AGENDA
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
March 26, 2007 – 3:00 P.M.
Mayor’s Pre-Council Chamber – Mobile Government Plaza
205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER – Chair

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Approval of Mid-Month Requests Approved by Staff

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Caroline Contracting  
   Property Address: 1751 Dauphin Street  
   Date of Approval: February 27, 2007  
   Paint exterior wood elements in white and window accents in black (all brick will remain unpainted).

2. Applicant's Name: Stephen May  
   Property Address: 1002 Elmira Street  
   Date of Approval: February 27, 2007  
   Install a 5-V crimp metal panel roof in a galvanized steel color.

3. Applicant's Name: Montdrakgo Caldwell  
   Property Address: 400 Charles Street  
   Date of Approval: March 1, 2007  
   Repair/replace rotten wood as necessary throughout the exterior with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint the fascia, siding and trim in white.

4. Applicant's Name: Ken Baggette  
   Property Address: 66 South Ann Street  
   Date of Approval: March 5, 2007  
   Construct a 7’ x 12’ rear deck. The wood will be treated and left a natural color. The rail will be per MHDC stock design.

5. Applicant's Name: Mark West  
   Property Address: 350 McDonald Avenue  
   Date of Approval: March 5, 2007  
   Replace the current inappropriate asphalt shingle roof with Monier Lifetile concrete tiles that have an España profile similar to the original Ludowici tiles that were removed in the 1980s. The color of the tiles will be a combination of Citrus Clay, Gold Dust and Casa Grande Blend.

6. Applicant's Name: Earl Harris Construction  
   Property Address: 965 Selma Street  
   Date of Approval: March 6, 2007  
   Replace siding on back wall with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.

7. Applicant's Name: Professional Remodeling and Repair  
   Property Address: 359 Church Street  
   Date of Approval: March 6, 2007  
   Repair/replace exterior doors as necessary with doors that match existing in material, profile, dimension and features. Paint doors in the existing color scheme.

8. Applicant's Name: Chris Peters  
   Property Address: 401 Church Street  
   Date of Approval: March 6, 2007  
   Paint to match existing color scheme.
9. **Applicant's Name:** Walter Johnson/Stewart Contracting  
**Property Address:** 163 South Jefferson Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 6, 2007  
Repair or replace rotten windows as necessary to include any or all of the entire units with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension – windows to have true divided lights; replace rotten siding as necessary with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile; paint in existing color scheme.

10. **Applicant's Name:** CWS Construction Company  
**Property Address:** 112 Beverly Court  
**Date of Approval:** March 7, 2007  
Prep and paint to match existing color scheme.

11. **Applicant's Name:** Monty Graham  
**Property Address:** 1760 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 8, 2007  
Repair and replace roof tiles to match existing. Repair rotted/damaged wood on dormers to match existing, prime and paint to match existing. Replace damaged roof vents to match existing. Paint metal portion of roof (flat top) to stop/prevent rusting. Paint color to be light gray, will not be visible from street level. Repair corners of metal roof to match existing. Install drip rail on roof over front steps to prevent backsplash on porch and rotting of porch deck.

12. **Applicant's Name:** Daniel Bark  
**Property Address:** 26 Blacklawn  
**Date of Approval:** March 8, 2007  
Enclose the window from the bathroom on the south side elevation with a set of louvered wood shutters on the exterior and plywood and dur-rock on the interior in order to meet building codes that require a minimum of 60” from the drain to the window. The exterior framing will be maintained in order to preserve the fenestration pattern of the residence. The interior sash will be saved and protected so that future residents may reopen the window if it is allowed.

13. **Applicant's Name:** Alex and Bethany Kraft  
**Property Address:** 1219 Texas Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 9, 2007  
Prep to paint. Replace rotten wood as necessary with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material on main house and back shed. Add original porch balustrade to front porch per MHDC stock plans. Repair columns and replace missing column to match original wooden columns. Paint house and shed. Repair foundation and add brick infill to match existing brick in color, profile and dimension. (Paint colors to be submitted at a later date.)

