AGENDA
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
November 24, 2003 – 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
   4. Approval of Agenda

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund/Douglas Kearley, Architect
   Property Address: 355 Charles Street
   Date of Approval: October 30, 2003
   Work Approved: Reroof structure with GAF Timberline Gray dimensional shingles. Repair rotten wood as necessary. Replace rotten wood with new wood matching existing in profile and dimension as necessary. Prime and paint.
   Remove existing exterior cast iron plumbing pipes.

2. Applicant's Name: Jim & Julie Dransfield
   Property Address: 54 North Monterey Street
   Date of Approval: October 30, 2003
   Work Approved: Repaint residence in the following colors:
   Body: Sherwin Williams Rookwood Brown
   Trim: Off white
   Shutters: black

3. Applicant's Name: Skip Shirah
   Property Address: 908 Augusta Street
   Date of Approval: October 30, 2003
   Work Approved: Repair to rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in profile and dimension.
   Paint the house in the following colors:
   Body - Roycroft Pewter, SW2828
   Trim - White
   Accent Color - Roycroft Mist Gray SW2844
   Foundation, steps, shutters- Black

4. Applicant's Name: Do Right Construction
   Property Address: 1326 Old Shell Road
   Date of Approval: October 30, 2003
   Work Approved: Reroof garage with 5 v-crimp galvalume
   Repair/replace rotten wood with materials matching existing in profile and dimension.
   Repaint to match existing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant's Name</th>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Date of Approval</th>
<th>Work Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Mobile Symphony/Mobile Opera</td>
<td>257 Dauphin Street</td>
<td>October 31, 2003</td>
<td>Install ticket drawer and speaker in glass as per submitted plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Barbara Giddens</td>
<td>200 South Dearborn Street</td>
<td>October 31, 2003</td>
<td>Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint house to match existing color scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tom Karwinski</td>
<td>17 S. Lafayette Street</td>
<td>November 3, 2003</td>
<td>Paint exterior in the following color scheme that approximates the existing colors: Benjamin Moore Yellow Rose #353; trim-white; lattice/foundation-dark green.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lucy Hartley / Kenneth Willard</td>
<td>307 Rapier Avenue</td>
<td>November 6, 2003</td>
<td>Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint to match existing color scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Coulson Roofing</td>
<td>220 S. Dearborn St.</td>
<td>November 6, 2003</td>
<td>Repair portion of damaged roof to match existing in color, profile and dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Chris Conlon/Guidos in Oakleigh</td>
<td>351 George Street</td>
<td>November 6, 2003</td>
<td>Relocate existing 6’ wood privacy fence to rear of property. Install 3’ wood picket fence with gate at location of existing wood privacy fence, facing George Street. Install 3’ wide poured walkway from existing deck to existing dumpster enclosure. Pour 6x10 slab for walk-in cooler. Place walk-in cooler on slab. Place 2’ of framed wood lattice on east-facing privacy fence to disguise the cooler.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Matt McDonald/Mack Lewis Contractor, Inc.</td>
<td>1260 Selma Street</td>
<td>November 6, 2003</td>
<td>Construct 8’ x 8’ storage building per drawings supplied by MHDC. Building to have gable roof, lap siding and match the details of the main house. It will be painted to match the color scheme of the main house. Building to be constructed on slab 8ft. from side and rear property lines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Applicant's Name: Paul H. Christopher  
   Property Address: 451 Dauphin Street  
   Date of Approval: November 7, 2003  
   Work Approved: Repair existing building canopy to include: remove and replace existing wood fascia, decking, framing etc. to match existing; replace framing as required to level existing canopy framing; remove existing light fixtures; repair/replace deteriorated wood framing and decking; repair/replace existing roofing as required; repair/replace turnbuckles as required. Drawings on file in MHDC office.

14. Applicant's Name: Mr. and Mrs. Nicholas Holmes, Jr.  
   Property Address: 22 S. Lafayette Street  
   Date of Approval: November 10, 2003  
   Work Approved: Repair/replace rotten wood as needed with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile; paint exterior in existing color scheme: white with white trim and dark green shutters.

15. Applicant's Name: Gallery of Beauregard/ Gary Lambert, owner  
   Property Address: 453 Dauphin Street  
   Date of Approval: November 10, 2003  
   Work Approved: Install double sided wood sign, measuring approximately 3’ long by 2.5’ high, as per submitted plan.

16. Applicant's Name: Emanuel Gazzier  
   Property Address: 153 South Monterey Street  
   Date of Approval: November 12, 2003  
   Work Approved: Repair to roof shingles and flashing as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension.

17. Applicant's Name: Joe Eiland/ Stauter Construction  
   Property Address: 352 West Street  
   Date of Approval: November 10, 2003  
   Work Approved: Repair to rotten wood with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile; paint new materials in existing color scheme. Demolish 8 x 8 shed at rear and install AC unit on concrete pad.

18. Applicant's Name: USA Foundation/ MDS Construction  
   Property Address: 211 N. Conception Street  
   Date of Approval: November 12, 2003  
   Work Approved: Paint exterior in existing color scheme.

19. Applicant's Name: John Gengo  
   Property Address: 109 South Monterey Street  
   Date of Approval: November 13, 2003  
   Work Approved: Construct carport at rear of property as per submitted application. Carport to measure 24’x 30’, design based on MHDC stock design. All
details – siding, cornice, soffit, eaves, to match that of the main house in profile, material and dimension. Paint to match main residence.

