CALL TO ORDER
Chair Cindy Klotz called the Architectural Review Board Meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Ed Hooker, Architectural Engineer, called the roll as follows:
Present: Robert Brown, Bunky Ralph, Dan McCleave, Cindy Klotz, Dennis Carlisle, Karen Carr, Buffy Donlon, Nick Holmes, III
Absent: Douglas Kearley, Jackie McCracken, Bill Christian
A quorum was declared after the roll was called.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Attendance</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steven Arroyo, Williams &amp; Associates</td>
<td>300 North Joachim</td>
<td>053-02/03-CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Williams, Williams &amp; Associates</td>
<td>300 North Joachim</td>
<td>053-02/03-CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:  May 27, 2003 Meeting
Bunky Ralph moved to approve the minutes as mailed. Nick Holmes, III seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

APPROVAL OF THE MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:
Dennis Carlisle moved to approve the mid-month certificates as mailed. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

MID MONTH APPROVALS

1.  1766 Dauphin Street: Michael Peavy
   Replace rotten wood with new matching existing in profile and dimension. Paint house white with white trim; stairs, porch deck and previously-painted brick - Bellingrath Green; porch ceiling - Robin’s Egg Blue.
   APPROVED 5/16/03 asc

2.  1005 Dauphin Street: Blackard’s Roofing Company
   Reroof to match existing roof, 3 tab charcoal shingles.
   APPROVED 5/16/03 asc

3.  305 George Street: Anne Moore Patton.
   Construct 4’ high picket fence left natural along south property line and portion of north property line as per site plan on file in MHDC office. Construct gate to match across driveway. (This CoA replaces CoA dated 10/19/1999)
   APPROVED 5/19/03 weh
4. 320 Dauphin Street: City of Mobile
   Install new hot tar flat roof to match existing.
   **APPROVED 5/19/03 asc**

5. 1154 Dauphin Street: Joseph Law
   General wood repair with new wood to match existing in profile and dimension.
   Repaint in the following color scheme:
   - Body – Medium Gray
   - Trim – White
   - Porch Deck – Black
   **APPROVED 5/19/03 asc**

6. 103 Dauphin Street: Van Antwerp Condominiums, LLC
   Repair roof with asphalt roofing felt, plywood and torch-down membrane roof with welded seams.
   **APPROVED 5/20/03 weh**

7. 550 Government Street: Williams & Associates, LLC
   Change two glazed window openings to emergency exit doors, one on the east elevation and one on the west elevation, as per submitted plans and approval by the ARB.
   **APPROVED 5/20/03 weh**

8. 918 Conti Street: Timothy Carmady
   Repaint house in the existing color scheme:
   - Body – Moon Rock, 2C13-4
   - Trim, door and accent – Midnight Sky, 2U37B
   - Window and fascia – Antiquated White, 1C22-1
   **APPROVED 5/21/03 jss**

9. 1552 Monterey Place: Wendy and Bill James/Ray Williams
   Replace rotten wood with new to match existing in profile and dimension.
   Repaint house in existing color scheme.
   **APPROVED 5/21/03 asc**

10. 909 Church Street: Jim Duncan
    Repair rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile. Paint in the following colors:
    - Body – Windham Cream HC-6
    - Trim – white
    - Porch deck and shutters – Essex Green
    **APPROVED 5/21/03 asc**
11.  1165 New St. Francis Street: Joann Yarborough
Repaint house to match existing:
   Body – Charles Street Brick
   Trim – DeTonti Square Off White
   Shutters and Porch – Bellingrath Green

   **APPROVED** 5/23/03 weh

12.  11 Semmes Avenue: Chris Huff
Reprint or replace rotted columns with new materials matching existing in profile and dimension.
Repaint house in the following colors:
   Body – Classical Yellow, SW2865
   Trim – Classical White, SW2829
   Window sash – Colonial Revival Stone Green

13.  1212 Government Street: Darrell Anthony/Clay Lewis Contractor
Re-roof building with new shingle roof, russet in color, to match existing in profile and dimension.

   **APPROVED** 5/28/03 asc

NEW BUSINESS

1.  **053-02/03 – CA**  256-258 North Claiborne Street
   **Applicant:** Theodore Pitsios Owner, Williams and Associates, Architects
   **Nature of Project:** Construction of a 2 ½ story, 8-unit apartment building as per submitted plans.

   **APPROVED** as submitted. Copy of Certified Record Attached.

2.  **057–02/03 –CA**  1002 Dauphin Street
   **Applicant:** Karen Carr
   **Nature of Project:** Install picket fence at rear of yard as per submitted site plan.

