AGENDA
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
January 9, 2006 – 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: New Beginning Construction
   Property Address: 358 Dauphin Street
   Date of Approval: 12/5/05
   Work Approved: Repair windows to match existing in materials, profile and dimension. Where windows cannot be repaired, replace with new wood windows to match existing in materials, profile and dimension. Re-deck existing balconies. Re-roof with 26 gauge standing seam metal roof, silver in color.

2. Applicant’s Name: K.V. Fordham
   Property Address: 1611 Government Street
   Date of Approval: 12/5/05
   Work Approved: Repair columns, capitals and fascia on front porch. Capitals to be repaired using existing pieces of capitals and by inserting hand cast plaster where necessary. Porch to be supported by a temporary transverse beam while fascia repairs are being done.

3. Applicant’s Name: Harris Oswalt
   Property Address: 301 West Street
   Date of Approval: 12/5/05
   Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Repaint to match existing color scheme.

4. Applicant’s Name: Heather Guidry
   Property Address: 1504 Church Street
   Date of Approval: 12/5/05
   Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, charcoal in color.

5. Applicant’s Name: Fred South
   Property Address: 1112 Dauphin Street
   Date of Approval: 12/6/05
   Work Approved: Remove secondary front door and infill with siding to match existing in material, profile and dimension, restoring the front façade to its original appearance.
Remove cedar shake infill in attic dormer to reveal keyhole window. Reglaze keyhole window.

6. Applicant’s Name: A-1 Services
   Property Address: 31 South Lafayette Street
   Date of Approval: 12/6/05 weh
   Work Approved: Re-roof building with architectural shingles, sablewood elk in color.

7. Applicant’s Name: Caldwell and Osborne
   Property Address: 951 Selma Street
   Date of Approval: 12/6/05 jdb
   Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, black in color.

8. Applicant’s Name: Charles Bowen
   Property Address: 1414 Brown Street
   Date of Approval: 12/7/05 asc
   Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials matching existing in profile, dimension and material. Repaint building in existing color scheme.

9. Applicant’s Name: Jose Attar
   Property Address: 1200 Government Street
   Date of Approval: 12/8/05 weh
   Work Approved: Repair or replace damaged wood siding with materials matching existing in materials, profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing.

10. Applicant’s Name: George Borne
    Property Address: 306 George Street
    Date of Approval: 12/8/05 weh
    Work Approved: Construct carport using MHDC stock plan. Materials to be hardiplank siding (house has aluminum); roof pitch, cornice, soffit and fascia to match that of the main house.

11. Applicant’s Name: Theresa Powe
    Property Address: 1009 New St. Francis Street
    Date of Approval: 12/9/05 weh
    Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, charcoal in color.

12. Applicant’s Name: Custom Remodeling
    Property Address: 109 South Monterey Street
    Date of Approval: 12/12/05 weh
    Work Approved: Re-roof with 3 tab shingles, onyx black in color.
13. Applicant’s Name: First Church of Christ, Scientist  
Property Address: 1151 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 12/12/05  
Work Approved: Re-roof with architectural grade shingles, either black or gray in color. Turn sign to be perpendicular with the street.

14. Applicant’s Name: TCM Remodelers  
Property Address: 251 St. Anthony Street  
Date of Approval: 12/13/05  
Work Approved: Repair storm damaged brick wall by reinstalling fallen old brick and with old brick to match existing in profile, dimension and color. Repair or replace wooden fascia, sills and gutters to match existing in profile, dimension and color. Re-attach shutters. Re-roof storm-damaged roof portion with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and color. Repaint wooden materials to match existing color scheme.

15. Applicant’s Name: Teri Williams  
Property Address: 253 St. Anthony Street  
Date of Approval: 12/13/05  
Work Approved: Re-roof with charcoal gray shingles.

16. Applicant’s Name: Larry M. Crawley  
Property Address: 303 South Ann Street  
Date of Approval: 12/14/05  
Work Approved: Re-roof with timberline, black architectural shingles.

17. Applicant’s Name: Jeff Medlin  
Property Address: 1258 Texas Street  
Date of Approval: 12/15/05  
Work Approved: Re-roof building with Timberline shingles, slate gray in color.

18. Applicant’s Name: Sims Family Properties/ Town Court Apartments  
Property Address: 1111 Church Street  
Date of Approval: 12/15/05  
Work Approved: Install 6’ high wood fence around dumpster.

19. Applicant’s Name: Yolanda Garcia  
Property Address: 224 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 12/15/05  
Work Approved: Re-paint current signs for new business as per the submitted plans.

20. Applicant’s Name: Keith Lott  
Property Address: 1104 New St. Francis Street  
Date of Approval: 12/16/05  
Work Approved: Re-roof building with architectural shingles, brown in color.
21. Applicant’s Name: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund  
   Property Address: 256 Marine Street  
   Date of Approval: 12/20/05  
   Work Approved: Rehabilitate historic structure as per submitted plans. Remove rear wing and repair areas where wing is removed. Repair or replace all rotten siding with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repair or replace windows and doors with materials matching existing in profile, materials and dimension. Re-roof with architectural grade shingles. Repair or replace porch elements with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Paint in historic color scheme – to be submitted at a later date.

