

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

September 2, 2009 – 3:00 P.M.

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Tom Karwinski, called the meeting to order at 3:05. Gertrude Baker, Mary Cousar, Bill James, and Bradford Ladd were in attendance.
2. Ms. Cousar moved to approve the minutes of the August 19, 2009 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Ms. Cousar moved to approve the midmonth COAs granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. Applicant: Peter Dias

- a. Property Address: 12 N. Cedar Street
- b. Date of Approval: 08/13/09
- c. Project: Reroof with materials to match the existing.

2. Applicant: Jebb Cobb, Jr.

- a. Property Address: 60 Fearnway
- b. Date of Approval: 08/14/09
- c. Project: Replace south side 4 foot picket fence with 6 foot privacy fence, smooth side out; Construct 6 foot high double gates, smooth face out. Re-gravel existing drive.

3. Applicant: Jim Webb

- a. Property Address: 250 South Georgia
- b. Date of Approval: 08/14/09
- c. Project: Pave 23 foot by 22 foot parking pad, per submitted plan opposite exiting curbcut; Paving is contingent on permission from Urban Forestry to remove magnolia tree and compliance with any landscape requirements along west property line imposed by Urban Forestry.

4. Applicant: Nolan McLean

- a. Property Address: 1213 Selma Street
- b. Date of Approval: 08/12/09
- c. Project: Reroof house with Timberline Shingles, slate in color.

5. Applicant: Nicholas Holmes, II

- a. Property Address: 22 South Lafayette Street
- b. Date of Approval: 08/12/09
- c. Project: Repair and replace wooden shutters as required. Replacements will be wooden to match existing.

6. Applicant: John Switzer

- a. Property Address: 210 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 08/12/09
- c. Project: Remove damaged ply board barrier from sidewalk. Replace barrier using material from unauthorized barrier at 214 Dauphin Street. Barrier to be flush with façade. This temporary barrier to in place for one year.

7. Applicant: Neal Higgins

- a. Property Address: 1059 Elmira Street
- b. Date of Approval: 08/12/09
- c. Project: Remove lattice fence. Construct a 6 foot interior lot wood privacy fence between house and garage.

8. Applicant: Susan Gardener

- a. Property Address: 1665 Lamar Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 08/12/09
 - c. Project: Repair fascia board. Repaint to match existing color scheme.
- 9. Applicant: John Mark Church**
- a. Property Address: 1705 Hunter Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 08/17/09
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated siding on main house and garage. Work to match the existing in profile, dimension, scale, and material.
- 10. Applicant: Kristen Rogers**
- a. Property Address: 352 McDonald Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 08/17/09
 - c. Project: Construct a 4', wood privacy fence and gate at end of driveway per submitted plan.
- 11. Applicant: MHDC – Restore Mobile Revolving Fund**
- a. Property Address: 458 Chatham Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 07/22/09
 - c. Project: Stabilize Property. Clean out interior. Add brick piers and repair flooring at NW corner of house. Remove charred/burned out framing. Replace charred framing, plates, sills as required. Remove place from walls. Remove roof decking and shingles. Replace roof structure with engineered pre manufactured trusses. Replace decking and underlayment. Install new shingles. Board up windows and exterior doors. Repair and replace front porch decking, columns and railing to match existing in material and dimension. Manufacturer's engineered stamped drawings will be provided for roof trusses. All new construction will be tied with hurricane straps to the plate/sill framing.
- 12. Applicant: John Rochelle**
- a. Property Address: 1327 Spring Hill Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 08/18/09
 - c. Project: Reroof house, shingles to match the existing.
- 13. Applicant: ICM Foundation**
- a. Property Address: 1007 Government Street
 - b. Approval Date: 08/18/09
 - c. Project: Spot roof repair; remove 3-tab shingles and decking. Replace rotten decking. Install new 3-tab shingles, same color as existing.
- 14. Applicant: ICM Foundation**
- a. Property Address: 1009 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 08/18/09
 - c. Project: Remove flat roof from NE and NW corner of building. Reinstall flat roof.
- 15. Applicant: Samantha Spurlock with Presley Roofing for Kim Richardson**
- a. Property Address: 1671 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 08/19/09
 - c. Project: Remove shingles from one half of garage. Install shingles to match the existing.
- 16. Applicant: Anthony Franks**
- a. Property Address: 1350 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 08/19/09
 - c. Project: Repair east rear lot wooden privacy fence. Work to match existing.
- 17. Applicant: Phillip Foster**
- a. Property Address: 1319 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/20/09
 - c. Project: Reroof house with architectural shingles.
- 18. Applicant: Stephen Taylor**

- a. Property Address: 1221 Selma Street
- b. Date of Approval: 09/20/09
- c. Project: Repaint front and rear porch decks, steps and cheeks black as per existing color scheme.

19. Applicant: Bill Bru

- a. Property Address: 206, 208, and 210 State Street
- b. Date of Approval: 09/24/09
- c. Project: Repaint all buildings per submitted color scheme in file. 210 (administration) to have classic white buff trim, beige walls, and mahogany porch decking. 208 to have buff trim, stone walls, mahogany decking, red sashes, mahogany at grade brick. 206 to have andiron eaves, buff walls, mahogany decking, red sashes, and mahogany watercourse.

