

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA**  
**January 5, 2011 – 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: Sterling Perry**

- a. Property Address: 1563 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/7/10
- c. Project: Repair and replace rotten fenestration moldings to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint to match the existing color scheme.

**2. Applicant: Terry Trotter**

- a. Property Address: 1550 Eslava Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/8/10
- c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted color scheme. The body will be green. The trim will be of white. Replace the later six paneled door with a glazed and paneled door more appropriate to the period and style of the house.

**3. Applicant: Trey Littlepage**

- a. Property Address: 70 Etheridge
- b. Date of Approval: 12/8/10
- c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork to match the existing. Repaint to match the existing color scheme.

**4. Applicant: Scogin Construction**

- a. Property Address: 1116 Palmetto Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/8/10
- c. Project: Repair and replace rotten and/or deteriorated exterior wood siding as necessary only. New siding to match existing siding in profile, dimension and material. Repair and replace rotten and/or deteriorated porch ceiling as necessary to match existing in profile, dimension and material.

**5. Applicant: Lucy and David Tufts**

- a. Property Address: 308 Michigan Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 12/8/10
- c. Project: Erect a four foot picket fence at rear of property.

**6. Applicant: Meleah Jurasek**

- a. Property Address: 61 North Monterey Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/9/10
- c. Project: Replace rotten wood to match original in profile and dimension, reglaze windows, replace broken window panes, replace one shutter. Repaint as existing.

**7. Applicant: Vickers, Riis, Murray & Curran**

- a. Property Address: 56 Saint Joseph Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/9/10
- c. Project: Install a 16" by 30" Corian wall sign.

**8. Applicant: Colson Roofing**

- a. Property Address: 11 Macy Place
- b. Date of Approval: 12/14/10
- c. Project: Repair the roof and install flashing.

- 9. Applicant: Williams Foundation**
- a. Property Address: 202 South Monterey Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/15/10
  - c. Project: Repair the existing foundation piers. The work will match the existing.
- 10. Applicant: Tony Moore**
- a. Property Address: 310 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/17/10
  - c. Project: Relocate the existing neon sign (measuring 2'x10') to a location over the door.
- 11. Applicant: John Klotz**
- a. Property Address: 350 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/17/10
  - c. Project: Repaint per the existing color scheme.
- 12. Applicant: John Klotz**
- a. Property Address: 354 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/17/10
  - c. Project: Repaint per the existing color scheme.
- 13. Applicant: William Graham**
- a. Property Address: 1760 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/17/10
  - c. Project: Install a canvas awning over the rear entrance.
- 14. Applicant: Advanced Roofing**
- a. Property Address: 205 Congress Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/17/10
  - c. Project: Reroof the building with asphalt shingles.
- 15. Applicant: Grant Zarzour**
- a. Property Address: 1756 New Saint Francis Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/20/10
  - c. Project: Relocate an existing carport (approved 1993) to a point closer into the lot. The carport will be less visible from the public view.
- 16. Applicant: Highmark Roofing Services**
- a. Property Address: 65 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/20/10
  - c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.
- 17. Applicant: MH3 Printing, Signs and Ad Specialties**
- a. Property Address: 1325 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/20/10
  - c. Project: Replace an existing aluminum sign with a new aluminum sign of the same dimensions (under 30 square feet). The sign will feature a green ground and white lettering.
- 18. Applicant: Cameron Pfeiffer**
- a. Property Address: 204 Michigan Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/20/10
  - c. Project: Replace shingles where damaged by tree to match original.
- 19. Applicant: Mike Henderson**
- a. Property Address: 1300 Old Shell Road
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/21/10
  - c. Project: Reroof the house to match the existing.
- 20. Applicant: Tom Hassel**
- a. Property Address: 114 Garnett Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/27/10

- c. Project: Replace roof with 35 year architectural GAF shingle; Slate in color.

**21. Applicant: Richard Brown**

- a. Property Address: 56 South Hallet Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/22/10

Project: Repaint house per existing. Reintroduce porch railings found under house.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2011-01-CA: 112 Lanier Avenue**

- a. Applicant: Charles Weems for
- b. Project: New Construction – Construct a rear addition.

**2. 2011-02-CA: 355 Government Street**

- a. Applicant: Kim Kearley for the Carnival Museum
- b. Project: Sign Approval - Construct a monument sign.

