AGENDA
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
August 9, 2004– 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: Stauter Construction
   Property Address: 256 Rapier Avenue
   Date of Approval: 7/15/04
   Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary on porches and siding with new materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.

2. Applicant's Name: Ross Holliday
   Property Address: 609 Conti Street
   Date of Approval: 7/19/04
   Work Approved: Install additional 5’ chain link gate in existing chain link fence as per submitted site plan.

3. Applicant's Name: Millie Dorman
   Property Address: 201 Rapier Avenue
   Date of Approval: 7/20/04
   Work Approved: Replace existing fence with new fence to match existing in materials, profile and dimension.

4. Applicant's Name: Jackson Street Partners/Do Right Construction
   Property Address: 7 N. Jackson Street
   Date of Approval: 7/21/04
   Work Approved: Repair/replace existing deteriorated wood work with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Reinforce rear balcony by adding supports at 4’ intervals. Prime and paint to match existing.

5. Applicant's Name: Jana Faye Carney
   Property Address: 215 S. Cedar Street
   Date of Approval: 7/22/04
   Work Approved: Minor wood repair with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile; Paint exterior in the following Sears colors: body-Fossil White; trim- Lamplight; porch deck-dark gray; door-dark blue.
6. Applicant's Name: David Powers  
   Property Address: 959 Charleston Street  
   Date of Approval: 7/22/04  
   Work Approved: Install handrails on sides of front steps using MHDC stock handrail design, matching existing porch railing. Construct 4’ x 8’ shed addition to existing previously-approved storage building as per submitted plans.

7. NOTICE OF VIOLATION  
   Issued To: Michael P. Kahalley  
   Address: 22 South Reed Avenue  
   Violation: Installation of satellite dish in front yard

8. Applicant's Name: Ross Holliday  
   Property Address: 609 Conti Street  
   Date of Approval: 7/26/04  
   Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with new materials to match existing materials in profile and dimension. Repaint new materials to match existing color scheme.

9. Applicant's Name: First Federal Bank  
   Property Address: 313 George Street  
   Date of Approval: 7/26/04  
   Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint in existing color scheme.

C. OLD BUSINESS:

1. **005-03/04-CA**  
   Applicant: Paul Christopher  
   Nature of Request: Remove deteriorated canopy cited under the Minimum Maintenance Ordinance.

D. NEW BUSINESS:

1. **079-03/04-CA**  
   Applicants: Jim Farris and Chad Johnson  
   Nature of Request: Construct wood privacy fence across side yard, connecting newly constructed masonry fence to residence, as per submitted plans.

2. **080-03/04-CA**  
   Applicants: Justin and Danielle Hovey  
   Nature of Request: Construct wood privacy fence as per submitted plans. Replace existing picket fence with new picket fence matching existing as per submitted plans.
3. **081-03/04-CA**
   - 361 Marine Street
   - Applicants: Douglas Kearley, Architect; William Carroll, Contractor
   - Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund, Owner
   - Nature of Request: Install picket fence at front and 6’ high wood privacy fence at sides and rear, all as per submitted plans.

4. **082-03/04-CA**
   - 6-8 St. Emanuel Street
   - Applicants: Douglas Kearley, Architect; The Cybil Smith Charitable Trust/Ann Bedsole, Owner
   - Nature of Request: Rehabilitate existing historic Franklin Fire Station as per submitted plans. Construct new two story masonry structure site of the old Masonic Temple as per submitted plans.

5. **083-03/04-CA**
   - 1509 Monroe Street
   - Applicant: John Van Hook
   - Nature of Request: Install 6’ wood privacy fence along east property line as per submitted site plan.

D. **OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

E. **ADJOURN**
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – STAFF COMMENTS

005-03/04 – CA 451 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Paul Christopher
Received: 10/06/03
Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/20/03
Meeting Date(s): 1) 10/20/03 2) 8/9/04 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Nature of Project: Remove deteriorated canopy and place painted plywood over area left exposed by removal of canopy.

The building is sited on the southwest corner of Hamilton and Dauphin Streets.

The Mobile City Ordinance entitled “Historic Preservation” requires that Demolition plans for either character-defining elements or entire structures be submitted with time lines.

Current Conditions: The canopy is currently being supported by a brace constructed of 2x4s on the sidewalk.

Additional Information: The ordinance requires that the Architectural Review Board review all mothball plans.

