

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

May 6, 2009 – 3:00 P.M.

Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Jim Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:03. Carlos Gant, Kim Harden, Bill James, Tom Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Craig Roberts, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson were in attendance.
2. Tom Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the April 1st and April 15th 2009 meetings. The motion passed unanimously.
3. Tom Karwinski moved to approve the mid month COAs granted by Staff. The motion passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Kent Broom**
 - a. Property Address: 1609 Dauphin St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/13/09
 - c. Project: Landscaping per submitted plan; add gate to conceal dumpster.
2. **Applicant: Allen Johnson**
 - a. Property Address: 1006 Selma St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/09/09
 - c. Project: Replace and repair tongue and groove porch decking; repaint per existing color scheme.
3. **Applicant: John Klotz**
 - a. Property Address: 354 Dauphin St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/13/09
 - c. Project: Repaint per existing color scheme; re-glaze windows as needed.
4. **Applicant: Sharon Bohannon**
 - a. Property Address: 201 S. Georgia Ave.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/10/09
 - c. Project: Reissue of COA; replace 18' wood privacy fence with a 5' tall powder-coated black aluminum fence with a 3' arched gate per ARB approval.
5. **Applicant: Ray Martin**
 - a. Property Address: 36 S. Reed St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/10/09
 - c. Project: Replace rotten wood siding to match existing in profile and dimension; repaint house white; repaint porch and pillars deep green or black.
6. **Applicant: Chris Smith**
 - a. Property Address: 1257 Elmira St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/14/09
 - c. Project: Paint house per submitted colors; body – Hazelcrest or Magnolia Homestead; trim – off white; porch ceiling – light blue; porch decking – Battleship Gray.
7. **Applicant: John Edward Walters**
 - a. Property Address: 310 S. Monterey St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/06/09
 - c. Project: Repaint house; body – dark gold; steps and porch – plum; stain door and sidelights red oak.
8. **Applicant: Ralph Colson**
 - a. Property Address: 24 S. Reed St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/06/09

- c. Project: Reroof workshop with tuff-rib Galvalume Metal roofing.
- 9. Applicant: Presley Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 1800 Dauphin St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/15/09
 - c. Project: Repair leaks to roof per submitted plan; roof appearance will not change.
- 10. Applicant: Jennifer Ambrester**
 - a. Property Address: 1165 Old Shell Road.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/14/09
 - c. Project: Erect 3' picket fence across front of property and driveway with two gates.
- 11. Applicant: Timothy Carmody**
 - a. Property Address: 906 Church St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/04/09
 - c. Project: Repaint per existing color scheme; body – green; trim – white.
- 12. Applicant: Josh Basenberg**
 - a. Property Address: 207 Rapier St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/08/09
 - c. Project: Install a 6" black valence per submitted plan on side porch; install guttering around same porch; replace upstairs guttering to connect with new.
- 13. Applicant: Patrick and Althea Kingsmill**
 - a. Property Address: 68 N. Monterey St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/09/09
 - c. Project: Paint house per submitted Sherwin Williams colors; Classic Yellow and Essex Green.
- 14. Applicant: Low Cost Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 1011 Elmira St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/16/09
 - c. Project: Reroof with three-tap charcoal gray Timberline shingle.
- 15. Applicant: Tyler Martin**
 - a. Property Address: 205 Government St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/13/09
 - c. Project: Repair roof over 9th floor of South Tower.
- 16. Applicant: Laura Clarke**
 - a. Property Address: 10 S. Catherine St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/02/09
 - c. Project: Replace rotten wood; repaint per submitted color scheme; body – Colonial Revival Stone; trim and sash - Classic White; front door – Rockwood Red; front porch underpinnings – Black Wrought Iron; porch decking – Rockwood Medium Brown.
- 17. Applicant: Ralph Coulson for H. C. Geron**
 - a. Property Address: 113 Macy Pl.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/20/09
 - c. Project: Remove portion of shingle roof; repair and replace roof decking; replace removed shingles in kind.
- 18. Applicant: Jerald Bates, II**
 - a. Property Address: 266 Dexter Avenue.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/22/09
 - c. Project: Paint house submitted Mobile Paints colors.
- 19. Applicant: Ormandus M. Jackson**
 - a. Property Address: 505 St. Francis St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 04/23/09
 - c. Project: Repair and stabilize foundation, materials to match in profile, scale, and dimension; reroof in kind.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 036-09: 1059 Palmetto Street.
 - a. Applicant: Craig Roberts for John and Joan Dixon
 - b. Project: Fencing and landscape approval; shutter removal and replacement; siding removal and replacement; new construction (outbuilding).
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
2. 037-09: 400 Chatham St.
 - a. Applicant: Cheryl Shifflet
 - b. Project: Fenestration changes to rear elevation; fence approval.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
3. 038-09: 1601 Dauphin St.
 - a. Applicant: Kent Broom
 - b. Project: Construct Fence around utility units; landscape approval.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
4. 039-09: 1220 Elmira St.
 - a. Applicant: Leigh Ellis
 - b. Project: Fencing Approval.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
5. 040-09: 1257 Spring Hill Ave.
 - a. Applicant: Hien Bui
 - b. Project: Add solar panel.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
6. 041-09: 201 S. Washington St.
 - a. Applicant: Keith Mills
 - b. Project: Reroof house with Galvalume metal roofing.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
7. 042-09: 8 South Hallett St.
 - a. Applicant: John W. King
 - b. Project: Construct wood deck off rear of house.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
8. 043-09: 1119 Church St.
 - a. Applicant: S. Adam Davis
 - b. Project: New Construction – carport and storage room.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
9. 044-09: 210 South Georgia St.
 - a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley
 - b. Project: Side Rear Addition.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. 412B Dauphin Street

