking on the lot.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

There was no finding of fact by the Board.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Douglas Kearley moved to deny the application since, according to the guidelines, chain link is an inappropriate fencing material. Dan McCleave seconded the motion which was approved with Bunky Ralph opposing the motion.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/8/04