20. Applicant: Joshua Cowart for James McPhail

- a. Property Address: 126 Government
- b. Date of Approval: 09/24/09
- c. Project: Repair and replace rotten wooden window sills. Work to match the existing in profile, dimension, scale, and material. Repaint work per existing color scheme.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 084-09: 262 South Broad Street
 - a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Thomas and Tracey Host
 - b. Project: Ancillary Construction.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
2. 085-09: 109 Lanier Avenue
 - a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Julie and John McClelland
 - b. Project: Porch Addition.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
3. 086-09: 301 Government Street
 - a. Applicant: Maura Garino for the Holiday Inn Downtown
 - b. Project: Sign Approval.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
4. 087-09: 31 North Royal Street (107 St. Francis Street)
 - a. Applicant: Goodwyn, Mills and Cawood for the Retirement Systems of Alabama
 - b. Project: Window Replacement.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
5. 088-09: 1211 Palmetto Street
 - a. Applicant: Max B. McGill and Daniel J. Burkoff
 - b. Project: Restore front porch. Install gravel drive. Construct rear deck.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
6. 089-09: 1650 Dauphin Street
 - a. Applicant: Timothy and Marian T. Clarke
 - b. Project: Rear Addition.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
7. 090-09: 12 South Monterey Street
 - a. Applicant: Denise J. Bunks for Stephanie Harvey
 - b. Project: Extend curbcut and install concrete strip drive.

TABLED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
8. 091-09: 1562 Blair Avenue
 - a. Applicant: Greg Dreaper
 - b. Project: Amend Certificate Appropriateness to allow Vinyl Windows.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
9. 092-09: 453 Dexter Avenue

- a. Applicant: Bobby White for Jerry Kerley
- b. Project: Demolition Request.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

10. 093-09: 256 South Cedar Street

- a. Applicant: Warren and Jacquelyn Carmichael
- b. Project: Fencing Approval.

TABLED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

11. 094-09: 12 South Lafayette Street

- a. Applicant: Thomas Karwinski for Bill and Pam Miller
- b. Project: Rear Addition.

TABLED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Guidelines
- 2. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

084-09-CA: 262 South Broad Street
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Thomas and Tracy Host
Received: 08/11/09
Meeting: 09/02/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Ancillary Construction

BUILDING HISTORY

This boxy astylar house of precast stone was built circa 1910. After years of disrepair, the house was restored in 1998. The front porch was reconstructed at that time.

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 corner lot property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicants propose construction of a garden shed in backyard.
- 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. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, shed and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures 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:
 - 1. Construct a Garden Shed with attached pergola in northwest corner of backyard (Per Submitted Plan)
 - A. Hardiboard Shed to measure 15 by 15 feet.
 - B. V-crimp metal roofing to cover pyramidal roof surmounted by a monitor.
 - C. East Elevation
 - 1. Features three narrow bays divided by pilaster strips
 - 2. One-over-one window to occupy southernmost bay.
 - 3. Wood door with two-paneled lower half and glazed upper half to occupy northernmost bay
 - D. South Elevation
 - 1. Features a central paneled and glazed door flanked by one-over-one windows
 - E. Pergola to be attached south side of Garden Shed
 - 1. Pergola to rest on 10 by 10 foot concrete slab
 - 2. Eight wooden posts to support pergola’s rafters

STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposed garden shed and pergola would be located in the northwest corner of a fenced backyard. The structure would not be visible from the street. The structure meets the material and design standards set by the Guidelines. Staff does not believe the application impairs the architectural or historical character of the house or district, thus recommends approval of the application

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application. Mr. Kearley requested the option of asphalt fiberglass shingles for the garden shed.

BOARD DISCUSSION

No discussion took place. .

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Ladd 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) B allowing the option of asphalt fiberglass shingles.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Ladd 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: 9/02/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

085-09-CA: 109 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Julie and John McClelland
Received: 08/19/09
Meeting: 09/02/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Porch Addition

BUILDING HISTORY

This Arts and Crafts-informed house dates from the 1935. The cross gabled and irregularly massed dwelling features walls with conscientiously rustic brickwork and a prominent projecting bay window with mullioned panes.

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. A small rear wing was added to this house in 1992. In 1995, a courtyard enclosure to the north of the house was approved.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new shall be differentiated from the old shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its 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:
 - 1. Remove casement windows.
 - 2. Install two French doors.
 - 3. Install built-in cabinet between French doors.
 - 4. Construct a 14’by 24’ screened porch to south side of house (Per Submitted Plan):
 - A. Continuous brick foundation to support porch.
 - B. Projecting course of brick at floor level to be painted black.
 - C. Tongue-and-groove decking to cover porch deck.
 - D. Porch roofing and flashing to match existing on house.
 - E. All woodwork to be painted black.
 - F. East and West Elevations
 - 1. Three 10’ posts and one pilaster to demarcate three bays.
 - 2. Horizontal beam to provide transom effect.

G. South Elevation

1. Six posts to demarcate five bays.
2. Horizontal beam to provide transom effect.
3. Demi-octagonal brick steps to access central bay of porch.
4. Double door to occupy central bay of porch.
5. Gable to feature half-timbered woodwork over hardipanel painted to match brick-work and two clad wood fixed casement windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Houses of this style and date often featured screened side porches. The proposed porch is set back from the front plan of the house. The design maintains the proportion and scale of the house, but utilizes different materials in order to differentiate the new work from the existing house. Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical character of the house or district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

No discussion took place.