412 B Dauphin Street is part of the larger Gulf Mattress Factory redevelopment project. Originally the building was a one-story brick warehouse featuring a large opening on the west elevation and unarticulated east elevation. The Board approved the applicant's plans on June 12, 2008. Work commenced in August of the same year. In order to grant a Certificate of Occupancy, staff visited the site on January 1, 2009. Staff observed that the building did not correspond with the plans approved by the Board. A thirty day Certificate of Occupancy was

granted. The applicant returned to the Board on February 18th. His proposal was tabled. On February 25th, members of the Board convened for a Design Review Session. The applicant reappeared before the Board on March 6th with a proposal incorporating the Design Review Committee's recommendations. The proposal was approved with modifications and amendments. Among the amendments was the use of lighting fixtures in the faux panels of the east and west elevations. The applicant was to submit examples to Staff. Staff finds that the fixtures he submitted protrude too far beyond the building. The applicant is amendable to the Board's suggestions. Board members are to drive by the building in order to determine the appropriateness of the lighting fixtures.

2. Guidelines

3. Discussion

City Attorney John Lawler discussed with the Board the process of appeals for applicants wishing to overall ARB rulings.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

036-09-CA: 1059 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Craig Roberts for John and Joan Dixon
Received: 04/15/09
Meeting: 05/06/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fencing and Landscape Approval; Shutter removal and replacement; Siding removal and replacement; New construction - sauna.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house dates to 1867. It was the original kitchen wing of next door Twelve Oaks. In 1938, the wing was detached from the main house and moved to the present location. At that time, the frame structure was faced in brick and refitted in the Colonial Revival style.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. This application concerns the landscaping and remodeling of a Colonial Revival house.
- B. The state Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts in pertinent part:
 - 1. Fences “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
 - 2. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property. Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting. Asphalt is inappropriate for walkways.”
 - 3. “Blinds and shutters were integral functional components of historic buildings. Blinds and shutters should be fitted to the reveal of the window opening precisely. Operable units, hung with appropriate hinges are encouraged.”
 - 4. “The exterior of a building helps define its style, quality, and historic period.”
 - 5. “An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. The appropriateness of accessory shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):
 - 1. Paving and Landscaping in Front Yard
 - A. Remove existing brick entrance walkway and driveway
 - B. Replace brick walkway with bluestone stepping stones
 - C. Lay a bluestone path along side existing driveway
 - D. Construct a secondary set of front steps at end of proposed path
 - E. Add and Remove plantings per submitted plan