14. **Applicant's Name:** James Oates  
**Property Address:** 153 Houston Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 9, 2007  
Prep and paint the exterior of the residence in the existing color scheme. Repaint the rail on the front porch black. Repair/replace rotted wood throughout the exterior, including the existing privacy fence, with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Replace the current front door, which is an interior door that replaced the previous historic exterior door several years ago, with a new exterior door in a pre-finished Medium Walnut color. The door will have an oval light with leaded glass on top and two decorative panels on the bottom.

15. **Applicant's Name:** Karen and Michael Rodriguez  
**Property Address:** 208 Rapier Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** March 9, 2007  
Repair/replace rotted wood as necessary throughout the exterior with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint the exterior in the following Sherwin Williams colors:

- **Body** – Universal Khaki
- **Trim** – White
- **Porch Deck, Stairs and Front Door** – Black Emerald
16. **Applicant's Name:** Joseph Sejud  
**Property Address:** 1115 Montauk Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** March 9, 2007  
Repair/replace any rotted wood on the existing privacy fence with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Extend the 6’ wood privacy fence approximately 70’ to the north along the western boundary of the property, maintaining a setback of approximately 45’ from the curb. Match the new boards to the existing 6” wide, unpainted, dog-eared boards.

This application was approved by the Architectural Review Board on October 30, 2006. However, a Certificate of Appropriateness was not issued at that time pending a current survey of the property line in order to satisfy a concern as to whether the fence was on Mr. Sejud’s property or his neighbor’s property. Mr. Sejud has had a survey done and the fence will be on his land. A copy of the survey can be found in the property file located at the MHDC offices on the second floor of the Government Plaza building.

17. **Applicant's Name:** Gene and Theresa Coleman  
**Property Address:** 56 North Monterey Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 12, 2007  
Build a garage at the rear of the property per MHDC stock plans. Replace current concrete driveway and concrete sidewalk with brick pavers. Replace current chain link fence along the rear of the property with a 3’ wood picket fence. Continue painting residence in the existing color scheme (renewal of previous COA).

18. **Applicant's Name:** Paul Averette  
**Property Address:** 205 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 12, 2007  
Install a 20 SF, double-faced (10 SF per face) hanging sign made of wood with a composite edge and metal letters. The sign will have a gray background and the letters will be red and white. It will hang from the existing chains.

19. **Applicant's Name:** Big Zion AME Church/Joe Pomeroy  
**Property Address:** 1112 South Bayou Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 12, 2007  
Replace the current 3-tab shingle roof system with a new 3-tab shingle roof system in the same color as existing. Re-caulk the building walls where necessary.

20. **Applicant's Name:** James Wagoner/Charles Howard  
**Property Address:** 1805 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 12, 2007  
Repaint front porch floor, ceiling and columns in the existing colors. Repair/replace rotted wood on porch as necessary with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint side porch floor, walls, ceiling and columns in the existing colors. Repair/replace rotted wood on porch as necessary with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint upstairs deck above side porch in the existing colors. Repair/replace rotted wood on deck as necessary with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.

C. **NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS**

1. **Notice of Violation:** David McDonald  
**Property Address:** 203 South Warren Street  
**Date of Violation:** March 14, 2007  
Did not receive Architectural Review Board approval for the substantial work completed on the front porch and fence.

2. **Notice of Violation:** City Management Company LLC  
**Property Address:** 805 Church Street  
**Date of Violation:** March 14, 2007  
Did not comply with the approved work outlined in and performed work in direct violation of the Certificate of Appropriateness issued on November 14, 2005.
D. OLD BUSINESS

1. **018-07-CA**: 251 Government Street
   - Applicant: Chris Reynolds of Nextel Partners Inc
   - Request: New cell tower antennas.

