

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA**  
**January 16, 2013 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

1. Introduction of New Board Member
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Minutes
4. Approval of Mid Month COAs Granted by Staff

**B. MID MONTH APPROVALS**

1. **Applicant: Michael Lord**
  - a. Property Address: 1352 Old Shell Road
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/19/12
  - c. Project: Repair windows to match the original in profile, dimension and materials.
2. **Applicant: Bryan Wiggins**
  - a. Property Address: 163 South Jefferson Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/31/12
  - c. Project: Reconstruct a picket fence on the same location and according to the same design as an earlier fence.
3. **Applicant: Mark Dodson**
  - a. Property Address: 165 Hannon Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/2/13
  - c. Project: Replace rotten wood and paint gray to match.
4. **Applicant: Sally M. Bachran and George M. Penados**
  - a. Property Address: 1159 Texas Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/3/13
  - c. Project: Level and re-point the foundation piers. Repair and/or replace deteriorated wooden siding to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repair and when necessary replace any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing. Repair the damaged roof and windows to match the existing in kind. Install plywood over the exposed rear wall until this first phase of the building's restoration is completed. At that point, a plan for new rear elevation will appear before the Board.
5. **Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for John Schley Rutherford**
  - a. Property Address: 201 North Conception Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/3/13
  - c. Project: Install a temporary chain link fence around portions of the property for the duration of the house's restoration. If the restoration exceeds 31 December 2013, the CoA will be have to be renewed.
6. **Applicant: Katherine Whitely**
  - a. Property Address: 106 South Catherine Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/4/13
  - c. Project: Repaint the house and paint the new carport per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme: the body will be Quiver Tan; the door and window trim will be Red Cent; the columns, rafter tails, windows, and other doors will be Panda White; and the porch floor will be Relaxed Khaki.
7. **Applicant: Bobby Gipson**

- a. Property Address: 250 Dexter Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 1/3/13
- c. Project: Replace rotten wood to match, repaint house in BLP colors--Body Government Street Olive; Trim DeTonti Off White; porch deck Bellingrath Green. Repair rotten rear deck. Replace two sills on south elevation.

**8. Applicant: Do Right Construction for Ms. Maggie Crawford**

- a. Property Address: 104 North Julia Street
- b. Date of Approval: 1/4/13
- c. Project: Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2013-05-CA: 701 Spring Hill Avenue**

- a. Applicant: Benjamin Cummings for Wendell Quimby
- b. Project: Approval of Altered Plans – Approve altered fenestration.

**2. 2013-06-CA: 202 Government Street**

- a. Applicant: Angie Odom for the Red Square Agency
- b. Project: Install a new garage door in Government St. facade

**3. 2013-07-CA: 50-52 North Georgia Avenue**

- a. Applicant: Jennifer Bexley
- b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain two doors.

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

- 1. Discussion

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

**2012-05-CA: 701 Spring Hill Avenue**  
**Applicant: Benjamin Cummings for Wendell Quimby**  
**Received: 12/28/12**  
**Meeting: 1/16/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Approval of Altered Plans – Approve altered fenestration.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This multi building complex occupies a triangular block bound by Spring Hill Avenue, Washington Street, Dauphin Street, and Scott Street. The address first appears in the City Directories in 1947; therefore the building dates from circa 1946. The single-story Flat Iron-like building features a streamlined rounded-corner entrance.

**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 building last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on June 6, 2012. At that time, the Board approved the exterior restoration and renovation of the empty unit. Changes were made to the building during the process of the renovation. The changes differ from the approved scope of work. This application calls for approval of altered access and fenestration.
- B. The Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building.”
  - 2. “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 windows openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
  - 3. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
  - 4. “Wood and metal garage doors should be simple in design compatible with the main building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted drawings and explications):
  - 1. Approve alterations to approved plans.