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Baker 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

Ms. Baker 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: 9/02/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

086-09-CA: 301 Government Street
Applicant: Maura Garino for Holiday Inn
Received: 07/06/09
Meeting: 09/02/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Sign Approval.

BUILDING HISTORY

This 16-story masonry building was constructed in 1975 as a Sheraton Hotel. The complex occupies an entire city block. The circular roof top bar/lounge is characteristic design feature and social component of 1970s high rise construction. The building now houses the Holiday Inn Downtown Historic.

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 last appeared before the Board on November 5, 2008. The Board approved new signage and lighting programs which formed part of the Holiday Inn Downtown’s ongoing renovation. In May of 2009, the applicant submitted another application for sign approval. The maximum amount of signage allowed for buildings in the historic districts and along Government Street is 64 square feet. Any measurement beyond that amount requires a variance. The Holiday Inn’s proposal exceeded in size and scope an earlier sign variance. In July of this year, the Holiday Inn Downtown Historic received a second variance which allowed the establishment to further exceed the maximum square footage allotment. The applicant returns to the Board with an proposal for a monument sign to be located just within the complex’s northwest corner property line
- B. The Sign Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The height of free standing signs shall not be higher than 8 feet.
 - 2. The overall design of all signage including the mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property. Buildings with a recognizable style such as Greek Revival, Italianate, Victorian, Queen Anne, Neoclassic, Craftsman, et al., should use signage of the same style. This can be done through the use of similar decorative features such as columns or brackets. For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors.

3. The structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building. Wood, stucco, stone or brick, is allowed. Plastic, vinyl or similar materials are prohibited. Neon, resin to give the appearance of wood, and fabric may be appropriate.
 4. Internally lit signs are prohibited.
 5. The total allowable square footage for the display area of a monument sign is (50) fifty square feet, for pole signs 40 square feet, and for projecting 40 square feet.
 6. Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination. Such lighting shall not shine into or glare at pedestrian or vehicular traffic, nor shall it shine into adjacent areas. Light fixtures mounted on the ground shall be screened by landscaping.
 7. Flashing blinking, revolving, or rotating signs are not permitted.”
- C. Scope of Work (Per Submitted Plan and Site Plan):
1. Install double-faced non-illuminated aluminum monument sign in northwest corner of lot just within the property line
 - A. Stepped base
 1. measures 1’ 7” in height.
 2. measures 1’ 7” in depth.
 - B. Double-faced signage to sit atop base
 1. measures 4’ 5” in height.
 2. measures 6’ 3 ½ ” in length.
 3. Each face measures 37.5 square feet.
 4. Total square footage measures 75 square feet.
 5. Signage features Holiday Inn logo and name.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposed monument sign is a modification of one of the Holiday Inn’s standard designs. The sign would be non-illuminated, positioned within the property line, and accented by existing landscaping. The materials meet the standards set by the Guidelines.

Under the Sign Design Guidelines, the display area of monument signs shall not exceed 50 sq. ft. The display area of the proposed sign is approximately 56 sq. ft. As such, the display area should be reduced to conform to the Design Guidelines.

Further, though the sign is under the required 8’, in recent years the ARB has ruled that monument signs shall not exceed 5’ in height. In keeping with that precedent, Staff recommends the applicants be required to lower the height of this monument sign.

Once the sign has been designed to conform to the above conditions, Staff recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Maura Garino was present to discuss the application. Ms. Garino told the Board that the Holiday Inn Downtown Historic was listed among the top 100 Holiday Inns in the nation. She explained that the proposed sign was part of an ongoing multimillion dollar renovation. Increased tourism and bookings motivated the proposal. Ms. Garino closed by saying the Hotel would meet the height and size requirements recommended by Staff.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd asked Ms. Garino if she had received approval from the Department of Traffic and Engineering.

FINDING OF FACT

Ms Cousar moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as amended, deleting all of fact 1 (A) and (B).

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. James 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 on the condition that monument sign be under five feet in height and under fifty feet in total square footage. The motion received a second was passed unanimously. The applicant is to submit the plans for Staff approval.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/02/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

087-09-CA: 31 North Royal Street (107 St. Francis Street)
Applicant: Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood for the Retirement Systems of Alabama
Received: 08/07/09
Meeting: 09/02/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Window Replacement.

BUILDING HISTORY

This mid-twentieth-century skyscraper originally housed the First National Bank. Commercial establishments occupy a portion of the first floor of the six story base. Floors two through six contain a parking deck. The curtain wall of the parking deck was originally faced with perforated concrete blocks. The base supports an office tower with a south elevation featuring a rhythmic pattern of ribbon windows within hexagonal frames.

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 Retirement Systems of Alabama recently acquired this building. As the first phase of the renovation process, the RSA proposes to remove and replace windows on the seventh through thirty-fourth floors. The mechanical units below the windows would also be removed as well.
- 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. Original window openings should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Remove existing windows from 7th to the 34th floors.
 - 2. Remove wall mechanical units below windows
 - 3. Replace windows and mechanical units with one of the following Architectural Grade Aluminum Window options.
 - A. Install Viracon VE-11-42 OR,
 - B. ¼ PPG Solarblue with ½” Air Space and 1/4” PPG Solarban 80(3) Windows.
 - 4. Windows to occupy interior space of hexagonal frames.
 - 5. Windows to be have 1” insulated glass.
 - 6. Glass to be tinted.
 - 7. All windows to be provided with matching sub and perimeter frames