2. **023-07-CA**: 304 State Street
   - Applicant: John and Mary Bridler
   - Request: New construction.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. **031-07-CA**: 1555 Springhill Avenue
   - Applicant: Eric Roberts

2. **032-07-CA**: 550 Church Street
   - Applicant: Kurt Nerlinger of National Signs
   - Request: New sign.

3. **033-07-CA**: 451 Marine Street
   - Applicant: Lee Franks
   - Request: New fence.

4. **034-07-CA**: 211 North Jackson Street
   - Applicant: Charles Steeg
   - Request: New construction.

5. **035-07-CA**: 63 South Hallett Street
   - Applicant: Douglas Kearley/Scott Baria
   - Request: New garage.

6. **036-07-CA**: 1119 Palmetto Street
   - Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
   - Request: Renovate existing residence.

7. **037-07-CA**: 102 Levert Avenue
   - Applicant: Lewis Hassell

8. **038-07-CA**: 103 Lanier Avenue
   - Applicant: James and Elissa Watkins
   - Request: New garage.

9. **039-07-CA**: 65 North Monterey Street
    - Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. E. Luckett Robinson

10. **040-07-CA**: 125-127 Dauphin Street
    - Applicant: Tilmom Brown/Hancock Bank
    - Request: New ATM.

11. **041-07-CA**: 1751 Dauphin Street
    - Applicant: Caroline Contracting
    - Request: New sign.

F. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

G. ADJOURNMENT
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF COMMENTS

018-07-CA: 251 Government Street
Applicant: Chris Reynolds of Nextel Partners Inc
Received: 02/01/07 (+45 Days: 03/18/07)
Meeting: 02/26/07
Resubmitted: 03/12/07 (+45 Days: 04/26/07)
Meeting: 03/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install a stealth antenna on the building side and an antenna and repeater on the roof.

BUILDING HISTORY

This twelve-story masonry building opened in 1940 as the Admiral Semmes Manor hotel. It is currently part of the Radisson chain of mid to high range business and leisure hotels.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change…will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…”

STAFF REPORT

A. There are currently a number of antennas on the roof of the building, which can only be seen from high elevations. A Radisson sign was formerly located at the area of the proposed stealth antenna. The wiring from the sign is still there. The MHDC maintains an easement on the façade.

B. There are no specific guidelines regarding cell towers and antennas, so the Architectural Review Board examines each application on a case-by-case basis.

C. The proposed plans include the following:
   1. Move the proposed dipole antenna flush mount on the side of the building to the roof per phone call from Chris Reynolds on Monday, 03-20-07.
   2. Place a 2'-6" x 7'-3" Yagi antenna and 6'-0" x 3'-0" repeater on the roof per submitted plans.
      a. The antenna will be placed 1'-0" inside the parapet wall on the existing equipment platform.
      b. The repeater will be placed 8'-0" inside the parapet wall on the existing equipment platform.
      c. The antenna and repeater will be placed on the west side by the parking garage and should be minimally visible from the street

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information contained in the application, the proposed work should not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district.

The rooftop antenna and repeater will not be seen from the street. In addition, they are much smaller in comparison to the antennas currently on the roof. Relocating the stealth antenna to the roof should also keep it from being seen on the street.

Staff recommends approving the application if the Board finds the roof an acceptable location. Mr. Reynolds will be bringing information regarding the new location to the Board meeting. Due to the easement on the property, ARB approval must be conditioned by the approval of the Properties Committee of the MHDC.
023-07-CA: 304 State Street
Applicant: John and Mary Bridler
Received: 02/12/07 (+45 Days: 03/29/07)
Meeting: 02/26/07
Resubmitted: 03/12/07 (+45 Days: 04/26/07)
Meeting: 03/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-B
Project: New construction.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is currently an empty lot that once held residential buildings.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that "the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change…will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…"

