

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA
March 18, 2009 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Approval of Mid Month COAs Granted by Staff

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant: Kellie King Schodgrass

- a. Property Address: 56 Bradford St.
- b. Date of Approval: 03/16/09
- c. Project: Install 6 foot privacy fence.

2. Applicant: Jeff Mizell

- a. Property Address: 108 Houston St.
- b. Date of Approval: 03/01/09
- c. Project: Reroof (weathered wood timberline).

3. Applicant: Lawrence Hallett

- a. Property Address: 503 Government St.
- b. Date of Approval: 01/07/09
- c. Project: Remove deteriorated soffit and fascia along second floor of the east elevation; repair and replace rotten wood as needed, matching the existing in profile and dimension.

4. Applicant: Brent Ericson

- a. Property Address: 1658 Government St.
- b. Date of Approval: 02/27/09
- c. Project: Replace rotting handrail on upper front porch with materials that match existing porch on first floor in profile and dimension; replace several missing siding pieces to match existing in profile and dimension; reroof house with charcoal black fiberglass shingles; repair rotting soffit with materials to match existing in profile and dimension.

5. Applicant: Chris King

- a. Property Address: 208 South Georgia St.
- b. Date of Approval: 2/25/09
- c. Project: Replace rotten wood on porch and/or soffit to match existing in material, dimension, and detail; repair per existing in profile and dimension.

6. Applicant: Mark and Ramon Macines

- a. Property Address: 959 Palmetto St.
- b. Date of Approval: 03/05/09
- c. Project: Paint residence in the following BLP color scheme: Body - Palmetto Street Bronze; Trim and Porch Floor – Fort Conde Beige; Ironwork – Bellingrath Green; Front Door – Government Street Olive.

7. **Applicant: Nicholas Vrakelos**
 - a. Property Address: 56 LeMoyne Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 02/26/09
 - c. Project: Install storm windows (white, flat baked enamel finish) to north and south elevations.
8. **Applicant: Robin Pittman; Scott Electric Sign Company**
 - a. Property Address: 1500 Government Street; AT&T storefront
 - b. Date of Approval: 02/15/09
 - c. Project: Wall sign approved, as illustrated by submitted drawing; Door approved, as illustrated by submitted drawing.
9. **Applicant: Damon Lett**
 - a. Property Address: 72 North Reed St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 03/3/09
 - c. Project: Reroof with charcoal grey shingles.
10. **Applicant: Blackard Roofing Company**
 - a. Property Address: 359 Charles St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 03/05/09
 - c. Project: Reroof with three tab asphalt shingles.
11. **Applicant: Jerald Bates, II**
 - a. Property Address: 266 Dexter Ave.
 - b. Date of Approval: 03/09/09
 - c. Project: Repair and Replace column and siding to match existing dimensions, profile, and material; reroof with architectural charcoal or black shingles; replace broken glass in windows to match existing; paint house same as existing.
12. **Applicant: Tina Campbell**
 - a. Property Address: 958 Selma St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 02/10/09
 - c. Project: Install new Timberline roof in charcoal; stabilize foundation piers; paint either white or SW 2811 (muted green) with white trim.
12. **Applicant: Mike Myrick**
 - a. Property Address: 359 Charles Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 03/11/09
 - c. Project: Paint exterior walls Benjamin Moore "Georgian Green;" replace roof with in-kind asphalt shingles; replace porch in-kind.
13. **Applicant: Sai Wo Au**
 - a. Property Address: 1706 Government Str.
 - b. Date of Approval: 03/06/09
 - c. Project: Install 8 foot fence.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 021-09: 1211 Palmetto Street
 - a. Applicant: Max B. McGill
 - b. Project: Fenestration Changes on Enclosed Porch.
2. 026-09: 251 Government Street.
 - a. Applicant: Admiral Semmes Corporation
 - b. Project: Fence Approval.
3. 027-09: 310 Dauphin Street
 - a. Applicant: Mike Moore

b. Project: Sign Approval.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Fence Guidelines

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

021-09-CA: 1211 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Daniel J. Burkoff / Max B. McGill
Received: 02/27/09
Meeting: 03/18/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Renovation; window replacement

BUILDING HISTORY

This is American 4-square was constructed in 1907 and has gone through numerous changes to its south (rear) and north (front) elevations.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. The applicants seek approval to make some exterior changes based on interior, floor plan changes as the house undergoes renovation. This house received a significant overhaul in the 1960s or 1970s. The front porch was removed and replaced with the existing portico and all original windows were removed and replaced with 18-lite, fixed pane wood windows. The original windows, judging from adjacent properties which mirror this house, were one-over-one. More recently, the southeast corner of the home, which was once a back porch with rear stair, was enclosed and non-conforming, vinyl windows were installed. When the applicants appeared with proposals at the February 18, 2009 meeting, the Board tabled their request for eliminating windows in the upper porch area. The applicants have returned in order to seek approval of an alternate plan for the enclosed rear porches fenestration.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines read, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building.
 - 2. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.
 - 3. The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work includes:
 - 1. removing previously-installed, non-conforming windows in enclosed porch
 - 2. replacing windows on rear elevation of the enclosed porch with salvaged windows