22. Applicant’s Name: Decora Smith  
   Property Address: 302 Congress Street  
   Date of Approval: 12/20/05  
   Work Approved: Repaint building in existing color scheme.

23. Applicant’s Name: Fred South Construction  
   Property Address: 1054 Old Shell Road  
   Date of Approval: 12/21/05  
   Work Approved: Re-roof with architectural grade shingles, gray in color.

24. Applicant’s Name: Steve Weiss  
   Property Address: 1135 Montauk Street  
   Date of Approval: 12/21/05  
   Work Approved: Stabilize foundation.

25. Applicant’s Name: Parker & Poynter/ Sign Pro  
   Property Address: 305 North Joachim Street  
   Date of Approval: 12/21/05  
   Work Approved: Install wood sign with painted graphics, measuring 2’ x 3’, double sided, or 12 sf, on 50” 4x4 post as per illustration provided.

C. NEW BUSINESS:

1. 022-05/06-CA  
   Applicant: L. Lawrence Carroll  
   Nature of Request: Erect 6’ wood privacy fence along west property line as per submitted site plan.

2. 023-05/06-CA  
   Applicant: James LaGrave  
   Nature of Request: Install metal roof as per submitted information.
3. **024-05/06-CA**  
   Applicant: City Government LLC  
   Nature of Request: Install iron galleries at Government and Conception Street facades. Install roll-up doors at each side. Add additional wood windows at north side. Stucco Conception Street façade to match Government Street façade, all as per submitted plans.

4. **025-05/06-CA**  
   Applicant: Richard Tapscott  
   Nature of Request: Install 8’ and 6’ wood privacy fence in rear yard as per submitted site plan. Install 4’ metal fence around front yard as per submitted site plan.

5. **026-05/06-CA**  
   Applicant: David Ayers  
   Nature of Request: Construct rear addition on existing rear deck; roof over existing deck, all as per submitted plans.

D. **OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. Election of Board Chair and Vice Chair

E. **ADJOURNMENT**
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF COMMENTS

022-05/06-CA   1066 Church Street
Applicant: L. Lawrence Carroll
Received: 12/09/05   Meeting Date(s):
Submission Date + 45 Days: 1/23/06   1) 1/9/06   2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Install 6’ high wood privacy fence as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

Sections   Topic             Description of Work
3   Fences, Walls & Gates   Install 6’ privacy fence

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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

A. The Guidelines state that “These 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 subject structure is a 1 one and one-half story Victorian cottage.
   2. The subject structure was moved from Springhill Avenue and restored by the Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund.
   3. The subject structure is located on the northeast corner of Church and George Streets.
   4. The applicants have received a variance from the Board of Adjustment to construct the 6’ fence where proposed at the sidewalk.
   5. Currently there is a 4’ high wood picket fence around the front and side of the property.
   6. The proposed fence would begin at the north property line and run a distance of 25’, then turn west and run a distance of 20’ to the sidewalk then turn south and run to within 36’ of the sidewalk at Church Street, then turn east and die into the house.
   7. The existing 4’ fence is proposed to be reused on the east of the property to close off the rear yard from the front yard, as shown on the site plan.

Staff recommends approval of the request as submitted.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF COMMENTS

023-05/06-CA 1456 Church Street
Applicant: Jim LaGrave
Received: 12/09/05
Submission Date + 45 Days: 1/23/05
Meeting Date(s): 1) 1/9/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Install metal roof on residence as per submitted sample.

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>Roofs</td>
<td>Re-roof with metal roofing</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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work does not comply with the Design Review Guidelines and will impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

A. The Guidelines state that “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch, should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
   1. The subject structure is a ca. 1927 Bungalow with an end gable roof.
   2. The existing roof is an asbestos shingle.
   3. The proposed roof is a steel panel emulating five v-crimp tin, gray in color.
   4. Historically, Bungalows in Mobile were constructed with either wood shakes or asbestos tile roofs.
   5. Historically, Bungalows in Mobile were not constructed with metal roofs.
   6. Metal roofs are examined on a case-by-case basis and allowed where appropriate.
   7. Due to the configuration of the roof, the roofing material will be highly visible from public view.
   8. In this case, the metal roof does impair the integrity of the historic residence.

Staff recommends denial of the application as submitted.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF COMMENTS

024-05/06-CA 202 Government Street

Applicant: City Management LLC

Received: 12/27/05

Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/10/05

Meeting Date (s):
   1) 1/9/06  2)  3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District

Classification: Non-Contributing

Zoning: B-4, General Business

Nature of Project: Install iron galleries at Government and Conception Street facades. Install roll-up doors at each side. Add additional wood windows at north side. Stucco Conception Street facade to match Government Street facade, all as per submitted plans.