STAFF REPORT

A. This empty lot at the corner of State and North Claiborne is 56’ x 120’.
B. The Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction state “the goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history.”
C. The proposed plan includes the following:
   1. Construct a contemporary two-story single-family residence on an empty lot per the submitted plans.
      a. The house will have a 25’ setback and face State Street.
      b. The house will rest on a 3’ continuous brick foundation.
      c. The siding will be a combination of Old Mobile Jumbo on the front facade, stucco in Old Dauphin Way Gold by BLP on the left, right and rear facades, Hardiplank on the garage and slate shingles on the dormers.
      d. The roof will be fiberglass/asphalt shingles in Owens Desert Tan and have three dormers.
      e. The windows will be a combination of 1/1 and small diamond-shaped wood openings on the first floor and 1/1 wood arched openings in the dormers; the first floor 1/1 windows will have lintels.
      f. The front door will be wood with six panels, sidelights and a transom, stained Dark Oak.
      g. There will be two one-light double doors with iron balconets on the second story of the left elevation.
      h. There will be a masonry chimney covered in stucco on the right elevation.
      i. There will be a front porch with four 12” masonry columns with simple capitals and masonry steps.
      j. The garage doors will be metal per submitted photograph.
      k. The rear pedestrian door will also be metal.
   2. Install a concrete driveway.
      a. It will be located at the rear of the residence.
      b. The curb cut will be located on North Claiborne.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the new construction should not impair the historic integrity of the district.
The proposed construction follows the setback and orientation pattern of residences in the vicinity. Its massing and scale, including the raised foundation and simple L-shaped footprint, are proportional to buildings typical of the district. It has a front porch, an “important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture.” Ornamentation such as the window lintels, iron balconets and porch columns is inspired by nearby residences, yet has a contemporary look and feel. As such, it succeeds in the ultimate goal of guidelines for new construction, which state, “new designs should relate to the historic context yet read as contemporary” as well as “avoid creating a false sense of history.”

There are, however, some elements that staff feels should be changed. Instead of having 4” raised stucco trim at the windows, staff recommends a wood trim. Staff also recommends that the Hardiplank siding be smooth-faced and the rear pedestrian door be wood rather than metal. Finally, staff recommends that the roof shingles be in a darker color blend in order to offset the neutral tones of both the stucco and the brick on the house.

Staff recommends approving the application with the recommended changes. The applicant will need to contact Urban Forestry regarding the removal of the Water Oak and Traffic Engineering and Right-of-Way regarding the curb cut of North Claiborne.
INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Install an 8’ privacy fence at the rear (south) property line. Install a 3’-6” open ironwork fence at the side and front property lines. Install a small metal post and chain barrier on right-of-way. Remove a hollow tree.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story masonry building was constructed in the latter half of the 20th century. It originally served as a medical building for the Health Department. It is currently being used as a law office.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change…will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…”

STAFF REPORT

A. There is currently no fence around this building. On the south side of the property is a parking area that is often used as a cut through between Kilmarnock and Catherine. The large tree, which is hollow, is located directly in front of the main entrance; it is also causing problems with the roof and foundation of the building.

B. The Design Review Guidelines say fences should “complement the building and not detract from it.”

C. The proposed plan includes the following:
   1. Install a wood privacy fence
      a. The fence will be 8’ tall with standard width dog-eared boards.
      b. It will run along the south boundary from Kilmarnock to Catherine.
   2. Install an open ironwork fence
      a. The fence will be 3’-6” tall and look similar to the submitted photograph.
      b. It will run along the north, east and west boundaries per the submitted site plan.
      c. There will be an iron gate for vehicles at the entrance to the parking area.
   3. Install a small metal post and chain barrier on the right-of-way
   4. Remove the hollow tree at the front of the building

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The proposed fences fall within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines. In addition, the tree is hollow and, because of its location so close to the building, it is damaging the roof and foundation of the building.