- a. Retain the main entrance's glazed and paneled door. A single-light door had been approved.
- b. Retain the two windows located to the north of the main entrance. Four windows had been approved.
- c. Retain a tripartite window grouping on the North Elevation. A pair of windows had been approved. An existing beam prevented its construction.
- d. Retain the handicap access as constructed. The grade was changed thereby making a handrail unnecessary.
- e. Retain altered bays on the South Elevations. The altered sequence reflects original bay breaks as discovered during the renovations.
- f. A board and batten partition will not be constructed in the North Elevation's northernmost vehicular bay.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the approval of altered plans. Changes were made as the building was being renovated. Some of the changes reflect construction-related discoveries pertaining to the structural fabric of the building. Other changes were motivated by aesthetic concerns.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that replacement doors should respect the age and style of the building (See B-1). complement the design. The door design was altered so that the solid expanse of the paneling would align with the wooden paneling located beneath the flanking fenestration.

The Design Review Guidelines state that the location and configuration of windows on the building help establish the historic character (See B-2). Alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building (See B-3). The placement and spacing of windows was altered on account of the discoveries of a previously unknown pier that determined the original placement of fenestration as well as the consideration of how one bank of windows would related to the others. The ribbon-like arrangement has remained the same.

As a consequence of changing the grade of the sidewalk and by installing landscaping, the handicap access ramp was not installed.

The existing vehicular gates were retained; therefore the board-and-batten partitions that were initially proposed were not constructed.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-4), Staff does not believe this application will impair the approved architectural or historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application.

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

**2013-06-CA: 202 Government Street**  
**Applicant: Red Square Agency**  
**Received: 12/31/12**  
**Meeting: 1/16/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Install a new garage door.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous notations in this property's MHDC file, this mid 20<sup>th</sup>-Century original housed the Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph office. The building has undergone numerous alterations since its construction.

**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 building last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on March 6, 2008. At that time, the Board approved the installation of new signage.
- B. The Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. "Wood and metal garage doors should be simple in design and compatible with the main building."
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans and photographs):
  - 1. Remove the existing gate/grille from the South Elevation's vehicular bay.
  - 2. Install a new garage door in the same location.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the removal and replacement of a vehicular door. The existing garage door facing Government Street was approved on December 3, 2007. The Design Review Guidelines state that garage doors should be simple in design and compatible with the main building (See B-1).

Though the building is non-contributing this type of request creates concern. The current style of the building uses historicized detailing to create the appearance of an older structure. The installation of the very modern door is out of character with the current design of the building. Staff believes this creates a dichotomy that draws attention to a modern garage door which is generally inappropriate in style for the building.

Reviewing the illustration sent by the applicant, the folding garage doors on the right are more in keeping with the doors and window on the façade. Since the owners have expressed a desire for more light the upper panel (below the transom) could be replaced with glass, frosted in required. These would be more appropriate to the look of the building and not be as jarring on Government Street as the proposed door.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1), Staff believes that this application impairs the historical character of the neighborhood and suggests the folding garage doors with glass in place of the long panels would be a better solution. Staff recommends the application not be approved, and encourages the applicant to consider the aforementioned suggestion regarding the substitute design.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2013-03-CA: 50-52 North Georgia Avenue**  
**Applicant: Jennifer Bexley**  
**Received: 12/10/12 (Held over at the applicant's request from the 1/2/13 meeting)**  
**Meeting: 1/16/13**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain two doors.

**BUILDING HISTORY+**

This brick duplex was constructed in 1937.

**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 property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application was scheduled for review at the January 2, 2013. At the request of the applicant, review of the application was heldover for the present meeting. The application calls for the after-the-fact-approval of two doors. The doors were installed without the issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness. A 311 call was made and Staff responded. The applicants appear before the Board with a request to retain the doors.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building.”
  - 2. With regard to materials, metal is listed as inappropriate.
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):
  - 1. Retain two metal doors located on the duplex's west-facing façade.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the after-the-fact-approval of two doors. The doors were installed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that original doors should be retained and that replacement doors should respect the age and style of the building (See B-1).The wooden doors featured a chamfered vertical treatment and a staggered

light treatment. The replacement doors are metal in composition. The Design Review Guidelines list metal as an inappropriate material (See B-2). Staff recommends that the applicant install doors that are more in keeping the historic character of the building.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application impairs the historical character of the district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.