3. replacing the window of the southernmost bay of the enclosed porch's side elevation with a blind paneled shutter to match in scale and dimensions the proposed windows for the rear of the porch

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicants appeared before the ARB on February 18, 2009 and a Design Review Committee was convened on February 27, 2009 to discuss the applicants proposed treatment for the rear, enclosed porch. The applicants were encouraged to retain some sort of fenestration along these walls. During the committee meeting, the applicants were advised to leave a window on each façade or shutter the openings. The applicants returned the following proposal. Staff is unconvinced this is most appropriate treatment for these rear walls and will be continuing to work with these applicants prior to the ARB meeting to discuss options.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

027-09-CA: **251 Government St.**
Received: **02/16/09**
Meeting: **03/18/09**

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: **Church Street East**
Classification: **Non-Contributing Property**
Zoning: **B-4**
Project: **Fence Approval**

BUILDING HISTORY

The twelve-story masonry building opened in 1940 as the Admiral Semmes Manor hotel. It is currently part of the Radisson chain of mid to high range business and leisure hotels.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. On June 5, 2008, Staff issued a six month Certificate of Appropriateness for 56 ‘O’ chain link fence on the Church Street and Joachim corner of the Admiral Semmes property. The ASH Corporation now requests to retain that fence permanently.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines read, in pertinent part, as follows:
 - 1. “Fences should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Retain existing chain link fence on the northwest corner of Church and Joachim Streets until the hotel moves forward with its expansion plans.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff understands that the applicant intends to appear with plans for the hotel’s proposed expansion at this site; however, in discussion with the applicant, Staff has also been advised that this expansion is a year or two years out.

The use of chain link fencing is not deemed appropriate for Mobile’s historic districts. Given the degree of visibility afforded by this site’s prominent location and the type of fencing chosen, granting another extension for this proposal is inadvisable.

The unpaved parking space encompassed by the fencing is bound by a parking garage to the west, and a service alley running alongside a fenced pool area to the north. A narrow strip of landscaping fronting an iron fence with interspersed brick piers surrounds the pool area along Joachim Street. The service alley is separated from the area enclosed by the chain link fence by a wood fence.

Staff recommends that the applicant submit an application for fencing and landscaping which takes in to account the Mobile Historic District Guidelines and the prominence of location.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

025-09-CA: 310 Dauphin Street.
Applicant: Mike Moore
Received: 03/05/09
Meeting: 03/14/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Non-Contributing Property
Zoning: B-4
Project: Signage

BUILDING HISTORY

The historic façade of this building faces Dauphin St; the sign proposed will attach a new addition overlooking the ST. Francis St. parking lot at the rear of the building.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

A. On September 3, 2008, the Board granted approval for the construction of a free standing vestibule on the rear entrance off the building. The applicant’s proposal places the sign within the gable face of the new vestibule. The building’s rear elevation has undergone many changes over the years. It is probable that this building face was never very finished in appearance. In this proposal the applicant seeks to add another element, a metal sign with neon lighting, to a historically neglected elevation.

B. The Sign Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street read in pertinent part, as follows:

1. “The overall design of all signage including the mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property. Buildings with a recognizable style such....This can be done through the use of similar decorative features such as columns or brackets. For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors.
2. The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs. The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 feet. A multi-tenant building is permitted a maximum of 64 square feet. The size of the sign shall be determined by measuring the area within each face of a geometric shape enclosing all elements of functional or representational matter including blank masking. ... For double faced signs, each side shall be counted toward the maximum allowable square footage.
3. The structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building.
4. Internally lit signs are prohibited. Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination. Such lighting shall not shine into or create at pedestrian or vehicular traffic,

nor shall it shine into adjacent areas. Flashing, blinking, revolving, or rotating signs are not permitted.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Mount a metal wall sign measuring 11 feet 10 inches in height by 4 feet 8 inches in width (total square footage of 10.9 square feet) with neon lighting to a building frontage of 50 feet square.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposed sign faces an interior parking lot which divides a city block. Though visible diagonally from Claiborne and Jackson Streets, the sign cannot be viewed frontally without the parking area. Since the building’s rear elevation has been altered, probably never fully finished, it defies a stylistic categorization upon which a design could be based. Other criteria, including additional aspects of design, scale, material, and lighting, remain to be considered. The sign is to be affixed to the building’s recently constructed rear vestibule. Since the vestibule does not ascribe to a historical stylistic precedent, a degree of license extends to the design of the proposed sign. The proposed sign does not exceed the total square footage allotted for signage. Metal is an approved material for use in signs found in the historic districts. The lighting will infringe upon neither pedestrian nor vehicular traffic. The sign appears to meet guidelines. Font, color, and illumination still need to be considered. Staff defers to the Board for approval.