20. Applicant's Name: Wanda Cochran/Thomas Roofing  
    Property Address: 255 N. Conception Street  
    Date of Approval: November 13, 2003  
    Work Approved: Remove old flashing material from parapet walls, install new EPDM membrane and re-flash with copper; install new copper coping over top of parapet walls.

C. New Business

1. 016-03/04 – CA 200 Marine Street  
   Applicant: Clifton Sons  
   Nature of Project: Remove existing asbestos shingles and replace with cement fiber board siding (hardiplank) as per submitted application.

2. 017-03/04 – CA 114 North Lafayette Street  
   Applicant: J. M. Clark  
   Nature of Project: Install fencing in four phases, as per submitted information

D. Other Business and Announcements

1. Appointment of a Design Review Committee for the proposed project at the northeast corner of Government and Ann Streets

2. Notice of meeting of the Design Review Committee at 4:00 following the regularly-scheduled ARB meeting.

E. Adjournment
INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District  
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building  
Nature of Project: Remove existing asbestos shingles and replace with cement fiber board siding (hardiplank) as per submitted application.  
Current Condition: The existing residence is located on the southwest corner of Marine and Palmetto Streets. The Board approved the applicant’s request to enclose a rear porch at the August 11, 2003 meeting. The one story frame structure is covered with asbestos shingles, installed over portions of the original wood lap siding. The MHDC file dates the construction of this residence between 1915 and 1925. The non-contributing status is due to the fact that the house was not architecturally significant in the 1982 architectural survey.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exterior Materials and Finishes</td>
<td>Remove asbestos siding and install hardiplank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF COMMENTS

Exterior Materials and Finishes

A. The Guidelines state that “The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period…”
   1. The subject residence is a non-contributing structure within the district.
   2. The applicant has stated that the wood lap siding underneath the asbestos siding is in a deteriorated state, and unable to be salvaged.
   3. Upon investigation at a recent site visit, staff noted that the applicant’s statements about the condition of the wood lap siding were accurate.

B. The Guidelines state that “Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
   1. The façade of the subject residence is flat asbestos shingles.
   2. The replacement material will replicate the wood lap siding original to the structure.
3. Typically, the Board only allows the use of hardiplank for new construction. However, hardiplank is an evolution from masonite siding, which was a evolution from asbestos siding.

Staff suggests that the Review Board approve the application as submitted.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – STAFF COMMENTS

017-03/04 – CA 114 North Lafayette Street
Applicant: J. M. Clark
Received: 11/05/03
Submission Date + 45 Days: 12/20/03
Meeting Date(s): 1) 11/24/03 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Classification: Non-Contributing
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Nature of Project: Install fencing in four phases, as per submitted information.

Phase IV – construction of a 6’ high solid wood privacy fence resting on a 2’ high concrete foundation; concrete foundation to be pierced with drainage holes as denoted on fence elevation; fence to be located between existing frame shed and north property line. Previously-approved 8’ high wood fence runs along north property line. Proposed fence to run an approximate distance of 26 feet. Fence design based on a similar fence approved by the ARB where the main streets of the Ashland Place Historic District intersect Old Shell Road.

Phase V - construction of a 4’ high wood picket fence resting on a 2’ high concrete foundation; concrete foundation to be pierced with drainage holes as denoted on fence elevation; fence to be located in the middle of the property, running from an existing frame shed and running south to Campbell Street.

Phase VI - construction of a 3’ high solid wood fence on a 1’ high concrete foundation; concrete foundation to be pierced with drainage holes as denoted on fence elevation; fence to be 3’ wood square pickets, matching the fence shown in sample photograph.

Phase VII – construction of a 3’ high wood fence around perimeter of front yard; fence to be wood picket with Gothic pickets as shown in sample photograph.

Current Condition: The existing residence is located on the northeast corner of North Lafayette and Campbell Streets. The Board approved the applicant’s request for fencing phases 1-3 at the August 11, 2003 meeting. The Board denied the use of vinyl fencing in phases 4-6. The amended application proposes alternative fencing materials in the same locations.

Additional Information: A copy of the Certified Record from the previous application is attached.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fences, Walls and Gates</td>
<td>Install fencing as per submitted plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

**STAFF REPORT**

A. The Guidelines state that fences “…should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.

1. The residence is a non-contributing, one story brick veneer ranch-style house.

2. The proposed fencing types are:
   a. 6’ high cedar solid privacy fence constructed on 2’ concrete base
   b. 4’ high cedar solid privacy fence constructed on 2’ concrete base
   c. 3’ high wood square picket fence constructed on 1’ concrete base
   d. 3’ high straight top wood Gothic-top picket fence.

B. The Guidelines state that “The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to 6’. However, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an 8’ high fence may be considered.”

1. The subject property is adjoined by properties with commercial uses/zoning on the north and northwest property lines, where 8’ high fencing is requested.

2. 3’ high picket fencing is allowed by zoning code for placement along the sidewalk.

C. The Guidelines provide a list of appropriate and inappropriate materials for fencing.

1. Wood is an appropriate material for fencing in historic districts

Staff recommends approval of the application with the following conditions:

Fencing around the property should be consistent. 3’ high picket fences are most appropriate in terms of height and scale for sidewalk/perimeter fencing.