2. Remove existing fixed board shutters across front of house
 - A. Replace existing shutters with operable, louvered and paneled shutters
 - B. Shutters will be made of a heavy-duty composite material
 - C. Hinges will be black, stainless steel
3. Remove existing lattice fence at northwest corner of lot
 - A. Replace existing fence with a 4 foot 6 inch iron, steel, or aluminum fence bound by two brick posts, one brick pilaster
4. Paving and Landscaping in Back Yard
 - A. Remove and add plantings per submitted plan
 - B. Remove existing brick path along west side of house
 - C. Replace brick path along west side of house with smaller brick path
 - D. Construct brick patio in back yard
 - E. Add a lap pool
5. Remove T-1-11 siding from later rear wing
 - G. Replace T-1-11 with stucco
6. Remove east facing deck
7. Remove shutters from east, south, and west elevations
 - A. Fill screw holes with mortar to match existing in material and color
8. Construct a 4'6" aluminum fence from northeast corner of house to plane of existing privacy fence
9. Repair existing privacy fence on east, south, and west sides of lot
10. Construct wood frame sauna per submitted plan
 - a. approximately 25 sq. ft.
 - b. featuring wood siding, brick foundation, slate roof tiles, and a copper cupola
11. Construct a tile outdoor shower

STAFF ANALYSIS

When relocated and remodeled this former service wing became a new building. It is essentially a 1930s house utilizing historic materials.

The applicant intends to use stepping stones to repave the front walk which match the pavers already incorporated in the side drive. Though the existing bricks match the masonry on the structure, staff does not find that these stepping stones impair the historic structure or neighborhood and recommends approval. All removed brick will be recycled in the proposed patio.

Staff finds heavy-duty composite shutters appropriate for application to historic buildings. The Board has approved such shutters in the past and staff recommends approval.

A fair amount of brick paving exists in the rear yard currently. The applicant intends to remove the bricks and essentially redesign the existing courtyard by reinstalling these bricks once the pool is inset. Staff finds this work appropriate.

The existing addition was finished with plywood siding when constructed in 1986. Since the main building is masonry, the removal of this siding and the application of stucco to these walls is a more appropriate treatment for this house. Therefore, Staff recommends approval.

Staff further recommends approval of Items 8, 9, and 10. Fence repairs are routinely approved for in-kind repairs. The sauna is small and constructed of materials appropriate for an outbuilding. The outdoor shower does not feature an enclosure.

The requests put forth in this application do not impair the historical integrity of the 1930s house or that of surrounding district. Staff recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Craig Roberts was present to discuss the application. He presented and answered questions regarding the application, but recused himself from the final discussion and vote. Mr. Roberts made one clarification regarding the proposal. He stated that the fixed shutters to be removed on the east elevation will be replaced with operable louvered shutters.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Roberts why there were brick posts framing the northwest fencing, but not the northeast fencing. Mr. Roberts informed the Board that the landscape architect thought the posts provided a fitting terminus and focal point for the existing driveway. Ms. Harden and Mr. Karwinski then asked Mr. Roberts whether the fencing was to be iron or aluminum. The plans mentioned both materials. Mr. Robert asked the Board to amend his fencing submissions to allow aluminum, iron, or steel fencing. He added that regardless of the material, the fence would be painted black.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts C (3) and C (8) to allow aluminum, steel, or iron fencing. Said fencing will be painted black. The Board also amended fact C (7) adding C (7) B allowing the replacement of shutters on the east elevation.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/06/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

037-09-CA: 400 Chatham Street
Applicant: Cheryl Shifflet
Received: 04/03/09
Meeting: 05/06/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Remove window and door on south side of enclosed porch; Replace window and door with wood window and wood French door. Remove existing back door; Replace existing door with wood window. Replace chain link fence with 6 foot wood fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This side hall cottage with recessed side wing was constructed in 1903. The side hall with wing was popular residential type in the area now comprising the Oakleigh Historic District.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. The applicant is a new resident in the Oakleigh Garden District having just purchased this home in October, 2008. She appeared before the Board on April 1, 2009 with earlier submissions aimed at enhancing the historical integrity of her property. The applicant returns with plans to remove non-conforming windows from the rear, south elevation of the home. At the April 1, 2009 meeting, the applicant was instructed to receive a variance for her proposed fence. Having received the variance, the applicant resubmits the plan for the fence.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building.”
 - 2. “The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
 - 3. Fencing “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship the Historic District.
 - 4. 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.
 - 5. All variances required by the Board of Zoning Adjustment must be obtained prior to issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.”
- C. Scope of Work:

1. Remove existing double, awning window units on south side of enclosed side rear porch
2. Replace western window unit with six over six wood window unit
3. Replace eastern window unit with wood French doors
4. Remove existing back door and metal security doors
5. Replace existing door with a wood six over six window unit
6. Remove existing chain link fence along Selma Street
7. Install a 6' foot box top fence
 - i. See submitted photographs of sample fence
8. Variance approved for fencing

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicant's submissions address an enclosed rear side porch. The former porch's existing windows are not appropriate to the style or the age of the house. The proposed replacements make the space read more as a porch. Staff believes that the applicant's proposal does not impair the historical or architectural character of the house or district and therefore recommends approval.