Staff recommends approving the application. The applicant will need to contact Right-of Way regarding the small post and chain barrier as well as Urban Forestry regarding the tree removal.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF COMMENTS

032-07-CA: 550 Church Street
Applicant: Kurt Nerlinger for National Signs
Received: 02/28/07 (+45 Days: 04/14/07)
Meeting: 03/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: New signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

This masonry commercial building was built in the latter half of the twentieth century.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change…will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…”

STAFF REPORT

A. This building sits on a 105x111 lot at the corner of Church and South Cedar Streets. It is currently in the process of being renovated into the Talecris Plasma Center.
B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile state that signs shall “not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building…shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property…shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs…should match the historic materials of the building…[and] shall use focused, low intensity illumination.”
C. The proposed sign package includes the following:
   1. Install two 25 SF aluminum panel wall signs with acrylic graphics mounted directly onto the panels that will have the Talecris Plasma Resources logo.
   2. There will be no additional lighting other than what is already on the building.
   3. The Board approved two 1 SF sticky vinyl door signs for this building on February 26 (case number: 024-07-CA).
   4. The total sign package, including the door signs, is approximately 52 SF.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The proposed signs fall within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines.

Staff recommends approving the application.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

033-07-CA: 451 Marine Street
Applicant: Lee Franks
Received: 03/12/07 (+45 Days: 04/26/07)
Meeting: 03/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a 3’ and 6’ privacy fence around the east and south sides of the property.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame residence with Classical detailing was built circa 1906.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change…will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…”

STAFF REPORT

A. This residence sits on a lot at the southeast corner of Marine and Elmira streets. The privacy fence has been partially completed.
B. The Design Review Guidelines say fences should "complement the building and not detract from it."
C. The proposed fence will be a 6’ dog-eared wood privacy fence that will run along the east boundary approximately 52’ from Elmira to the southeast corner of the property and 100’ from the southeast corner of the property toward Marine. It will then be shortened to 3’ for another 30’.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the fence will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The proposed fence falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines.

Staff recommends approving the application.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

034-07-CA: 211 North Jackson Street
Applicant: Charles Steeg
Received: 03/12/07 (+45 Days: 03/29/07)
Meeting: 02/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-B
Project: New construction.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is currently an empty lot that once held residential buildings.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change…will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…”

STAFF REPORT

A. This empty lot at the corner of State and North Jackson is approximately 79’ x 152’.
B. The Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction state “the goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history.”
C. The proposed plan includes the following:
   1. Construct a two-story single-family residence per the submitted plans on an empty lot that will resemble the 1856 Federal-style Butt-Frazier house on State Street.
      a. The house, which will face North Jackson Street, will have a 5’ setback from North Jackson and a 10’ setback from State.
      b. The house will rest on a 3’ continuous brick foundation with round vents and a course delineating the foundation from the building.
      c. The siding will be Carolina Brick – Olde Charles Towne on all sides; mortar will be white.
      d. The roof, which will be a side gable with parapets at either end, will have Slate Gray Timberline shingles.
      e. The windows will be 6/6 wood sashes with true divided lights, soldier courses, brick sills and operable wood shutters.
      f. There will be rectangular recesses along the north and south elevations mimicking windows in order to maintain the fenestration pattern of the residence.
      g. The east (front) elevation will have a wood entry door with four decorative panels, a rectangular transom and sidelights.
      h. The east and west elevations will have a series of paired wood French doors with six lights and a decorative panel; the doors on the first floor will have rectangular transoms.
      i. There will be a two-story front porch with a Dark Bronze metal standing seam roof, masonry steps, iron posts and decorative Lawler ironwork that will be placed in a similar manner to the ironwork on the LeVert House.
      j. There will be a two-story rear porch with 10’-0” x 10’-0” wood columns with capitals and wood rails per MHDC stock plans.
   2. Construct a two-story frame carriage house at the rear of the property.
      a. The carriage house will have smooth-faced Hardiplank siding.
      b. The windows will be 6/6 wood sashes with true divided lights, soldier courses, brick sills and operable wood shutters.
c. The east elevation will have a series of paired wood French doors with six lights and a decorative panel; the doors on the first floor will have rectangular transoms.

d. There will be a two-story porch with 10'-0” x 10'-0” wood columns with capitals and wood rails per MHDC stock plans.

e. There will be two garage doors on the north elevation with wood trim.