**3. 2011-03-CA: 263 South Cedar Street**

- a. Applicant: David Thomas
- b. Project: Install vinyl windows

**4. 2011-04-CA: 309 Stocking Street**

- a. Applicant: Jewel Davis
- b. Project: Face a house with a brick veneer. Install interior lot fencing.

**5. 2011-05-CA: 158 Michigan Avenue**

- a. Applicant: Quick Phones
- b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain painted window signage.

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

- 1. Discussion

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

**2011-01-CA:** 112 Lanier Avenue  
**Applicant:** Charles Weems for  
**Received:** 12/20/10  
**Meeting:** 1/5/11

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Ashland Place  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: New Construction – Construct a rear addition.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This two-story residence was constructed in 1937 according to the designs of Mobile architect C. L. Hutchisson, Jr. The house is one of several contemporary Hutchisson designs featuring complex brick combinations and colorings.

**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. With this application, the applicant’s representative proposes the construction of rear addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Construct a rear addition.
    - a. The addition will extend between the main house and the existing garage. See C (2) for the garage.
    - b. The addition will not be visible from the public view.
    - c. The addition will be one story in height.
    - d. The walls of the addition will be faced with stucco.
    - e. The addition will feature six-over-six vinyl or aluminum clad wooden windows.
    - f. The proposed window type matches that of the main house.
    - g. The addition will be surmounted by gable roof set perpendicular to Lanier Avenue and the rear alley.
    - h. The roof will be sheathed with asphalt shingles matching those found on the

- body of the house.
  - i. The North Elevation will feature a bay window.
  - j. Four six-over-six windows will be located within the bay window.
  - k. The East Elevation will have a paneled and glazed garage door. For further alterations to the garage see C (2).
  - l. The South Elevation will feature a two bay porch accessed by two pairs of wooden French doors.
  - m. The South Elevation's porch will be defined by three wooden porch posts located atop stuccoed pedestals.
  - n. A flight of steps will descend from the porch's single eastern bay.
  - o. The porch will be surmounted by a shed roof.
  - p. An octagonal window will be located east of the porch. For the remainder of the South Elevation's fenestration see C (2).
2. Reconstruct/remodel the existing garage.
- a. The reconstructed garage will maintain the same footprint/setbacks.
  - b. The walls of the reconstructed garages will be stuccoed in the same manner as those of the addition.
  - c. The six-over-six aluminum or vinyl-clad wooden windows will match the existing.
  - d. The gable roof's pitch will be altered to be made more comparable to those of the main house and the addition.
  - e. The gable roof will feature a louvered vent like that of the main house's rear gables.
  - f. The garage's East Elevation will feature the aforementioned garage door. See C (1).
  - g. The garage's South Elevation will feature two six-over-six vinyl or aluminum clad windows.
  - h. The two-six-over-six windows will flank a glazed and paneled wooden door.
  - i. A shed roof overhang featuring curvilinear brackets will be located over the South facing door.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

The proposed addition will not be visible from the public view. This inner lot rear addition and garage reconstruction will only be visible from the alley. The addition will in effect connect the house to the garage. The garage, which will maintain its existing footprint, will be extensively remodeled.

In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, the proposed addition and alterations will be differentiated from yet compatible with the massing, form, and materials of the main house. The use of a stuccoed wall treatment will be complementary to, albeit distinguished from the brick walls of the main house. The roof forms and pitch will be based upon those of the main house. The roof sheathing and window type will match the existing. Staff does not believe the proposed addition will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

As per the remodeling of the garage, the existing single story wooden ancillary structure is not of the same architectural caliber and construction as the main house. The reconstructed garage will become a rear wing of the main house though it will continue to function as a garage. It will feature a stuccoed wall treatment matching that of the addition. The fenestration type will match that of the body of the house. The fenestration patterns will remain the same. While the roof pitch will be altered so to better complement the rear gables of the main house and the addition, it will maintain the overall gable with side shed form. The roof will be lower in height than that of the rear addition thereby indicating a transition in

mass and use. Given that the proposed garage reconstruction will maintain the existing building footprint, retain the existing roof form, and match the wall treatment of the addition, Staff does not believe the reconstruction will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

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

**2011-02-CA: 355 Government Street**  
**Applicant: Kim Kearley for the Carnival Museum**  
**Received: 12/20/10**  
**Meeting: 1/5/11**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Church Street East  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-B  
Project: Sign Approval – Install a monument sign.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This 1872 Mobile side hall house with recessed wing was built in 1872 for the Bernstein family. The Italianate style house was designed by Mobile architect James H. Hutchisson.