STAFF ANALYSIS

This building is one of the hallmarks of the Mobile skyline. The distinctive rhythm and shape of the office tower's windows constitute a defining feature of three of the buildings four elevations. The proposed window replacement and extension (into the area occupied by the mechanical units) would not greatly affect the building's mid-twentieth century design aesthetic since hexagonal framing would remain intact. The removal of the mechanical units would only result in a barely visible textural change. The visual impact would be minimal and an overall improvement. Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical character of the building or the district and thus recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Steve Penley of Goodwyn, Mills and Cawood was present to discuss the application. Mr. Penley explained that this proposal was the first phase of the Retirement Systems of Alabama's renovation of the property. He told the Board that the proposed windows were impact resistant. The tinted glass panels would replace the existing window panels and mechanical units on the 7th through the 34th floors.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. James asked the applicant if the glass would have a reflective surface. Mr. Penley said the panels would have a light blue-green tint but would not have a reflective surface. Ms. Baker asked Staff if both window options listed in the scope of work could be approved. Staff answered yes. The applicant would be able to choose between the two alternatives. Mr. Penley explained to the Board that the windows were out to bid, thus the two options. The appearance of the two types of glass is the same.

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Baker 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

Ms. Baker 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: 9/02/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

088-09-CA: 1211 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Max B. McGill and Daniel J. Burkett
Received: 08/17//09
Meeting: 09/02/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Restore front porch. Install gravel drive. Construct rear deck.

BUILDING HISTORY

This classically detailed and proportioned American 4-square house was constructed in 1907. The house has undergone numerous changes to the south (rear) and north (front) elevations.

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 property last appeared before the Board on March 18, 2009. The Board approved changes in fenestration to a previously enclosed southeast corner rear porch. The applicants return to the Board with a proposal for reconstructing a demolished front porch.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state in pertinent part:
 - 1. “A building’s base, or foundation, gives the building a sense of strength and solidity, and serves to “tie” the structure to the ground. Traditionally, residential buildings were raised on piers. Occasionally, certain early styles and mid-20th century styles used continuous masonry foundations.”
 - 2. “Foundation screening should be recessed from the front plan of the foundation piers. Lattice, if used, should be hung below the skirt board or siding, between the piers and framed with trim. Lattice secured to the face of the building is inappropriate. Solid infill should be recessed and screened.”
 - 3. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
 - 4. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.”
 - 5. “Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting. Asphalt is inappropriate for walkways. Gravel or shell are preferred paving material, however a variance from the Board of Zoning is required for commercial applications. Hard surface materials may also be accepted.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Reconstruct front porch.

- A. Remove later brick steps and stoop accessing front door.
- B. Construct porch (per submitted plan with corrections).
 - 1. Salvaged brick from the demolished stoop and drive to be used in three foundation piers supporting porch deck.
 - 2. Lattice skirting, suspended, framed, and recessed, will occupy space between foundation piers.
 - 3. Three wooden steps to ascend to eastern bay of porch.
 - 4. Three columnar posts, minus bases, to support porch entablature.
 - 5. Tongue-and-groove decking to cover porch deck.
 - 6. Dentil and other moldings to divide and demarcate entablature.
- 2. Remove existing front door.
- 3. Install Craftsman door.
- 4. Construct rear deck.
 - 1. Wooden pilings to support deck.
 - 2. Two sets of steps (one from south and one from west) to ascend to decking.
 - 3. Lattice skirting to encircle deck.
 - 4. Pressure treated boards to cover deck.
 - 5. MHDC Stock Balustrade to encircle deck.
- 5. Remove loss bricks from drive.
- 6. Install gravel in existing drive to west of house (loose bricks cover portions of the drive).

Clarifications

- 1. Height of porch deck
- 2. Treatment of columnar post bases

Staff Analysis

This house has undergone many changes in recent decades. The reconstruction of the porch would recapture much of the lost integrity of the north (front elevation). Staff recommends approval of the porch reconstruction pending clarifications of the height of the porch deck and the treatment of the columnar post bases. Staff also recommends approval of the rear deck and side drive. None of these submissions impair the architectural or historical character of the house or district.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Max McGill was present to discuss the application. Mr. McGill explained to the Board that the existing front door is contemporary six panel metal-faced replacement door which is not historically appropriate to the style of the house. He asked the Board if they would allow Staff to recommend and approve an appropriate door.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Karwinski voiced concern over the accuracy of the proposed front porch drawing. He pointed out the lack of a skirting board between the foundation piers and the porch decking. Such omissions he said should make the drawing unacceptable as fact. Ms. Coumanis informed the Board that Staff has spoken with the applicants regarding the porch. She explained that the applicants intend to copy the porch at 1206 Palmetto Street. Mr. Karwinski reiterated his concerns. Mr. Ladd asked if the Board could address the issues during the meeting so the applicant could proceed with the proposed work. The Board decided to allow the applicant work with Staff on the porch detailing.

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Baker moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as amended, deleting B (3.) and finding the drawings insufficient.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bradford Ladd 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 on the condition that the applicant work with Staff regarding the detailing of the porch and the selections of a door.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/02/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

089-09-CA: 1650 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Nodar Griashvalia for Timothy and Marian T. Clarke
Received: 08/17/09
Meeting: 09/02/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Addition

BUILDING HISTORY

Traditional and contemporary forms and features combine in this distinctive 1950s ranch house. On the one hand, the ranch house form, yellow brick walls, and glass block windows are hallmarks of third quarter of the 20th century design nationwide. On the other hand, the use of decorative cast iron tied the then new house to decorative tradition long associated with the City of Mobile.