   **APPROVED** as submitted. Copy of Certified Record Attached.

OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

1.  *Mothballing Historic Buildings* – The final draft of the Mothballing Plan was adopted by the Board by unanimous consent. Bunky Ralph moved to adopt the final draft. Robert Brown seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

There being no other business before the Review Board, Buffy Donlon moved to adjourn the meeting. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote. The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

Applicant: Karen Carr
Received: 5/27/03
Submission Date + 45 Days: 5/29/03
Meeting Date(s): 1) 6/9/03 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence
Conflicts of Interest: Karen Carr recused herself from reviewing this application.
Nature of Project: Construct a wood picket fence at rear of yard as per submitted site plans. Fence to be unpainted, 4’ high, with 3 ½” wide picket boards spaced 2” apart. One 8’ gate to match fence. Fence to begin at northeast corner of house, and run east to property line, then turn north and run approximately 40’ to rear property line; then run west approximately 30’; then turn south and return at house. Enclosed area to measure 30’ x 40’.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines

Sections | Topic | Description of Work
--- | --- | ---
3 | Fences, Walls and Gates | Install picket 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

1. 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.
   a. the residence is a two story wood frame structure with 3-sided porch and hipped roof
   b. the proposed fence is wood picket, with a profile illustrated in the Design Review Guidelines
   c. the proposed fence is at the rear of the property and will be obscured from public view by existing vegetation.
Staff recommends approval as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Buffy Donlon moved that based on the facts presented in the application and at the public hearing, the Board finds the Staff Report, 1, a-c, to be acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph, and passed by unanimous vote.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Buffy Donlon moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/9/04
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

053-02/03 – CA 256-258 North Claiborne Street
Applicant: Theodore Pitsios Owner, Williams and Associates, Architects
Received: 5/28/03
Substitution Date + 45 Days: 7/12/03
Meeting Date(s): 1) 6/9/03 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (vacant lot/new construction)
Zoning: R-B, Residential Business

A request to re-subdivide the two lots purchased from the city and the lot on the southeast corner of Congress and Conception is to be reviewed by the Planning Commission June 6, 2003.

Additional Permits Required: (4) Building, Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing

Nature of Project: Construction of a 2 ½ story, 8-unit apartment building as per submitted plans.

The building measures approximately 74’-8” x 58’ – 8”.

The building is sited on the center of two lots of record, with the main façade of the building located at a distance of 5’-10” from the sidewalk. The proposed building is a 2 ½ story stucco-covered masonry structure. The ground plan is u-shaped in design, with an enclosed gated courtyard facing Claiborne Street. The proposed building has a 3’ finished floor above grade. The first floor has a 12’ ceiling height, the second an 11’ ceiling height, with an overall ground-to ridge height of 40’. The proposed roof is an end gable concealed behind stucco-covered masonry parapet walls. Proposed roofing materials is an architectural grade shingle with an ornamental ridge tile. The following are proposed building materials:

a. foundation – solid, stucco-covered masonry
b. façade – stucco covered masonry
c. doors – wood French doors, fixed and operable
d. windows – wood casement and fixed divided light
e. shutters – fixed wood louvered blinds on rear elevation
f. fences, walls and gates – painted metal gates at entries; capped stucco wall at front elevation

Proposed window hoods at first and second floor on front façade are constructed of stucco with synthetic slate shed caps, which extend past the face of the building approximately 8”

Second floor wood French doors have individual metal balconies which extend 2’-2” past the face of the building.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Guidelines for New Commercial and Residential Construction in 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>Design Standards for New Construction</td>
<td>Construct new apartment building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,I</td>
<td>Placement and Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,II</td>
<td>Massing and Scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “In the case of a proposed new building, that such building will not, in itself, or by reason of its location on the site, materially impair the architectural or historical value of the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity and that such building will not be injurious to the general visual character of the Historic District in which it is to be located.”

STAFF REPORT

3, I

I. Placement and Orientation: The guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
   A. Setbacks in DeTonti Square range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with a 5’-10’ setback.
   B. This setback matches the existing side setback of the recently-constructed two-story masonry building located directly to the north, at the corner of Claiborne and Congress Streets.
   C. There are two apartment buildings constructed within the last 5 years, constructed by this applicant. They utilize 3’high and 5’d deep planters located at the sidewalk to give the effect of a zero lot line construction and provide a planting buffer between the pedestrian and the building face. This design is similar to the what is proposed for this project.
   D. There are no new or existing buildings located on either side of the proposed construction site.
   E. The proposed setback for this building is 5’-10” from the sidewalk/property line.

