

**AGENDA**  
**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

March 12, 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:** Tilmon Brown  
**Property Address:** 125-127 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** January 30, 2007  
Paint exterior in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme: Body – Spiced Cider (SW7702) and Lanyard (SW7680); Trim – Eaglet Beige (SW7573); Accents – Koi Pond (SW7727) and Lemon Verbena (SW7726); Fire Escape – French Roast.
2. **Applicant's Name:** William May  
**Property Address:** 1008 Caroline Street  
**Date of Approval:** February 16, 2007  
Repair/replace rotten wood with materials to match existing. Install handrail and steps per MHDC stock design. Add lattice panels and working shutters. Install 5-V crimp roof in a natural tin. Prep/paint in the following ICI colors: Body – Pink Parfait; Trim – White; Shutters/Deck – Pine Grove Green.
3. **Applicant's Name:** Stephen May  
**Property Address:** 1016 Caroline Street  
**Date of Approval:** February 16, 2007  
Repair/replace rotten wood with materials to match existing. Install balustrade with turned balusters and steps per MHDC stock design. Install 5-V crimp roof in a natural tin. Prep/paint in the following Sherwin Williams colors: Body – Powder Blue; Trim – White; Shutters and Deck – Dark Green.
4. **Applicant's Name:** Amanda Wells  
**Property Address:** 200 Dexter Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** February 16, 2007  
Repair/replace rotten wood with materials to match existing. Prep/paint in the following Sherwin Williams colors: Body – Full Moon (SW6679); Trim – White; Porch Ceiling – Iceberg (SW6798); Porch Deck and Steps – Courtyard (SW6440).
5. **Applicant's Name:** El Dorado LLC  
**Property Address:** 1104 Selma Street  
**Date of Approval:** February 21, 2007  
Repair/replace rotten wood throughout the exterior (including the damaged fence) with materials to match existing. Prep/paint in the following Benjamin Moore colors: Body – Country Redwood; Trim – White Dove; Porch and Accents – Regent Green.
6. **Applicant's Name:** Cathy Barfield  
**Property Address:** 1216 Government Boulevard  
**Date of Approval:** February 21, 2007  
Repair/replace rotten wood with materials to match existing. Paint to match existing.
7. **Applicant's Name:** Coulson Roofing Company  
**Property Address:** 250 St. Anthony Street  
**Date of Approval:** February 22, 2007  
Re-roof second story with materials to match existing in material, profile, color and dimension.

8. **Applicant's Name:** Greg Murphy Contracting  
**Property Address:** 51 South Jackson Street  
**Date of Approval:** February 22, 2007  
Repair/replace rotten and damaged wood with materials to match existing. Paint to match existing. Remove non-historic windows enclosing the rear porch. Repair roof with materials to match existing.
9. **Applicant's Name:** Celia and Mack Lewis  
**Property Address:** 161 South Jefferson Street  
**Date of Approval:** February 23, 2007  
Extend 6' privacy fence 17' west at north boundary. Fence will match existing.
10. **Applicant's Name:** Stephen May  
**Property Address:** 1006½ Caroline Street  
**Date of Approval:** February 23, 2007  
Repair/replace roof with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repair/replace rotten wood with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Prep/paint in the following color scheme: Body – Sage Green; Trim – White; Shutters and Accents – Brown.
11. **Applicant's Name:** Stephen May  
**Property Address:** 1002 Elmira Street  
**Date of Approval:** February 23, 2007  
Repair/replace rotten wood with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Prep and repaint in the existing color scheme. Put a tarp on the roof.
12. **Applicant's Name:** J Maintenance  
**Property Address:** 165 South Monterey Street  
**Date of Approval:** February 26, 2007  
Re-roof building with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension in Onyx Black.

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

1. No NoVs or MoTs were written during this time period.

#### **D. NEW BUSINESS**

1. **027-07-CA:** 125-127 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Hancock Bank  
**Request:** Install an ATM. New signage.
2. **028-07-CA:** 1717 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Harvey Gandler  
**Request:** Install new shutters.
3. **029-07-CA:** 1751 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Caroline Contracting  
**Request:** Enclose a side porch.
4. **030-07-CA:** 1420 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Waite, Strange and Hill CPAs  
**Request:** New signage.

#### **E. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. No other business.

#### **F. ADJOURNMENT**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**027-07-CA:** 125-127 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Hancock Bank  
**Received:** 02/23/07 (+45 Days: 03/09/07)  
**Meeting:** 03/12/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin Street Commercial  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-4  
**Project:** Install and ATM. New signage.