3. Remove trees on the property.

4. Create a new curb cut along State Street.

5. Construct a new 8'-0” stucco over CMU wall around the rear of the property per the submitted site plan.
   a. The wall will follow the property boundary along the north, south and west sides of the residence; it will be set back approximately 15'-0” from North Jackson Street.
   b. There is currently a historic (1836) masonry wall along the west boundary that the applicant is proposing to remove; MHDC has received a call opposing the removal of this wall.

6. Construct a new 3'-0” masonry wall with a 3'-0” iron fence on top along the front of the residence per the submitted site plan

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the new construction will not impair the historic integrity of the district.

The proposed construction follows the setback and orientation pattern of residences in the vicinity. Its massing and scale, including the raised foundation and simple L-shaped footprint, are proportional to buildings typical of the district. It has a front porch, an “important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture.” Ornamentation such as the window lintels, iron balconets and porch columns are similar to the nearby residences. As such, it “relates to the historic context” of the district.

Staff recommends approving the application. Staff, however, is concerned about the removal of the historic masonry wall along the west boundary and recommends that the applicant incorporate this wall into the new construction.

The applicant will need to contact Urban Forestry regarding the removal of the trees and Traffic Engineering and Right-of-Way regarding the curb cut on State Street.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF COMMENTS

035-07-CA: 63 South Hallett Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley/Scott Baria
Received: 03/12/07 (+45 Days: 04/26/07)
Meeting: 03/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, Robert Dumont, a consul to Belgium, built this frame residence with Victorian and Classical detailing circa 1900.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that "the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district..."

STAFF REPORT

A. This residence formerly had a garage, which was built in 1985. This structure was damaged in Hurricane Katrina and later demolished. The foundation slab remains.
B. The Design Review Guidelines state that accessory structures "shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction [and] should complement the design and scale of the main building."
C. The proposed plan is to construct a new frame garage on the property on the existing 26'-0" x 30'-0" slab per the submitted plans.
   1. The siding will have smooth-faced Hardiplank siding painted white.
   2. The front gable roof will have black 3-tab fiberglass/asphalt shingles.
   3. There will be two 9'-0" x 8'-0" automatic garage doors with applied trim on the west elevation.
   4. There will be a 3'-0" x 6'-8" metal door with embossed decorative panels on the south elevation.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the new garage will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district.

Staff recommends approving the application.
INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Renovate existing residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records and statements from neighbors, this one-story masonry Craftsman residence was built circa 1924 for a sea captain. This is reflected in some of the original design elements of the building, such as the lighthouses on the front stoop and the textured stucco walls. The lighthouses, which can be seen in old photographs, had been removed by the 1950s. This building is one of the very few residences in the Oakleigh district with a basement.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change…will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…”

STAFF REPORT

A. This residence is currently vacant and in fair condition.
B. The Design Review Guidelines call for new exterior materials, finishes and elements to reflect the age and style of the building.
C. The proposed improvements include the following:
   1. Repair/replace any rotten wood as necessary throughout the exterior with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
   2. Remove the existing burglar bars.
   4. Repaint exterior.
      a. Body – Benjamin Moore Georgian Brick (HC50)
      b. Base, windows, sills, eaves and water table – Benjamin Moore Dunmore Cream (HC29)
      c. Front steps and lights – Benjamin Moore Arcadia White (AC41)
   5. Restore front lights based on USA Archives photographs per submitted plans.
   6. Restore canopy based on USA Archives photographs and “ghosts” per submitted plans.
   7. Glass-in or screen rear porch to match current mullion arrangement.
   8. Reinstall concrete sidewalk.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information contained in the application, the proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district.