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>Porches and Canopies</td>
<td>Install iron galleries</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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work does not comply with the Design Review Guidelines and will impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

A. GALLERIES - The Guidelines state that “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture…Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”

1. The subject structure, the former Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Building, was constructed after 1904 and has facades on both Government Street and South Conception Street.
2. The subject structure is listed as Non-Contributing in the National Register Nomination.
3. The proposed balconies are 8’ deep on Government Street and 6’ deep on Conception Street.
4. The components of the balcony have yet to be determined by the architect.
5. The City of Mobile’s Right-of-Way Department will need to approve the pole placement on the sidewalk.
6. Historically a number of buildings in the immediate area had some type of porch or balcony.
7. The LaClede Hotel in the block to the east has a set of double balconies.
8. Balconies would not impair the historic integrity of the district.
B. ROLL-UP DOORS – The Guidelines state that “Replacement (doors) should respect the age and style of the building.”
1. The subject structure is detailed in the Federal style as noted in the National Register nomination.
2. The proposed doors are 10’ high by 12’ wide plain metal garage doors.
3. There is no precedent for garage doors opening onto Government Street.
4. Similar situations in New Orleans and other cities utilize decorative gates instead of metal garage doors.
5. The installation of garage doors on Government and Conception Streets would impair the historic integrity of the neighborhood.

C. ADDITIONAL WINDOWS – The Guidelines state that “The size and placement of new windows for additions should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
1. Currently the Government Street façade of the building has three door-length windows.
2. The proposed elevation will add 3 more door/windows to allow access onto the new balcony.
3. Currently the Conception Street façade of the building has a row of ribbon windows at the second floor level.
4. The proposed elevation will remove these windows and install 4 door/windows to allow access onto the new balcony.
5. Additional wood windows are proposed for the north elevation.
6. There is a common alley between the subject property and the property directly to the north.
7. Neither façade is considered contributing.
8. Alteration of the facades will blend with the nearby historic buildings and not impair the historic integrity of the neighborhood.

D. STUCCO CONCEPTION STREET ELEVATION – The Guidelines state that “The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. The finish and scoring of new stucco should match the original.”
1. Currently the Conception Street façade is faced in brick.
2. The proposed change is to stucco the façade to match that of the Government Street façade.
3. The current brick is not typical of the historic buildings nearby.
4. Stuccoing the Conception Street façade will make the building blend with those of the neighborhood.

Staff recommends the approval of work items A, C and D. Staff recommends that the Board consider approving work item B with decorative gates instead of metal roll-up doors.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF COMMENTS

025-05/06-CA 1310 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Richard W. Tapscott
Received: 12/27/05 Meeting Date (s): 1) 1/9/06 2) 3)
Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/10/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Install 8’ high wood privacy fence along property line joining commercially zoned property; construct 6’ wood privacy fence along 2 other rear property lines; construct 4’ metal fence in front yard all as per submitted plans. Install 5 v-crimp 26 gauge metal roof on residence.

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 &amp; Gates</td>
<td>Install 8’ &amp; 6’ privacy fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Roofs</td>
<td>Install 4’ metal fence in front yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Install new metal roof.</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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

A. FENCING - The Guidelines state that “These 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 subject structure is a ca. 1886 two story Victorian with a monolithic end gable roof.
   2. Currently there is a 6’ high chain link fence around the rear of the property.
   3. The applicant is requesting to construct an 8’ high fence section on the property line adjoining a building currently used as a doctors office.
   4. The applicant has stated that the extra height is requested to protect against loitering.
   5. The Design Review Guidelines do allow for the construction of 8’ fences when they adjoin commercial property.
   6. The applicant is also requesting to install a 4’ metal fence, black in color, around the front of the property.
   7. Open metal fences are allowed in the front of houses where the design is appropriate.
8. Six foot wooden fences are generally allowed in rear yards.

B. ROOFING – The Guidelines state that “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch, should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
   1. The subject structure is a ca. 1886 two story Victorian with a monolithic end gable roof.
   2. Currently the roof is sheathed in fiberglass shingles.
   3. The applicants are proposing a 26 gauge 5 v-crimp metal roof, silver in color.
   4. Metal roofs are examined on a case-by-case basis.
   5. Metal roofs were often used as early replacement roofs on Victorian houses.
   6. In this case, the metal roof does not impair the historic integrity of the historic residence.

Staff recommends approval of the request as submitted.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF COMMENTS

026-05/06-CA 205 George Street

Applicant: David Ayers

Received: 12/27/05

Meeting Date (s): 1) 1/9/06 2) 3)

Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/10/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential

Nature of Project: Construct rear addition on existing rear deck; roof over existing deck, all as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

1. The subject structure is a ca. 1887 one story Classical Revival residence with a monolithic side gable roof and an end gabled front portico.
2. Currently there is a rear addition and L-shaped deck at the rear of the property.
3. The applicant is requesting to construct an addition over the long side of the existing deck, and roof over the short side of the existing deck to create more living space and a covered deck.
4. Foundation, walls and roofing will match that of the existing addition.
5. Windows and doors will be wood to match the existing.
6. Deck railing will match existing, which is MHDC Stock Design number 1.
7. Column details will match that on the front porch.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.