**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 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." The 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 includes the following:
  - 1. Install a 3" thick 10 SF (5 SF per face) double-faced non-illuminated hanging sign (per submitted photograph and a set of sticky vinyl door signs that will have the Hancock Bank logo on the glass door surfaces.
  - 2. Install a standard ATM (per submitted photograph) within one of the window openings on the first floor.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information contained in the application, staff feels that some elements of the application will impair the historic integrity of the district. Staff is also lacking information on the sign portion of the application.

Since the first floor storefronts of these buildings 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 the building's 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 feels, however, that the ATM should not be located on Dauphin Street. This street is one of downtown's major thoroughfares and the main façade of the building; closing off an entire window opening would create an unwelcoming wall. The ATM should be located in a more inconspicuous location on St. Emanuel Street. Staff is aware that relocating the ATM may require additional signage and/or lighting to draw attention to it.

Staff recommends approving Item C1 once information is received regarding the square footage of the door and ATM signs as well as the material of the hanging sign. Staff further recommends that the ATM be installed on St. Emanuel as far from the corner as practical.

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/location falls under the rules of the National Park Service.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**028-07-CA:** 1717 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Harvey Gandler  
**Received:** 02/26/07 (+45 Days: 04/12/07)  
**Meeting:** 03/12/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Replace the existing window shutters with black Bermuda shutters.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this circa 1958 building is the former Ahavas Chesed Synagogue. In 1990 a one-story addition was constructed in front of the original Synagogue. The property, which is undergoing a significant expansion, is currently the Mary Abie Berg Senior Center.

**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 buildings on this property have undergone numerous alterations and expansions. A new gymnasium is currently being built.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for new exterior materials, finishes and elements to reflect the age and style of the building.
- C. The applicant proposes to replace the existing shutters with new Islander black aluminum shutters per the submitted plans and specifications.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information contained in the application, staff feels that some of the material choices may impair the historic integrity of the district.

Although Bermuda-style shutters are not a characteristic of Mobile buildings, the Board has approved them in historic districts on previous occasions. The Design Review Guidelines, however, state that aluminum is an inappropriate material. Nonetheless, staff feels that because the shutters are being added to a non-contributing building that has had significant alterations, the Board may make an exception in this case.

Staff recommends approving the application.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**029-07-CA:** 1751 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Caroline Contracting  
**Received:** 02/26/07 (+45 Days: 04/12/07)  
**Meeting:** 03/12/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Enclose a side porch to create a waiting area for a law firm.

**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. The porch has already been partially enclosed; however, a stop work order was issued on 23 February, 2007 to allow the Board to review the work. The porch had been previously enclosed by a different resident and later reopened.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “where rear or side porches are to be enclosed...preserve the original configuration of columns, handrails and other important architectural features.”
- C. The plan proposes to enclose the small porch on the east elevation and includes the following:
  - 1. Install Hardiplank siding on the bottom half.
  - 2. Install glass on the top half, slightly tinted to deflect the sun.
  - 3. Install a vinyl-clad door on the south side with four decorative panels and a fanlight.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information contained in the application, staff feels that some of the material choices will impair the historic integrity of the building.

The proposed improvements in Item C seek to sympathetically enclose a porch that has been enclosed and reopened on previous occasions. The current enclosure does not obscure the porch configuration and could easily be removed. Nonetheless, while Hardiplank siding is not specifically called out in the Guidelines, the Board has only approved this material for new construction in historic districts. Furthermore, the door on the south side of the porch is both materially and stylistically inappropriate.

Staff recommends amending Item C1 to replace the Hardiplank with either wood siding or glass. Staff recommends amending Item C3 to install a more appropriate door.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**030-07-CA:** 1420 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Waite, Strange and Hill CPA  
**Received:** 02/26/07 (+45 Days: 04/12/07)  
**Meeting:** 03/12/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-1  
**Project:** New signage

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This brick commercial building was built circa 1948. It has housed a number of businesses including a chiropractor and several different financial management companies. It has undergone a number of alterations.

**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 home to Waite, Strange and Hill CPAs.
- 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 will be a 32 SF (16 SF per face) double-faced synthetic wood sign that will hang from a black aluminum post. The sign will have a green trim with black letters on a tan background (all matched to the colors of the building).

**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.