Under the current guidelines, applicants are advised to receive all necessary variances from the Board of Zoning Adjustment prior to submitting an application for a fence. Though the Board has had recent discussions about limiting the height rear, side yard fences on corner lots, presently there are no restrictions on these fences in the current guidelines. The current guidelines allow rear yard privacy fences up to 6' feet in height and do not distinguish between interior and corner lots. The applicant wishes to replace existing, non-conforming chain link with a 6' box top privacy fence along her north property line which faces Selma Street. This fence will tie into an existing 42" front yard, picket fence approximately 12' behind the east façade of the house. Given the presence of similarly-situated fences in the neighborhood, the applicant's receipt of the variance, and the applicant's security concerns, Staff recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Cheryl Shifflet was present to discuss the application. Ms. Shifflet informed the Board that she received approval from the Department of Urban Development and Traffic and Engineering for her fencing submission. She then told the Board that the proposed gate in the drive will open inward.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd asked the applicant to what extent was the former porch enclosed. Ms. Shifflet informed the Board that former porch was fully enclosed.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, adding fact C (8) noting the variance granted by the Department of Traffic and Engineering influenced the Board's approval of the fencing.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts presented in the Staff Report, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/06/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

038-09-CA: 1601 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Kent Broom
Received: 04/02/09
Meeting: 05/06/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fencing Approval and Landscaping Approval.

BUILDING HISTORY

This noncontributing building originally consisted of only the central portion. That center block was based on the South Claiborne Street Fire Station. Hyphens and wings were constructed in 1985.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. This building serves as a law office. Staff approved the landscaping plans and the dumpster gate on April 2, 2009.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. Fences “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
 - 2. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location, and material be compatible with the property.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Place 4’ 4 ½” (height) King Architectural tubular aluminum fencing around five utility units.
 - i. See submitted plans for fence design details
 - 2. Place charcoal colored concrete pavers to either side the rear parking lot’s Macy Street entrance

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicant’s fencing submission would obscure five utility units. The units are currently surrounded by closely placed plantings which pose a threat of fire. The design of the utility enclosure fencing would match the recently approved dumpster gate. Staff believes that the proposed fencing would not impair the architectural or historical integrity of the district, therefore recommends approval. The paving submission might require approval from the Department of Right off way. Following approval from the Department of Right of Away, Staff recommends approval of C (2) as well.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Kent Broom was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner disclosed that earlier in his career he clerked at Cunningham and Bounds. Mr. Roberts added that he had numerous dealings with the firm, but none at present. Mr. Broom informed the Board that he would like to use light buff colored pavers instead of the charcoal colored pavers mentioned in his proposal. He then explained that star jasmine would be planted around the utility enclosures. The jasmine's eventual growth will cover the fencing.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending fact C (2) to read light buff colored concrete pavers.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/06/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

039-09-CA: 1220 Elmira Street
Applicant: Leigh Ellis
Received: 04/16/09
Meeting: 05/06/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fence Approval

BUILDING HISTORY

This 1920s house is a non-contributing residential structure in the Oakleigh Historic District.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. The applicant wishes to extend an existing side fence across an interior portion of her lot for security reasons.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Fences “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
 - 2. “The height of solid fences is usually restricted to six feet.”
 - 3. “The finished side of the fence should face the public view.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Extend the existing 6’ dog-eared wood privacy fence along the east side of the house to the front right corner of the house

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicant proposes extending an existing 6’ dog-eared fence 41’ 6” along the east side of her property. The proposed fence would then extend a further 8’ 6” to the corner southeast corner of the house. A 5’ wide gate would occupy part of the latter. All extensions would match the existing in type and material. The proposed fence would extend and connect to the front plan of the house which is set back a distance from the street. Staff does not believe this application impairs the integrity of the district and therefore recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Leigh Ellis was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Ms. Ellis explained the reason behind her submission. An empty house lies east of her property. Street traffic uses that adjoining lot, her back yard and driveway as a short cut through the block. The proposed fence will prevent further trespassing.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/06/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

040-09-CA: 1275 Spring Hill Avenue
Applicant: Hien Bui
Received: 04/03/09
Meeting: 05/06/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-3
Project: Fix a solar panel on roof.