History of the Project:
In October 2003, the owner submitted plans for stabilization of the canopy. Under separate cover the ARB received a letter requesting to remove the canopy. The applicant noted in this letter that he intended to construct a two story balcony at a later date.

The Review Board denied the request to remove the canopy (copy of Certified Record attached). At the same time the Board approved the repair of the canopy (CoA attached). No building permit has been purchased to undertake the approved work, nor has any work been done to the canopy. A temporary support system has been installed on the sidewalk.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,A</td>
<td>Rehabilitation/Restoration Guidelines for Existing Buildings</td>
<td>Remove canopy</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…”
A. High Priority Principles:
  1. Respect the original character of the building.
     a. The canopy is an integral part of the building façade and has achieved significance whether
        original or a later addition.
  2. Preserve and repair original materials.
     a. The proposed plans call for removal of the canopy.
     b. The proposed plans call for the installation of painted plywood over the area where the
        canopy is removed.
     c. Currently a stucco band runs along the building delineating the division of first and
        second floor. This band stops at the canopy.
     d. Painted plywood is not allowed by the Guidelines for this application.

Staff recommends that the canopy be retained and repaired as per the original submitted plan.
Should the Board determine that the removal of the canopy is appropriate, the condition that the stucco band
continue along the area where the canopy is removed.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS - STAFF COMMENTS

079-03/04 – CA 1801 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Jim Farris and Chad Johnson
Received: 7/21/04
Submission Date + 45 Days: 8/4/04
Meeting Date (s): 1) 8/9/04 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
Nature of Project: Construct 8’ high wood fence measuring 29’ as per submitted plan.

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>Construct wood fence</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 no detract from it. Design, scale, placement, and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
1. The main structure is a two story story frame American Foursquare residence.
2. The proposed fencing is 8’ high wood dog-eared fence matching that at the rear of the property.
3. Typically, the Design Guidelines limit wood privacy fences to 6’ in height, however, 8’ high fences and walls have been approved for areas along busy streets such as Springhill Avenue, Old Shell Road and Dauphin Street.
4. In terms of scale in relationship to the adjoining residential structure and the 8’stucco-covered masonry wall, an 8’ fence would not be inappropriate for this location.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS - STAFF COMMENTS

080-03/04 – CA 1565 Blair Avenue
Applicant: Justin and Danielle Hovey
Received: 7/26/04
Submission Date + 45 Days: 9/9/04  Meeting Date (s):
               1) 8/9/04  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
Nature of Project: Replace existing wood picket fence as per submitted plans. Construct 6’ high wood privacy fence in rear of property as per submitted site plan.

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>Construct wood fence</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 no detract from it. Design, scale, placement, and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
   1. The main structure is one story frame vernacular residence.
   2. The deteriorated wood picket fencing will be replaced with materials matching existing.
   3. The proposed fencing is 6’ high wood privacy fence.
   4. Typically, the Design Guidelines limit wood privacy fences to 6’ in height.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS - STAFF COMMENTS

081-03/04 – CA 361 Marine Street
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
Received: 6/28/04 Meeting Date(s):
Submission Date + 45 Days: 6/18/04 1) 7/12/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Nature of Project: Construct 6’ high wood fence with cap along sides and rear of property as per submitted site plan. Construct 3’ wood picket fence around front yard as per submitted site plan.

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>Construct wood fence</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 no detract from it. Design, scale, placement, and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
   1. The main structure is one story frame vernacular residence.
   2. The proposed wood privacy fencing is 6’ high wood with a cap.
   3. The proposed wood Gothic picket fencing is 3’ in height.
   4. Typically, the Design Guidelines limit wood privacy fences to 6’ in height.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – STAFF COMMENTS

086-03/04 – CA  6-8 St. Joseph Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley, Architect/ The Cybil Smith Trust, Ann Bedsole, Owner
Received: 7/21/04
Submission Date + 45 Days: 9/04/04
Meeting Date(s):
1) 8/9/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (vacant lot/new construction)
Additional Permits Required: (4) Building, Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing
Nature of Project: This project deals with two elements in one project. 1) The rehabilitation of the Franklin Fire Station for use as offices downstairs and loft apartments upstairs; and 2) the construction of a new Charleston side house on the lot of the old Masonic Building. For this reason, the staff report will address each element separately.

