

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA
December 17, 2008 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, 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: Beth Legett**
 - a. Property Address: 1208 Selma
 - b. Date of Approval: December 3, 2008
 - c. Project: Repaint in existing scheme, except trim to be white, shutters black.

- 2. Applicant's Name: Tim Dozier**
 - a. Property Address: 13 S. Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: December 3, 2008
 - c. Project: Replace rear modern door to match Barnett Millworks 686-MRBL but in wood with Luan cladding.

- 3. Applicant's Name: A.J. Edwards Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 162 S. Lawrence St.
 - b. Date of Approval: November 26, 2008
 - c. Project: Reroof flat portion with Duralast system and replace metal gutters and downspouts. Place metal coping on walls.

- 4. Applicant's Name: Hernandez Calhoun**
 - a. Property Address: 354 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: December 8, 2008
 - c. Project: Hang shingle sign per plans, 12 square footage total.

- 5. Applicant's Name: Gary Henderson**
 - a. Property Address: 458 Chatham Street
 - b. Date of Approval: December 3, 2008
 - c. Project: Stabilize structure, including repairing and or securing loose boards; Close up doors and windows with plywood to fit securely over existing opening; Applicant to come back with detailed work proposal for fixing up property at a later date.

- 6. Applicant's Name: Barbara Hamilton**
 - a. Property Address: 1110 Savannah
 - b. Date of Approval: December 2, 2008
 - c. Project: Replace rotten front porch decking with 5/4 inch tongue and groove decking. Paint entire porch floor to match the existing.

- 7. Applicant's Name: 1601 Dauphin Building Partnership, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 1601 Dauphin Street

- b. Date of Approval: December 4, 2008
- c. Project: Install new roof and decking as necessary. Roof to be: 40 year, GAF Timberline Prestique High Definition Charcoal Black in color.

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 160-08-CA: 208 Dauphin Street**
 - a. Applicant: JSM, LLC
 - b. Request: façade treatment approval
- 2. 179-08-CA: 301 Government Street**
 - a. Applicant: SignMgmt
 - b. Request: Signage
- 3. 184-08-CA: 1133 Montauk Avenuee**
 - a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley
 - b. Request: Renovation
- 4. 185-08-CA: 102 Dauphin Street**
 - a. Applicant: Quality Sign Co., Inc.
 - b. Request: Signage
- 5. 178-08-CA: 109 Bradford Ave**
 - a. Applicant: Pope
 - b. Request: window approval

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. New Guidelines
- 2. Board Orientation for New Members
- 3. January 7, 2009 Meeting

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

160-08-CA: 208 Dauphin Street
Applicant: JSMM, LLC.
Received: 11/26/08
Meeting: 12/17/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: B-4
Project: Façade approval

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a new, two-story commercial building where there was a shell of a former historic building which burned.

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 consulted the MHDC, as required, in order to acquire a certificate of occupancy for their new movie theater and loft condos. Staff visited the building and realized the façade deviated from the submitted plan. The applicants appeared before the ARB on November 5, 2008, seeking approval for the as-built facade. The Board suggested, and the applicants agreed to participate in, a Design Review Committee in order to determine alternate treatments for the façade.
- B. The original plan called for the transom (now mezzanine windows) to be directly above the doorways. As illustrated by the attached photos, the transom windows have been placed higher in order to accommodate interior floor plan changes. Any change from the submitted plan requires a reappearance before the ARB.
- C. Applicants seek approval to:
 - 1. to paint lower story of front façade per submitted plan;
 - 2. to apply decorative stucco to lower story of front façade per submitted plan.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicants’ proposal follows the recommendations of the Design Review Committee. Therefore, Staff recommends approval.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

166-08-CA: 301 Government Street
Applicant: Maura Garino for Holiday Inn
Received: 10/16/08
Meeting: 11/05/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing Property
Zoning: B-4
Project: Lighting and Signage

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this 16-story masonry building was built as a Sheraton in 1975. It now houses a Holiday Inn.

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. This contemporary building in the Church Street East district is now the Holiday Inn and has been undergoing an exterior renovation these last few months, including new windows and fresh paint. As part of the exterior renovation, the Holiday Inn would like to install new lighting and signage. The applicants appeared before the ARB on November 5, 2008 and received approval for the following:
 - 1. Exterior lighting, per submitted plan;
 - 2. 6 exterior, reverse-channel, illuminated signs.
- B. Since that time, the Holiday Inn’s national sign contractor, SignMgmt, has contacted the MHDC and indicated they would like to amend their request. SignMgmt will install the reverse-channel illuminated signage on the first floor of the building, as approved. However, SignMgmt is now seeking approval to install internally-illuminated (or back-lit signage) on the 17th floor of the building. Currently, the Holiday Inn has two internally-illuminated signs on the 17th floor of the building. The proposed signs would replace those.
- C. As discussed at the November 5 meeting, the proposed (and existing signage) exceeds the maximum square footage allotted for this parcel under the sign ordinance. However, Holiday Inn received a variance following the November 6, 2006 Board of Zoning Adjustment meeting allowing the Holiday Inn to exceed the allotted square footage for its signage. Staff has consulted the BZA. At this time, the Holiday Inn will not need to reappear before the BZA for the proposed signage since the square footage is equal to or lesser than the existing signage. Furthermore, the proposed signage is fewer square feet than existing.
- D. The Mobile Sign Ordinance read, in pertinent part:
 - 1. Internally lit signs are prohibited.
 - 2. Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination.