BUILDING HISTORY

This three-tenant commercial building was constructed in 2004.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. The applicant seeks to add a solar water heat panel to the roof of the building.
- B. The Design Guidelines for Mobile’s downtown commercial buildings, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Accessory roof elements not original structure, such as vents, skylights, satellite dishes, etc, shall be located inconspicuously.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Mount a solar panel in upper center portion of north roof face.

Staff Analysis

Solar power is an economically efficient and environmentally conscience energy alternative. The building on this site is a non-contributing commercial structure located on the boundary of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The proposed solar panel would be set on the roof the building’s north facing façade, which is highly visible from Spring Hill Avenue. The Board has no policy addressing solar energy panels on non historic properties; however, the Board has determined that non-historic rooftop appendages should be minimized when placed on historic buildings. Staff recommends that the applicant relocate the panel to the less visible south roof face where there are existing mechanical features present and be placed flush on the roof (i.e. not at an elevated angle). Pending the applicant’s amenability to that change, Staff recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Hien Bui was present to discuss the application. The applicant brought a sample solar panel to show the Board.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Roberts asked the applicant why he proposed locating the solar panel on the building's northern roof face. He informed the applicant that the southern elevation would provide greater exposure, thus increased energy supply. Ms. Harden asked Mr. Bui if the proposed location was dictated by utilities located inside the building. Mr. Bui stated that he was amenable to relocating the proposed panel.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending fact C (1) to read place panel on the south roof face and adding fact C (2) stating only one 80" x 86" solar panel will be used. Mr. Wagoner closed by stating that this was the Board's first application involving a solar panel. Their decision was motivated by the fact that this building is non-contributing structure in a commercial area. The panel will additionally be located on a less conspicuous elevation.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/06/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

041-09-CA: 201 South Washington Avenue
Applicant: C. Keith Mills
Received: 04/08/09
Meeting: 05/06/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Reroof house with Macsteel Metal Roofing.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house was constructed in 1867. In the early twentieth-century the structure served a mixed use function, operating as a residence and store. The commercial aspects of the latter were removed in the 1980s.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. Since the 1980s, this house has served as a multi-unit rental property. In this application the applicant wishes to remedy storm damaged roofing.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Remove existing asphalt shingles
 - 2. Reroof house with Macsteel Galvalume metal roofing in the Tuff-Rib Design.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This house is on the southeast corner of South Washington Avenue and Monroe Streets. The two-story house sits so close to the sidewalk. The roof is visible only at a distance and at certain angles. Metal roofing is an appropriate roofing material for certain structures within Mobile’s historic districts. Metal roofing became popular in Mobile in the first part of the twentieth century as a replacement to the traditional wooden shakes. At one point in its history, this house could have received one of the replacement metal roofs. Modern metal roofing differs from the older type. Color and seam are important considerations. Of the two options available in this type roofing, the Tuff-Rib design is better suited for residential use. It projects ¾” of the roof decking as opposed to the 1 ¼” of the R-Panel. The applicant has agreed to use the Tuff-Rib. Staff does not believe the proposal impairs the historical and architectural character of the building or the district, therefore recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Keith Mills was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Karwinski asked the applicant what motivated his selection of this particular roof profile. Mr. Mills informed the Board that he simply wanted to prevent further water damage inside the building by using an alternative to asphalt shingles. Ms. Harden stated that historical metal roofing was flat panel with a standing metal screen. Mr. Roberts asked if another type of metal roofing was possible. Mr. Karwinski and Ms. Harden asked about the pitch and visibility of the roof.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report noting the roof's low pitch and limited visibility affected their ruling.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/06/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

042-09-CA: 8 South Hallett Street
Applicant: John W. King
Received: 04/20/09
Meeting: 05/06/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a Deck