**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 Carnival Museum last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on October 25, 2004. At that time, the Board approved the construction of the Museum’s entry/gift shop. With this submission, the Museum’s representative proposes the construction of a monument sign.
- B. The Sign Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The height of free standing signs shall not be higher than 8 feet.”
  - 2. “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 as Greek Revival, Italianate, Victorian, Queen Anne, Neoclassic, Craftsman, et al., should use signage of the same style. This can be done through the use of similar decorative features such as columns or brackets.”
  - 3. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.”
  - 4. “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. A multi-tenant building is also limited to a maximum of 64 square feet.”
  - 5. “The total allowable square footage for the display area of a monument sign is (50) square feet, for pole signs 40 square feet, and for projecting signs 40 square feet.”
  - 6. “The structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building. Wood, stucco, stone or brick, is allowed.”
  - 7. “The size of the sign shall be determined by measuring the area within each face of a geometric shape enclosing all elements of informational or representational matter including blank masking. Structural supports not bearing information shall not be

included in the computation of display area. For double faced signs, each side shall be counted toward the maximum allowable square footage.”

**C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**

1. Construct a monument sign.
  - a. Remove the existing monument sign.
  - b. The single faced monument sign will face north toward Government Street.
  - c. The sign will be located between the property’s cast iron fence and the façade’s two-tiered portico.
  - d. Existing landscaping located to the east, south, and west sides of the sign will be retained.
  - e. The monument sign will feature two brick-veneered piers supporting a rectilinear brick sign board.
  - f. The stepped signboard will feature the Museum’s name. The actual signage will be aluminum in composition. It will be applied to and over the sign board. The signboard will feature a precast concrete coping. The height of the sign board and frame measures 6’ 5 ½”.
  - g. An aluminum Carnival figure will surmount the stepped sign board. The figure will be painted in a Carnival associated color scheme.
  - h. A scrolled iron overthrough will surmount the sign board. The Museum’s logo, executed in aluminum lettering, will be affixed to the overthrough. The overthrough will measure 3’ 6” in height.
  - i. The total square footage of the signage measures 37 square feet (plus 7’ additional feet with logo).

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

The Carnival Museum’s existing monument sign is at best minimally visible to pedestrian traffic and barely visible to vehicular traffic. The proposed signage would be located in the same location as the existing signage, which is between the high cast iron fence and the façade’s two tiered portico. An existing u-shaped box hedge would buffer the signage.

In the 1990s, the Board adopted a policy of restricting the height of monument signs to 5 feet in order to maintain a pedestrian friendly environment in the historic districts. Since that time, the only exception granted was to the Riverview Plaza based on the size of the building.

The sign will be comprised of a pair of brick-veneered piers surmounted by a brick sign board. An iron overthrough would be located atop the sign board. The total height of the masonry portion of the sign is 6’ 5 1/2”, well under the 8’ height allotment for signage in the historic districts. The overthrough measures an additional 3’ 6”. The total proposed height of the sign, roughly 10’, will require a sign height variance. Taking into account the height of the property’s fence, the vertical composition of the building, the height of surrounding buildings, and the limited range of view, the overall height of the sign and the overthrough is not disruptive to the visual or proportional aesthetics of the streetscape. Being independent from the building, possible removal and alteration would have no adverse structural effects.

The sign design and materials meet the standards outlined in the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts. The simple form echoes the massing of the building. The bricks will be painted to match the building’s color scheme, thereby blending into the built components of property. The spotting of Carnival associated coloring on the figural motif is in keeping with Museum’s theme, as well as existing Carnival motifs located on grounds.

Staff does not believe this application meets the requirements for monument signs in historic districts.



**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the 1990s policy adopted by the Board and used since that time, Staff believes this application should be denied and would encourage the applicants to return with a sign that meets the 5 foot height restriction.

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

**2011-03-CA: 263 South Cedar Street**  
**Applicant: David Thomas**  
**Received: 11/22/09**  
**Meeting: 1/5/11**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Church Street East  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Install vinyl windows

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This 2000 house constitutes recent infill construction in the Church Street East Historic District.