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 property last appeared before the Board on August 21, 2008. The Board approved a proposal for a small rear addition.
- 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 massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its 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. Construct rear a 1,518.2 square foot addition to northwest corner of house.
 - 2. Addition to utilize bricks matching the existing.
 - 3. Roofing material will match the existing roofing
 - 4. Foundation level of addition to continue that of the existing house.
 - 5. East Elevation
 - A. features two nine-over-nine windows beneath extension of existing hipped roof.
 - B. features projecting bay with tripartite window grouping with transom under a gable on hip roof matching that on body of house.
 - 6. North Elevation
 - A. features two paired and one single square window below cornice

STAFF ANALYSIS

This house is characterized by its horizontal massing and expansive plans. By virtue of the house’s corner lot location, the proposed addition would be visible from the street. A vine covered wall and privacy fence largely obscure the location. The proposed rear addition continues the proportional system established by the main house. The design utilizes materials, roof forms and window types that match those on the existing house. A fenestration shift and projecting bay would provide indications as to where the addition joins and extends from the existing house. Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical character of the house or the district thus recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tim Clarke and Nodar Griashvalia were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Karwinski asked the applicant why the cornice line stepped up in the northern section of the addition. Mr. Clarke informed the Board that an increased ceiling height in that portion of the addition resulted in the change in the cornice line.

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Baker 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

Ms. Cousar 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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/02/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

090-09-CA: 12 South Monterey Street.
Applicant: Denise J. Burk for Stephanie Harvey
Received: 08/18/09
Meeting: 09/02/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install a drive with concrete runners.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story house with paneled window aprons and an articulated door surround was built in 1911.

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 property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. It shares a drive easement with the neighboring property to the north, 10 South Monterey Street. The owners of 12 South Monterey Street propose installing a drive for their neighbors so both properties would have off street parking.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.”
 - 2. “Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting. Asphalt is inappropriate for walkways. Gravel or shell are preferred paving material, however a variance from the Board of Zoning is required for commercial applications. Hard surface materials may also be accepted.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Extend existing curb cut
 - 2. Remove existing rock coping wall along sidewalk
 - 3. Excavate portion of north half of front lawn for drive.
 - 4. Place stones from demolished coping wall along south side of proposed drive
 - 5. Install two 2’ wide concrete runners that would extend fifty feet into the lot.
 - A. Drive would stop at the rear plane of the front porch.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Rock coping walls were a common landscaping feature as Mobile’s western residential quarter expanded during first quarter of the twentieth-century. Old Dauphin Way has more of this type of coping wall than any of the City’s other historic districts. The west side of this portion of South Monterey Street derives much of its character from the rock walls. The removal of this segment of coping wall would provide a

maximum of two tightly spaced off street parking spaces. The resulting loss of a cohesive landscape exceeds the minimal gain. Staff believes this application impairs the historical character of the property and the district. Approval of this application is not recommended.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Denise Burk was present to discuss the application. Ms. Burk provided pictures for the Board's inspection. She stated that in the 1930s the shared drive was reduced in size. She said the owners of the house approve of the proposed drive since it would provide off street parking and increase property values for both properties. Ms. Burk said the stones from the coping wall would be moved to accommodate the drive. Grass would be planted to cover the slope to match the drive at 10 South Monterey. Ms. Bunks told the Board that the shared drive posed many inconveniences. Visitors do not know where to park. The backyard of 12 South Monterey is used as a parking pad for the owner's vehicles. She said that she had spoken with the Department of Traffic Engineering regarding the project.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. James asked about the size requirements for curbcuts. Ms. Coumanis informed the Board that curbcuts must be at least twelve feet for a single drive. Ms. Burk said curbcut would cover the existing entrance plus six more feet. Bill James said he could still not envision how the proposed drive would look. Ms. Burk told the Board that two concrete strips would lead into the property. Mr. James pointed out that the owners would be parking in front of the house. The result would not be a drive he said, but a parking pad. Ms. Cousar said she once lived in the area. She informed the Board that parking is not uniform along South Monterey Street. Some properties have driveways, others have half drives and still others have no off street parking. Ms. Cousar then asked Ms. Burk where the proposed parking strips would extend and end within the lot. Mr. Ladd noted that according to the submitted plans no car could go beyond the bay window. Staff clarified saying the drive would stop five feet beyond the porch.

Ms. Cousar made the motion to table the application. The motion received unanimous approval.

The applicant was asked to submit site plans and drawings. Board members are to revisit the site.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

091-09-CA: 1562 Blair Avenue
Applicant: Greg Dreaper
Received: 08/24/09
Meeting: 09/02/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: New Contributing Construction
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction

BUILDING HISTORY

This house, which is soon to be constructed, will occupy the site of a single-story bungalow that burned in 2006. The plans were approved on January 7, 2009.