3, II

II. Massing and Scale:
   A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
      1. the building is designed to resemble two historic buildings connected at the rear, similar to the Hanna House on Conception Street and the Malaga Inn on Church Street.
      2. 3 bay facades are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District
      3. 2 and 3 story masonry structures are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
      4. The proposed building is a 2 ½ story stucco-covered masonry building with two projecting three-bay fronts.
B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
   1. Historic buildings in DeTonti Square are constructed on piers, or are elevated above grade by a continuous foundation wall at a height of 2’-3’, and some even taller given the topography of the lot.
   2. Property covenants require new construction to be 2’-6” above grade.
   3. The proposed foundation is 3’ above grade.
C. The guidelines state that new construction should consider roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings.
   1. A variety of roof shapes exist in the DeTonti Square Historic District, but the most common are simple end gables and hips.
   2. Side gabled roofs with parapets are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District.

III. Façade Elements:
The guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.
   A. While end gables with parapets are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District, none occur parallel to the street.
   B. Use of a front gable behind a parapet is not a common design element seen in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
   C. The proposed entry way is dissimilar to the treatment of similar historic buildings that have been joined, such as the Hanna Houses on Conception Street, the law offices of Miller-Hamilton-Snider and Odom, or the Malaga Inn. All of these examples are are joined at or near the rear, with the fronts to appear as separate structures.
   D. The solid stucco-covered masonry entry way with metal gate and curvilinear cap does not relate stylistically to any other design element of the building, or anything else in the district.

IV. Materials and Ornamentation:
   A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
      1. There are very few historic stucco-covered masonry buildings remaining in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
      2. One of the two recently-constructed apartment buildings, 300 North Jackson Street, has a painted stucco-covered masonry exterior.
      3. Stucco-covered masonry is considered comparable to brick veneer construction.
B. The guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.

1. Examples of historic ornamentation include window hoods, decorative ironwork, articulated cornices, jib doors and walk-through windows.
2. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:
1. The courtyard wall be placed further back to emphasize the appearance of two separate residential structures.
2. A more compatible design for the wall and entry gate.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Architect John Williams and designer Steven Arroyo appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one present in opposition to the application.

John Williams stated that the Planning Commission had approved the re-subdivision of the lots at the June 6, 2003 meeting. The Planning Commission required that the construction adhere to a 5’ setback.

Cindy Klotz noted that the 2’-2” balconies would extend into the required 5’ setback. Richard Olsen, Planning Commission Staff, was present to report that under the current Zoning Ordinance, balconies above the first floor may extend 5’ into the required setback. Therefore, the proposed balconies are in compliance with the zoning ordinance.

BOARD DISCUSSION/FINDINGS OF FACT

Nick Holmes noted that with respect to staff comment 3,III, D, there were other curvilinear elements in the district. Dennis Carlisle noted that the freeform wall was a complimentary element to the rectilinear façade.

Buffy Donlon moved to accept the Findings of Fact as presented, with the exception of 3, III. This portion was reviewed per item. Nick Holmes seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Section 3, III – Façade Elements

Nick Holmes moved to delete Statement A from the factual findings. He noted that the Hannah Houses have a front gable behind a parapet on the side/corner elevation on St. Anthony Street. He also noted that the former Methodist Church chapel has a Mission Revival front parapet wall. Holmes moved that the presence of a front gable behind a parapet wall was not detrimental to the DeTonti Square Historic District. Dennis Carlisle seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Nick Holmes stated that while he did not contest the accuracy of Statement B, he did not believe the presence of a front gable behind a parapet wall was not detrimental to the DeTonti Square Historic District, and moved for a finding that this element would not be detrimental to the district. Robert Brown seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Nick Holmes moved that while Statement C was accurate, the proposed treatment was not detrimental to the DeTonti Square Historic District. Buffy Donlon seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.
Nick Holmes moved to delete Statement D from the factual findings. He noted that the proposed ornamental iron entry gate related to other proposed ironwork on balconies and railings. He further noted that the reverse arch on the courtyard wall relates to the arch at the rear of the building, and was not detrimental to the DeTonti Square Historic District. Buffy Donlon seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Buffy Donlon moved that based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, and the factual findings adopted by the Board, to approve the application and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness, without conditions. Nick Holmes, III seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

*Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/9/04*