BUILDING HISTORY

This center hall cottage with a pyramidal hipped roof was constructed in 1889.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. The applicant wishes to add a deck off the rear of his house. The deck is not visible from the street.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
 - a. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and the environment.”
 - b. “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.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Construct an L-shaped wood deck off the rear elevation per the submitted plan
 - a. dimensions 4’ by 12’ by 16’ by 8’
 - b. deck steps to measure four feet in width
 - c. deck to be raised 18” on wooden pilings
 - d. lattice matching that of body of house to skirt deck
 - e. encircling railing to measure 36” in height

STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposed deck would be located on the rear elevation of the house. A fence surrounds the back yard. The deck would not be visible from the street. Staff finds the material, dimension and design appropriate for the house. Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical character of the house or district and therefore recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

John W. King was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. James asked to the applicant whether he considered using a balustrade that would replicate the spindles on the front porch. Mr. King told the Board that the top rail of his deck balustrade was similar to that of the front porch, but he did not consider replicating the spindles.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/06/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

043-09-CA: 1119 Church Street
Applicant: S. Adam Davis
Received: 04/16/09
Meeting: 05/06/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct carport with attached storage room.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house was built in 1897. In the early 1920s the original structure was remodeled in the popular Arts and Crafts style. The second story was removed in the 1940s. A certificate of appropriateness from the July 12, 2005 allowed the removal of brick porch posts and the jerkin head roof dating from the earlier Craftsman remodeling.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. The applicant acquired this property in 2005. They received a certificate of appropriateness on July 12, 2005 allowing the alteration of the roof from a jerkin head to a gable. Second story fenestration and first floor post changes were also approved at the same time.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state in pertinent part:
 - 1. “An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. The appropriateness of accessory shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
 - 2. “Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting. Asphalt is inappropriate for walkways. Gravel and shell are preferred paving material.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):
 - 1. Lay a Concrete Slab for carport and pad preceding carport
 - 2. Construct a wood frame carport and storage space with lap-siding, posts, and roofing to match house
 - 3. Remove asphalt drive along east side of property
 - 4. Replace asphalt with gravel

Staff Analysis

The proposed carport with storage space will not be visible from the street. The applicant submitted two designs. They differ in roof and pier treatment. Staff finds the first submission more in keeping with

design of the house. It is the simpler of the two submissions. Staff does not believe this proposal impairs the architectural or historical character of the district and therefore recommends approval. The applicants have an approximate location for the carport and storage building; Staff has met with the applicants, toured the rear yard and advised the applicants to consult with the Board of Zoning Adjustment prior to setting the foundation for the building.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

S. Adam Davis was present to discuss the application. Mr. Davis clarified the staff report by adding he was examining alternatives to hard surface paving to avoid rain water runoff to the adjacent lots. The applicant said that properties to the east, south, and west of his home have ancillary structures at the property line. He has not fixed an exact location for the proposed carport and storage structure, but the building will be setback within the lot.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Staff variances procedures regarding lot line buildings. Mr. Karwinski asked the applicant whether he considered vehicular access prior to submitting his proposal. Mr. Davis told the Board that he had used cones to practice ingress and egress.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, conditional on a variance granted by the Department of Urban Development and Engineering.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/06/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

044-09-CA: 210 South Georgia Avenue.
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Received: 04/20/09
Meeting: 05/06/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Porch enclosure and New Construction

BUILDING HISTORY

This large classically detailed Queen Anne house was constructed in 1903.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. The Board approved the reconstruction of this house’s front balustrade in 1999.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and the environment.”
 - 2. “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.
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Double width of enclosed second story southwest corner porch to be in line with a projecting side bay along Elmira Street
 - 2. Enclose existing first floor porch beneath, extending enclosed space below proposed upstairs addition
 - 3. Add a two story projecting bay that maintain advance and recess of side elevation
 - 4. Relocate existing windows
 - 5. Install siding and cornice to match exiting

STAFF ANALYSIS

This house occupies the northwest corner lot of South Georgia Avenue and Monterey Streets. The proposed rear side addition would advance the plane of the recessed rear section of the house to be in line with a projecting side bay along Elmira Street. An existing wood privacy fence and surrounding foliage obscure the first floor. The projecting and receding planes of the house would be maintained by the

proposed advanced bay. Staff does not believe this application impairs the historical or architectural integrity of the building or the district, therefore recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Karwinski asked the applicant how much the original porch was already enclosed. Mr. Kearley stated that the upper tier was already enclosed.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/06/10