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 property last appeared before the Board on July 1, 2009. The applicant submitted a application involving the substitution of vinyl windows for previously approved vinyl clad windows. The submission was denied. The applicant filled notice of appeal with the City Clerk’s office. Staff has met with applicant on several occasions. On Wednesday, August 19, 2009, Staff and the applicant inspected window options at Keller Smith Windows. The applicant returns to the Board with an alternate set of vinyl-clad windows of higher quality and greater reveal that were inspected during that meeting. The applicant and his contractor have agreed to install a stool extension below the window that further the appearance of a true-divided-light window.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for New Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “In new buildings, exterior materials – both traditional and modern can use surrounding historic examples as a guide.”
 - 2. “Often one of the most important decorative features, doorways reflect the architectural style of a building. The design of doors and doorways can help establish the character of a building and compatibility with adjacent facades.
 - 3. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows, and their location and configuration (rhythm) help establish the character of a building and compatibility with adjacent structures. Traditionally designed window openings generally are recessed on masonry buildings and have a raised surround on frame buildings.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Amend COA to allow Series 450 Double Hung Atrium Windows instead of approved vinyl clad windows
 - A. Windows to feature 7/8” insulated glass

- B. Windows to feature continuous head and sill on twins and triples
- 2. Install stool extension below window

STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposed revision to previously approved plans involves the substitution of vinyl windows for vinyl clad windows. The applicant has spoken and met with Staff on multiple occasions. The proposed windows are of a higher quality and provide greater depth than the applicant's previous substitution proposal. The applicant and his contractor have agreed to install a stool extension and jambs that would provide additional relief. With the proposed framing, the windows will achieve a thickness that meets the standards set by the Guidelines. Staff does not believe the proposed window substitution impairs the historic character of the district thus recommends approval of this application.

In addition, Staff views this application as a "test" case. Staff believes this is an excellent opportunity to see how new materials, previously determined to be inappropriate for historic districts, have evolved. Given that new construction materials are entering the market everyday, Staff recommends approval of this application in order to evaluate the effectiveness of this proposal. In addition, the results will be taken into consideration as the MHDC finalizes the new design guidelines for new construction in historic districts.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Greg Dreaper was present to discuss the application. Mr. Dreaper showed the Board a sample of the proposed window. He noted the sample did not have the prairie muntins outlined in his request. Mr. Dreaper told the Board that denying the muntins would change the design of house. The muntins would be both interior and exterior. The window units would have the look of a traditional sash window. Mr. Dreaper told the Board that he believed the plans of his house were a link between the older and newer houses of Blair Avenue. The proposed windows, with their use of contemporary materials in a traditional guise, are part of that linkage. Mr. Dreaper then circulated a letter from a neighbor, who unable to attend the meeting, wrote of his approval of the proposed house and windows. Other neighbors spoke on behalf of the design and the windows.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. James asked the applicant if the windows were tinted. Mr. Dreaper answered yes. Mr. James said the black tint of most newer windows strikes a jarring tone with historic window panes. Mr. Dreaper agreed saying if another option were available from the supplier he would utilize that option. He mentioned that several contributing houses on the street used storm windows with a similar tint. Ms. Baker asked Staff if the applicant could choose between the proposed glass and an alternate if one was available. The Board then asked Mr. Dreaper about the proposed removal of the garage from the approved plans. Mr. Dreaper said the approved drive would remain and the deck would wrap around the corner of the house. The rear elevation would not have windows.

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Baker moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as amended, adding fact C (1) C the use of a lighter shade of glass if possible and fact C (3) the removal of the garage.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Ladd moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application may not impair the historic integrity of the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued in this test case approval. The conditional nature of the approval was further clarified. It was noted the application provided an opportunity to experiment with the effectiveness of the installation of new products to achieve traditional effects. Staff and the Board reiterated the experimental nature of the approval citing: this is new construction; the house is located on a cul de sac; and the street has several non-contributing structures in the immediate vicinity. It was noted that the Board would examine the house once complete to determine the appropriateness of using similar materials and construction in the future.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/02/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

092-09-CA: 453 Dexter Avenue
Applicant: Bobby White for Jerry D. Kerley
Received: 08/14/09
Meeting: 08/05/09

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition

BUILDING HISTORY

This house brick house, with a projecting entrance vestibule and a recessed side porch (since filled in), dates from the 1920s.

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 house is part of the new Leinkauf expansion. On March 12, 2009, an attic fire caused severe structural damage to the home. While not apparent from the street, the internal damage to the house was extensive. The applicant’s insurance fails to cover the full reconstruction of his home. The applicant, for reasons of ill health, is represented by Mr. White. On account of his physical condition and financial straits, the applicant requests permission to demolition his home. The application was first heard by the Board’s July 15, 2009. The application was tabled. The applicant was advised to return to the Board with a fencing plan that incorporated the vestibule portion of the house. A site plan was to accompany the drawings. The applicant withdrew his application from the August 5th meeting. On August 12, 2009 the applicant resubmitted drawings for inclusion in the September 2nd Agenda. The application does not incorporate the vestibule. The application calls for a wooden fence that would be constructed twenty-six feet from the street. The front plan of the vestibule wall is thirty feet from the street. An arbor would be situated at some point within the fencing.
- B. In regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - A. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the board shall consider:

- i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
This building is a contributing structure within the Leinkauf Historic District. Architecturally, the house reflects the local absorption of popular 1920s builder's catalogs.
 - ii. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. This house is a contributing structure in the Leinkauf historic district. Similar catalog inspired houses and bungalows comprise this block as well as the block just north on Dexter Avenue. They comprise a streetscape defined by small front lawns, side drives, and overhanging trees.
 - iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 - 1. The brick facing of the east (rear) elevation collapsed as result of the fire. Brick on the front and side elevations has cracked. The brick is no longer manufactured.
 - iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 - 1. Similar catalog inspired houses and bungalows comprise this block and create a street scene of which this is integral as well as the block just north on Dexter Avenue.
 - v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 - 1. If granted demolition approval, the owner of the house would like to extend the existing concrete block wall that currently ties into northeast corner of the house across the lot. The area to either side of the wall would be landscaped. The applicant would continue to live in the garage/guest house located in the rear of the property.
- B. *Content of applications.* All applications to demolish or remove a structure in a historic district shall contain the following minimum information:
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. The applicants acquired the property in 1995.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. The applicant plans to demolish the house or allow the house to decay.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The property has not been listed for sale.
 - ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 - 1. Not applicable.
 - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. None other than the creation of the front wall.
 - xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for

completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and

1. See attached paperwork.
 - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
- C. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”
- D. In case of denial, the applicant has submitted an application for financial hardship.

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):

1. Demolish house.
2. Construct a wooden arbor and fence.
 - A. Fence to be inset 26 feet from the street.
 - B. Fence to measure under six feet in height.
 - B. Fence to extend 46 ½ feet across lot
 - C. Fence to extend along existing drive 36 feet into the lot, terminating at existing wall
 - D. Arbor to be 8 foot tall and 4 foot wide.
3. Landscape site of house.

D. Clarifications

1. What is the exact height of the north-south section of fencing?
2. What is the exact location of the arbor?
3. What is the depth of the arbor?
4. Will there be a gate within the arbor?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This fire damaged home appeared before the Board at the July 15th meeting. Before the fire, this house was in excellent condition. The fire resulted in the almost complete loss of the internal roofing system. It also caused extensive damage to the internal wall structure. Generally the Board does not approve demolitions. Based on the condition of the house and the state of the applicant’s health and finances, staff recommended approval of the demolition request provided part of the house was saved to maintain a street line.

During the July 15th meeting, the Board requested that part of the house, the vestibule, steps, and chimney, be salvaged. The applicant submitted drawings for the August 5, 2009 meeting. The application was withdrawn before the meeting on account of the conjectural quality of the submitted drawings and incompleteness of the application form.

On August 12th, the applicant resubmitted drawings illustrating the post demolition plans. The plans did not incorporate the Boards recommendations, but the proposal substituted a wooden fence for the previously proposed masonry wall. The wooden fence would span the center of the yard and feature a trellis entryway.

At this juncture, Staff recommends approval for the complete demolition of the house. Staff recommends approval of the demolition of the house. A fence in the middle of a lot is not a historic treatment in this neighborhood. However, due to the unusual circumstances surrounding this application, Staff recommends that the proposed wooden fence be moved back to be in the plane with the front wall of the body of the existing house (or the western boundary of the fence) thereby maintaining continuity of the streetscape. The arbor should be located where the present entry to the vestibule is located. Additionally, the fence should be no higher than four feet. Pending observation of the setback and high of the fence along with the clarifications listed above, Staff recommends approval of this application with a note that no expansion of the existing living quarters will be allowed and that any future residence constructed on the property will have to meet the typical setbacks of the neighborhood and will have to match the existing architecture on the street.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Bobby White was present to discuss the application. Mr. White clarified the application. He told the Board the fence would be located in plane with existing façade. The arbor with a gate would be located on the site of the vestibule. The whole of the arbor and fence would be painted white. The whole of the lot would be landscaped. Mr. White t asked to speak with Mr. Lawler, the City's attorney, following the meeting.

BOARD DISCUSSION

No discussion took place.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. James 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) A to 35 feet, C (2) B to four feet, and C (2) D to locate the arbor with gate on the site of the vestibule.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bill James 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: 9/02/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

093-09-CA: 256 South Cedar Street
Applicant: Warren and Jacquelyn Carmichael
Received: 08/17/09
Meeting: 09/02/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fencing Approval

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story brick residence was built in 1999.

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 property last appeared before the Board on June 17, 2009. The applicants received approval to construct a stucco-face concrete block fence along their home’s south property line. In early August, Staff received a 311 regarding unapproved work. The applicants had added two more feet in height to last segment of the approved wall, extended the wall one bay along the west property line, and constructed five stucco-faced concrete shafts. A Notice of Violation and Stop Work Order were issued on August 4, 2009. Work has not resumed. The applicants also submit a request to move a sunroom/greenhouse to back further into the lot in order to come into compliance with the Board of Adjustment’s set back requirements.
- 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, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.”
 - 3. “The finished side of the fence should face toward public view.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Fencing (Per Submitted Photographs)
 - A. Heighten last segment of approved stucco-faced wall along south property line 2’.
 - B. Construct an 8’ high post to connect approved south wall to 8’ post of single segment of west side wall.
 - C. Construct a 6’ high segment of wall in southwest corner of backyard.
 - D. Construct 8’ post stucco-faced post to terminate wall to northern bay of west property line wall.
 - E. Construct 2 stucco-faced posts along west property line.

- F. Stucco inner face of west wall segment
- G. Stucco free and engaged posts
- H. Suspend wire between posts for vegetation.
- 2. Gate
 - A. Apply metal panels to existing driveway gate.
- 3. Greenhouse (Per Submitted Site Plan)
 - A. Move Greenhouse back roughly 1' 5" from lot line for five foot setback requirement.

Clarifications

- 1. What type of wire will be suspended between the piers?