Staff recommends approving the application.
037-07-CA: 102 Levert Avenue
Applicant: Lewis P. Hassell, Jnr
Received: 03/12/07 (+45 Days: 04/26/07)
Meeting: 03/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolish non-historic greenhouse and shed. Install small parking area at rear of property. Install new privacy fence. Install new walkway.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story English Revival residence was built in 1928 with fieldstones purportedly salvaged from the county jail.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that "the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change…will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…"

STAFF REPORT

A. The outbuildings that are scheduled to be demolished are non-historic and in fair condition. There are currently plantings and a small rubble wall where the privacy fence is proposed.
B. The Design Review Guidelines say fences should "complement the building and not detract from it." Due to the non-historic and secondary nature of the outbuildings, the standard of review for demolition does not apply.
C. The proposed plan includes the following:
   1. Demolish the existing non-historic shed and greenhouse for a proposed in-ground swimming pool.
   2. Install a gravel- or paver-surfaced parking area and a concrete walk per the submitted site plan.
   3. Install a new stone walk in the front yard per the submitted site plan.
   4. Construct a new wood shadowbox privacy fence per the submitted site plan.
      a. The existing rubble wall will be replaced with the proposed fence and new hedges.
      b. The fence will be 7'-0” tall along the north and west sides with 8'-0” capped stone posts.
      c. The fence will be 7'-6” tall along the south side with 8’-0” capped stone posts.
      d. The fence will be 8’-0” tall along the east side with 8’-0” capped stone posts.

RECOMMENDATION

The structures proposed for demolition are non-historic and their removal will not significantly impact the property. The parking area will also not significantly impact the property, since it will be small, located at the rear of the property off a side alley and paved with alternate, more appropriate materials. The stone walk and in-ground pool (which is not a formal part of this application) are alterations to a non-historic and/or non-significant landscape, and therefore do not need to come before the Board. However, based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the 8’-0” privacy fence will impair the historic integrity of the building and the district and should be limited to 6’-0” per the Design Review Guidelines.

Staff recommends approving Items C1-3. Staff recommends amending Item C4 to read a 6'-0” fence with 6’-0” or 7’-0” capped stone posts.
**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

**STAFF COMMENTS**

**038-07-CA:** 103 Lanier Avenue  
**Applicant:** James and Elissa Watkins  
**Received:** 03/12/07 (+45 Days: 04/26/07)  
**Meeting:** 03/26/07

---

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Ashland Place  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Replace non-historic carport and slab with new two-story garage.

---

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story Tudor Revival residence was built in 1917. The garage apartment, which matches the main residence in style and materials, was also built in 1917. A carport was attached to the garage apartment at a later date.

---

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that "the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change…will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…"

---

**STAFF REPORT**

A. The carport section of the garage apartment that is scheduled to be demolished is non-historic and in fair condition.  
B. The Design Review Guidelines state that accessory structures "shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction [and] should complement the design and scale of the main building." Due to the non-historic and secondary nature of the carport, the standard of review for demolition does not apply.  
C. The proposed plan includes the following:
   1. Demolish the existing non-historic carport.  
   2. Enlarge the garage apartment with a new two-story addition per the submitted plans.  
      a. The addition will sit on a new 22'-4” x 22'-4” concrete slab.  
      b. All of the new materials, finishes and details will match the existing materials, finishes and details to include the stucco walls, half-timbering, exposed rafter tails, ridge cap and roofing, wood casement windows, belt course and garage doors.  
      c. There will be a small balcony on the south elevation with a 36” high wood railing; the railing design has not been specified.

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the new garage apartment addition will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district.

Staff recommends approving the application.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF COMMENTS

039-07-CA: 65 North Monterey Street
Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. E. Luckett Robinson
Received: 03/12/07 (+45 Days: 04/26/07)
Meeting: 03/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story frame residence with Classical detailing was built in 1910 for Lizzie R. Haas.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that "the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change…will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…"

STAFF REPORT

A. There is currently a non-historic rear deck and spiral staircase attached to the house. There is a non-historic outbuilding where the proposed carport is planned.