Element 1: Rehabilitation of the Historic Franklin Fire Station

Current Conditions: The existing storefront was remodeled in the mid-1980s by the previous owners. At this time, a marble bulkhead was added across the façade and a recessed corner entrance was created. Historic photographs from the period of the building’s use as a fire station depict a similar first floor façade. Historic photographs from the period following the building’s use as a fire station depict the first floor storefront as commercial in nature with display windows and central entrance.

The fire station was constructed ca. 1882. The Masonic building was constructed in 1902. Originally both levels of the fire station had windows on the north elevation, but the first floor diamond-shaped window was filled in sometime after the construction of the Masonic building, as the Masonic building was constructed at zero lot line on the first floor, and stepped in 5’ on the upper floors to allow light into interior spaces. The second floor windows of the fire station were filled in sometime after the construction of the Masonic building.

Proposed Alterations:
1. The closing of the recessed entrance on St. Joseph Street;
2. The creation of an interior courtyard between the new structure and the existing fire station;
3. The opening & replacement of windows at the second floor level;
4. Rebuilding the rear north wall that does not actually attach to the fire station building;
5. The installation of window and entry doors on the first floor level;
6. The construction of two carriage-style garage bays;
7. The construction of a balcony over the garage bays;
8. The installation of doors accessing the balcony, flanked by sidelights and topped with fanlight transoms;

Maintaining The Street Line:
An 8’ high masonry wall with a 4’ concrete cap is proposed to be constructed between the existing parking garage and the Franklin Fire Station. This wall will have four ornamental gates – one set of double gates at the driveway and two smaller pedestrian gates. The design is simple in nature and references the ornamental ironwork already in place on the balcony of the fire station.

The original cornerstone of the Masonic Building is proposed to be inset in the masonry wall at the lower left hand corner of the wall at the sidewalk, in close proximity to its location on the non-extant building.
Element 2: Construction of a new Charleston Side House

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 duplex</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>
<tr>
<td>3,III</td>
<td>Façade Elements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,IV</td>
<td>Materials and Ornamentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, IV, A</td>
<td>Appropriate Materials for New Residential Construction</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 the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with a 5’setback.
   B. This is a lot in the middle of the block, facing Bienville Square.
   C. A multi story highrise with parking deck at the ground level to the north occupies the southeast corner of the lot and has a zero lot line setback.
   D. The structure to the south, the Franklin Fire Station, faces St. Joseph Street and has a zero lot line front setback.
   E. The proposed front setback for this building is 4’- 6” from the sidewalk/property line; the proposed north side setback for this building is 0’.
   F. An 8’ high brick wall with concrete cap is proposed to be constructed along the sidewalk, continuing the zero setback along the sidewalk across the lot.

3,II

II. Massing and Scale:

A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
   1. Buildings ranging in height from 2 stories to multi-story highrises are common throughout the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District.
   2. The proposed building is a 2-story structure featuring brick veneer and true stucco exterior.
B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
   1. Historic buildings in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District are typically commercial in nature and have entrances at grade.
   2. The proposed foundation is designed using solid stucco-covered masonry, at a height 2’-8” 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 Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District, but the most common are flat/sloping roofs concealed by commercial parapets.
   2. The proposed roof shape is end gable concealed behind a brick parapet.

III. Façade Elements:
   A. The guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.
      1. The use of a wood four panel door flanked by sidelights with transom above is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
      2. The proposed design elements for the main façade include a cast iron porch configuration, including flat columns, brackets and balustrade; scored stucco under the porch replicates historic patterning.
      3. Proposed window sills and lintels are of Alabama marble.

IV. Materials and Ornamentation:
   A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new 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 foundation vents and a cast iron porch system.
      2. The proposed design utilizes a single entry door and double-hung windows.
      3. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS - STAFF COMMENTS

083-03/04 – CA  1509 Monroe Street
Applicant: John Van Hook
Received: 7/21/04
Submission Date + 45 Days: 9/04/04
Meeting Date (s): 1)  8/09/04  2)  3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence
Nature of Project: Construct 6’ high wood fence along east property line as per submitted plan.

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>Construct wood fence</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 no detract from it. Design, scale, placement, and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
1. The main structure is one story frame residence.
2. The proposed fencing is 6’ high wood dog-eared fence matching that at the rear of the property.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.