STAFF ANALYSIS

At eight feet, the last portion of the approved south wall, the projecting piers providing transition to the west wall, and the unapproved single section of the west wall exceed the maximum height limit set by the Guidelines.

Staff recommends approval of the west wall, but the height of all the fencing should be brought into compliance with the six foot height limitation under the Guidelines, or reduced by two feet. The unapproved piers along the west lot line should be reduced to the same level. All unapproved fencing would then be of the same height as the approved wall. Pending observation of the above recommendations and clarification of the wire type to extend between the freestanding piers, Staff does not believe the fencing would impair the integrity of the district and recommends approval.

The applicants did not submit drawings or images of the driveway gate panels thus Staff cannot recommend approval.

Staff recommends approval of the greenhouse and its relocation.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Warren and Jacquelyn Carmichael were present to discuss the application. Mr. Carmichael told the Board that the greenhouse had been on their property since 2001. He said the complaint of a neighbor was the only reason they had to appear before the Board.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd asked about the history and particulars of the greenhouse. Mr. Lawler informed the Board that the Carmichael's constructed the greenhouse without a permit. Additionally, the greenhouse violates setback requirements. A recent ruling by the City Council requires that the greenhouse comply with setback requirements and obtain Architectural Review Board approval. Mr. Karwinski told the applicants that the Board should have received drawings of the site, the wall, and the greenhouse. Mr. Bemis told the Board that Staff will work with the applicants, but there are not guidelines for greenhouses. Mr. Carmichael reminded the Board that the greenhouse is located behind the house. Ms. Cousar suggested that the greenhouse portion of the application be tabled until before & after drawings and adequate photographs are submitted. She suggested that an appointment be made for the Board to visit the site. Mr. Carmichael addressed the

fence. He said the fence did not step up, but measured the same height as a fence he removed. Mr. James asked if the fence in question was the fence approved by the Board on June 17, 2009. He then inquired about the pilasters. Mr. Bemis told the Board that application was a result of a 311 call. Ms. Stillwell, a neighbor addressed the Board. She said the backyard is covered with concrete which creates a two inch cement slab. When the fence is viewed from neighboring properties it measures 6 feet 2 inches in height. Ms. Stillwell informed the Board that she had lived in the house just west of the Carmichaels for two years. Her house was built in 2001. An 8 foot fence was constructed contemporaneously. Ms. Stillwell said she would have given the Carmichaels permission to attach to her fence, but they never approached her. She did not know about the fence until her property experienced construction related damage. Concrete from the Carmichaels fence had poured into her lot. She noted that the outer face of the approved fence separating the Carmichaels and another neighbor's fence remains unfinished concrete. Dr. Helen Campbell, the owner of that adjoining property, confirmed the visibility of the unfinished outer face of concrete. Ms. Stillwell said she did not want a similar fence abutting her property. The poor design of the fence affects hers and her neighbors' property values. Dr. Campbell agreed. Mr. Ladd told the assembled parties that neighborhood disputes needed to be put aside. The matter at hand needed to be addressed. Mr. Karwinski reiterated saying the Board is not here to address social issues. Mr. Ladd and Ms. Cousar voiced their confusion regarding the application. He also suggested a time be set for the Board to visit the site. Mr. Ladd said that the Board would need measured plans and drawings. Mr. Lawler reminded the Board that the greenhouse needed to comply with setback and design requirements. Mr. Lawler said a complete application with drawings were required.

Deleted:

Mr. Ladd made a motion to table this request. The motion was unanimously approved.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

TABLED

094-09-CA: 12 South Lafayette Street.
Applicant: Thomas Karwinski for Bill and Pam Miller
Received: 08/17/09
Meeting: 09/02/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Addition

BUILDING HISTORY

This one story frame house with projecting gable bay was constructed in 1905. The porch was altered in 1925. The gable brackets were added at that time.

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 property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicant proposes a rear addition accessed by a hyphen off the rear elevation.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exteriors 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 massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its 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. Construct 19’ by 34’ addition connected to house by 5’ by 20’ hyphen; deck measuring 14’ x 20’ area to north of hyphen
 - 2. Add doorway to southwest corner of house
 - A. Door to be salvaged from the interior
 - B. wood steps and Thomas Karwinski Railing to access door

3. Remove door and windows from west elevation
4. Siding and trim of addition to be hardiboard or wood lap.
5. All Windows to be vinyl clad wood.
6. Shed roof to cover hyphen
7. Gable roof with broken pitch to south cover body of addition
8. Hyphen to rest on brick foundation piers
9. Bedroom addition to rest on brick foundation interspersing recessed solid brick skirting with vents.
10. South Elevation
 - A. Hyphen features tripartite grouping of one-over-one windows
 - B. Body of addition features three one-over-one windows
11. West Elevation
 - A. features expanse of siding
12. North Elevation
 - A. Body of Addition features three one-over-one windows
 - B. Hyphen features tripartite grouping of three one-over-one windows
 - C. Deck with gate for ingress and egress to feature Thomas Karwinski balustrade
 1. Wood steps to access deck
14. East Elevation (to north side of hyphen)
 - A. features one two unit window below louvered window

STAFF ANALYSIS

While taking design cues from and observing the scale of the existing house, the proposed addition is successfully differentiated from the original structure. It “reads” as an addition. Corner posts demarcate the transition from the old and new part of the house. Proportions and massing provide continuity of form. Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historic character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

Due to lack of a quorum the motion had to be TABLED