**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 last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on May 5, 2010. At that time, the Board approved the replacement of the façade’s wooden columns with fiberglass substitutions of the same design. With this submission, the applicant proposes replacing the façade’s four first story wooden windows with vinyl windows. The application was scheduled to be held on December 15, 2010. At the request of the applicant, the submission was heldover for the current meeting.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The type, size and dividing light 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”
  - 2. “Where windows cannot be replaced, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Replace the façade’s four first story wooden windows with vinyl windows.
    - a. The windows will feature the same one-over-one configuration as the existing.
    - b. The windows will not feature applied muntins.
    - c. The windows will have a white finish.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

With regards to windows, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts are directed toward historic and/or contributing structures, not new construction. The installation of vinyl windows is not allowed on historic buildings. This house constitutes traditional infill construction in the Church Street East Historic District. Taking into account the house's recent date of construction (2000), the Guidelines for New Residential Construction Mobile's Historic Districts must be consulted.

The Guidelines for New Construction allow the use of vinyl clad windows, but do not specifically forbid the use of vinyl windows. Mill finished metal windows, along with windows featuring snap-in muntins are deemed inappropriate. Vinyl windows have been discouraged. On September 2, 2009, the Board approved, on a test case basis, the installation of vinyl windows for a new house located at 1562 Blair Avenue. As proposed and installed, those windows utilized stool extensions. The extensions and framing of the windows provide the sense of depth and stability afforded by traditional true-divided-light wooden windows. Staff deems the results successful.

Generally, the Board is looking for a certain dimensionality to the windows. Since this is a brick house and Blair Avenue is a wood house, that dimensionality must come from the window itself. No window sample was submitted and the common vinyl window would not be deemed appropriate in a historic district.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

As submitted, Staff cannot recommend approval of this application.

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

**2011-04-CA: 309 Stocking Street**  
**Applicant: Jewel Davis**  
**Received: 12/20/10**  
**Meeting: 1/5/11**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Leinkauf  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Face a house with a brick veneer. Install interior lot fencing.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This single story Craftsman-influenced house was constructed in 1925.

**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 last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on November 17, 2010. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a rear addition. The owner/applicant returns to the Board with a proposal entailing the installation of a brick veneer around the body of the main house and the addition, as well as submittal for interior lot fencing.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. The exterior of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the existing in profile, dimension and material.”
  - 2. Fencing “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.”
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Face the walls of the main house and the approved addition with a red brick veneer.
  - 2. Install interior lot fencing.
    - a. The proposed aluminum fencing will be six feet in height.
    - b. The fencing will commence at the front plan of the body of the house, from hence it will encircle the rear of the property. The fence will feature an inward opening gate of the same design.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

The two part application calls for the facing of a single story wooden “bungalow” with a brick veneer and installation of an interior lot fencing.

As per the brick veneer, the proposed wall treatment would extend around the house, as well as the recently approved (and soon to be commenced) rear addition. The Design Review Guideline’s for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that original siding should be retained and replaced. Replacements should match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. The wooden siding survives intact. The facing of the wooden siding with a brick veneer would alter the architectural and historical character of the building.

The proposed fencing meets the material and design standards for Mobile’s historic districts.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1), Staff believes the portion of the application pertaining to the installation of a brick veneer to the main house and the addition would impair the architectural and the historical character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of that portion of the application.

Based on B (2), Staff does not believe the portion of the application pertaining to the installation of an interior lot fence would impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this portion of the application.

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

**2011-05-CA:** 158 Michigan Avenue  
**Applicant:** Quick Phones  
**Received:** 12/3/10  
**Meeting:** 1/5/11

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Leinkauf  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: B-2  
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain painted window signage.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

The brick veneered multi-unit commercial building was constructed in the 1970s.

**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 applicant seeks After-the-Fact-Approval of painted window signage.
- B. The Sign Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building.”
  - 2. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.”
  - 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. “The size of the sign shall be determined by measuring the area within each face of a geometric shape enclosing all elements of informational or representational matter including blank masking.”
  - 5. “Signs painted directly on window glass or hung in windows are permitted. Such signs will be counted toward the maximum size requirement, and are limited to 20% of the window area.”
- C. **Scope of Work:**
  - 1. After-the-Fact-Approval: Retain painted window signage.
    - a. The wrap-around painted commercial graphics occupy three east-facing storefront windows as well as two north-facing windows.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This multi-tenant commercial strip was constructed in the 1970s. The franchise holder installed painted window graphics without the issue of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The signage is located in all three of the east-facing plate glass windows and one of the two north-facing plate glass windows. While the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts allow signage graphics painted on windows, the amount of said signage is limited to 20% of the window area. .

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-5), Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and the historical character of the district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.