B. The Design Review Guidelines call for new exterior materials, finishes and elements to reflect the age and style of the building. The Guidelines also state that accessory structures “shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction [and] should complement the design and scale of the main building.”

C. The proposed plan includes the following:
   1. Replace the existing non-historic outbuilding with a new carport that matches the materials, finishes and details of the main residence.
   2. Enlarge the main residence with a new two-story addition per the submitted plans.
      a. The addition will sit on brick piers with wood lattice to match existing.
      b. All new materials, finishes and details will match existing materials, finishes and details to include wood lap siding, exposed rafter tails, shingle roofing and 1/1 wood sash windows.
      c. Some windows will be small wood casements.
      d. There will be a wood door with one light and a transom at the south elevation and two French doors with one light each at the west (rear) elevation; they will have wood hoods.
      e. There will be a small stoop at the south elevation and a deck at the west (rear) elevation with railing to match existing.
   3. Replace the existing wood privacy fence and gate along the east (front) elevation with a 6’ iron fence with concrete posts per the submitted plans.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district.

Staff recommends approving the application.
040-07-CA: 125-127 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Tilmon Brown/Hancock Bank
Received: 03/12/07 (+45 Days: 04/26/07)
Meeting: 03/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install an ATM.

BUILDING HISTORY

This complex consists of two commercial structures. The first is a two-story Art Deco building with construction dates of 1924 and 1930. Milton Scoble Builders built it for the Van Antwerp family to house McCrory’s 5 and 10. It also housed a number of other commercial ventures, including Campbell’s Pharmacy. The second is the three-story Beaux Arts-style Fitzgerald building built in 1907. While the upper stories of these buildings retain much of their historic detailing, the first floors have been altered significantly multiple times throughout the years.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change…will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…"

STAFF REPORT

A. This building is currently being renovated into condominium units with a bank on the first floor. This is being done with the aid of historical tax credits. As mentioned above, the first floor storefronts of these buildings had been altered significantly during previous and current updates. Little or no photographic evidence exists that shows the original look of the storefronts.
B. The Design Review Guidelines do not specifically call out ATM machines; however, they do state that “original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
C. The proposed plan is to install a standard ATM per the submitted photograph within the window openings on the second bay of the first floor of the St. Emanuel Street elevation; the ATM will have the bank logo on it, which will be approximately 8 SF. A 24 SF sign package was approved on 03-12-07 (case number 027-07-CA).

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information contained in the application, staff feels that the ATM will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district.

Since the first floor storefronts have been altered significantly during previous and current updates, staff feels that installing an ATM within one of the window openings (while maintaining the transom) does not impair any historical integrity. Due to the lack of photographic evidence for the old McCrory’s/Campbell’s Pharmacy section of the complex (where the ATM will be located), the current configuration of windows is conjecture based on traditional storefronts.

Staff recommends approving the application.

The building is being rehabilitated with tax credits administered through the National Park Service. The applicant and/or building owner will need to verify that the ATM’s placement falls under the rules of the National Park Service.
INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

This circa 1925 one-story brick Bungalow was originally a private residence. In the 1990s, it was converted into the office of Dr. Carl Booth; it later became the office of Sears & Algood, Attorneys. A new law firm is currently moving into the building.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change…will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…”

STAFF REPORT

A. This building had a post sign that was recently removed.
B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile state that signs shall “not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building…shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property…shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs…should match the historic materials of the building…[and] shall use focused, low intensity illumination.”
C. The plan proposes to install a 32 SF (18 SF per side) monument sign in the front yard per the submitted sketch.
   1. The sign will rest on a yellow brick foundation to match the building.
   2. It will be all wood.
   3. It will have a small 4/12-pitch gable top with shingles and flashing.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the signs will not negatively affect the historic integrity of the building or the district. The size and materials of the proposed monument sign fall within the standards of the Sign Design Guidelines. Also, the total signage for the property does not exceed the 64 SF maximum.

Staff recommends approving the application.