E. Applicants propose:

1. Two internally illuminated signs at roofline
 - a. 23' long
 - b. 4' tall
 - c. white script
 - d. 95 square feet total

STAFF ANALYSIS

According to the sign guidelines, internally-lit signs are not allowed in the historic districts. The applicants argue the approved, reverse-channel, illuminated signage will be useless, given the low amount of light emitted, on the 17th floor. The applicants have included a rendering of the nighttime elevation for the approved, reverse-channel illuminated sign (see attached photo marked “approved”). The applicants have also included a photo of what the proposed signage will look like as installed. See attached photo marked “proposed”(note: the signage for this site will only say “Holiday Inn”, not “Holiday Inn Express”).

As demonstrated by the renderings, given the height of this building and the placement of the proposed signage, Staff is inclined to agree with the applicants that reverse-channel, illuminated signage would not be particularly useful from that elevation. Therefore, and since the proposed signage replaces similarly-illuminated existing signage, Staff recommends approval.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

184-08-CA: 1133 Montauk Avenue
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Received: 11/26/08
Meeting: 12/17/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Porch renovation

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a large two-story, Victorian in the Old Dauphin Way district. Most likely constructed at the turn of the century, the original northeast corner of the porch was filled-in at a later date.

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. This is a large two-story, Victorian in the Old Dauphin Way district. Most likely constructed at the turn of the century, the original northeast corner of the porch was filled-in at a later date. The applicants seek to restore the porch to its original configuration, replicating existing columns and balustrade.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines read in pertinent part: “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/ columns, proportions and decorative details. The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch.”
- C. Applicants propose, per submitted plan:
 - 1. Open northeast corner of porch;
 - 2. Install columns, railing, valance and brackets to match existing;
 - 3. Remove roof from rear of porch to east wing;
 - 4. Repair/ replace porch decking with 5/4” x 4” tongue and groove decking as needed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff recommends approval. The application conforms to the applicable guidelines. One window removed from the porch will be reused on-site, per submitted plan. Others will be retained for use elsewhere. Therefore, Staff recommends approval.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

185-08-CA: 102 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Quality Sign Co., Inc.
Received: 12/01/08
Meeting: 12/17/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a two-story, masonry storefront with Italianate details.

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 intend to install a sign.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines provide for the following:
 - 1. For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors.
 - 2. The structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building. Wood, metal, stucco, stone or brick, is allowed. Plastic, vinyl or similar materials are prohibited. Neon, resin to give the appearance of wood, and fabric may be used as appropriate.
 - 3. The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet.
 - 4. Internally lit signs are prohibited.
 - 5. Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination.
- C. Applicants propose:
 - 1. flag sign mounted on metal arm bracket;
 - 2. heavy duty foam sign (sample to be brought to ARB meeting);
 - 3. approximately 8’ sq. ft.;
 - 4. colors to match building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicant’s proposal conforms to our sign design guidelines. Though sign is made of a modern material, the ARB has approved this material for signs in the past. Therefore, Staff recommends approval.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

178-08-CA: 109 Bradford Avenue
Applicant: Manicore Properties, LLC
Received: 10/28/08
Meeting: 11/19/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct rear staircase and porch; retain non-conforming windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a 4-plex in the Old Dauphin Way district constructed in the 1920s.

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 are seeking approval for non-conforming windows installed without a COA. The applicants removed steel casement windows without approval from the ARB. Staff cited the applicants and issued a stop work order. The applicants appeared before ARB on November 5, 2008, asking to retain the windows as installed. The ARB suggested the applicant research alternatives and tabled the application. The applicant has completed his research and would like to present alternative windows to the ARB at this point.
- 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. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
- C. Applicants propose:
 - 1. retaining 32-1/1, double-hung, insulated vinyl-clad, wood window framing
 - a. removing the new, single-pane sashes
 - b. replacing with either 4/4 or 6/6 sashes on the larger windows;
 - c. replacing with either 2/2 or 3/3 sashes on the smaller windows;
 - d. all proposed windows will have interior, faux muntins.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff intends to research this issue, as well, and present any findings at the upcoming ARB meeting.