

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA
May 5, 2010 – 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: Marsha Sutton

- a. Property Address: 208 South Warren Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/13/10
- c. Project: Repair and replace the balusters on the porches. Repair the window sills and frames. All work will match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Paint the work to match the existing color scheme.

2. Applicant: Mike Maddox

- a. Property Address: 19 South Lafayette Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/13/10
- c. Project: Paint house, body light blue, trim white.

3. Applicant: Thomas Neese

- a. Property Address: 8 North Julia Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/14/10
- c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair and replace rotten woodwork when necessary. The repair and replacement will match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.

4. Applicant: Information Transport Solutions

- a. Property Address: 1000 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/14/10
- c. Project: Install a wooden hand rail to one side of the back porch stairs. The railing design will match the balustrade of the porch. Repair a damaged window. The work will match the existing.

5. Applicant: Wayne Dobbs

- a. Property Address: 151 South Claiborne Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/15/10
- c. Project: Repair and replace the porch ceiling to match the existing.

6. Applicant: David T. McConnell

- a. Property Address: 2251 Ashland Place Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 4/15/10
- c. Project: Reroof with Timberline shingles. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.

7. Applicant: Wrico Signs

- a. Property Address: 1960 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/15/10
- c. Project: Reface the “tag line” of the existing aluminum sign. The refaced section will match the materials the existing sign.

8. Applicant: Robert Tacon

- a. Property Address: 16 South Ann Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/15/10
- c. Project: Install a concrete drive where the existing shell driveway is located.

- 9. Applicant: Kristen Gartman Rogers**
- Property Address: 352 McDonald Avenue
 - Date of Approval: 4/18/10
 - Project: Paint the existing aluminum siding Olympic's Toasted Almond. Install a utility shed in the backyard. The shed will have minimal visibility from the street. The siding will be painted to match the house. The roofing will match the house.
- 10. Applicant: Connie Arensberg**
- Property Address: 1563 Fearnway
 - Date of Approval: 4/16/10
 - Project: Paint the house in the following Olympic color scheme: Body: Sprig of Ivy D68-3; Porch and steps: Old Dauphin Way Green; Trim: white or Bone White D20-3; and Door: Apple a Day B35-6.
- 11. Applicant: David and Rosemary Van Lent**
- Property Address: 115-117 North Julia Street
 - Date of Approval: 4/19/10
 - Project: Install a six foot aluminum interior lot gate and fence to either side of the building. The section of fence will extend from south lot line to the southwest corner of the house, recessed within the lot. The aluminum gate, which will swing inward, will be located at the point where the existing six foot fence transitions to a four foot fence. Construct a storage/garden shed according to MHDC stock plans in the back yard, five feet from the rear/east lot line.
- 12. Applicant: Forrest Raley**
- Property Address: 1556 Blair Avenue
 - Date of Approval: 4/19/10
 - Project: Repair rotten woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Retouch the paint. Retouch the staining on front door.
- 13. Applicant: Ormandos Mark Jackson**
- Property Address: 507 Saint Francis Street
 - Date of Approval: 4/19/10
 - Project: Install a white gravel drive between the house and the adjoining house to the east. The drive will be approximately 10 feet wide. The drive will extend approximately 80 feet within the lot.
- 14. Applicant: Jimmy Stauter**
- Property Address: 1708 McGill Avenue
 - Date of Approval: 4/20/10
 - Project: Repair siding. The work will match the existing. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.
- 15. Applicant: William Hodge**
- Property Address: 1023 Dauphin Street
 - Date of Approval: 4/20/10
 - Project: Repair the roof. The work will match the existing.
 - paint per the existing color scheme.
- 16. Applicant: Michael Scheurmann**
- Property Address: 118 Houston Street
 - Date of Approval: 4/23/10
 - Project: Install 3' front yard picket fence along north property line running from sidewalk to solid face of the house; install 6' privacy fence along north property line from face of house to rear property line.
- 17. Applicant: Chuck Dixon**
- Property Address: 908 Palmetto Street
 - Date of Approval: 4/23/10

- c. Project: Install rear deck per submitted plan. Trim and railings to match existing back porch.

18. Applicant: William Lott

- a. Property Address: 960 Palmetto Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/22/10
- c. Project: Repair foundation to far left support. Changes will not alter the appearance of the element or the structure. Paint the house in current color scheme. Repair any rotten wood to match the existing in profile, dimension and material.

19. Applicant: John Thomas

- a. Property Address: 1419 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/21/10
- c. Project: Refurbish and reseal front stained glass windows.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2010-37-CA: 121 Bush Avenue

- a. Applicant: Chris Bowen
- b. Project: Demolition of a house.

2. 2010-38-CA: 1550 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Image Designs Inc. for Winn Dixie
- b. Project: Sign Approval - Mount three wall signs to the building's east elevation.

3. 2010-39-CA: 124 Ryan Avenue

- a. Applicant: Charles Weems for Thomas S. Rue
- b. Project: Alter fenestration on the side elevations. Screen a back porch.

4. 2010-40-CA: 263 South Cedar Street

- a. Applicant: David L. Thomas, Sr.
- b. Project: Replace the front porch's wooden columns and railing with fiberglass versions replicating the existing.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Opacity of fences and fences on berms
- 2. Guidelines
- 3. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2010-37-CA: 121 Bush Avenue
Applicant: Chris Bowen
Received: 4/12/10
Meeting: 5/5/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition of a house

BUILDING HISTORY

This house dates from the first quarter of the 20th Century. The original house consisted of a shotgun with a recessed wing. Later additions and porch enclosures expanded the dwelling.

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. A March 15, 2010 fire gutted the interior and the majority of the exterior. The structural unsound building poses safety concerns.
- B. In regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the board shall consider:
 - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
This building is a contributing structure within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The gradual and piecemeal nature of the house’s expansion is illustrative of earlier approaches to home expansion.
 - ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;

1. While not an exemplar of a particular architectural style or building type, this house contributes to the physical density and rhythm of Bush Avenue's largely intact streetscape.
 - iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced.
 - iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 1. While the house is not a surviving example of a single architectural style, the building does evidence the evolution and expansion of a small one story single family dwelling over the last three quarters of the 20th Century.
 - v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 1. The applicant is investigating the feasibility and options of rebuilding. If granted approval, the applicant will demolish the house and if possible submit plans for a new duplex. The initial plan is to demolish the house and clear the lot.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The owner acquired the property in August of 1997 for \$42,000.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. The applicant has considered rebuilding on the property.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. Not applicable.
 - ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 1. Not applicable.
 - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 1. Not given
 - xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and
 1. Check submitted.
 - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
 - 1.
3. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Demolish the house.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. Does the applicant plan to landscape the lot?

STAFF ANALYSIS

When reviewing demolition requests, three considerations are taken into account: the significance of the building; the condition of the building; and the nature of the proposed redevelopment. While the house is contributing building within the district and a component to the streetscape, it does not represent a particular building type or style. With regard to the building's condition, the March 15, 2010 fire gutted the house's interior. The rear portion of the house is a burned shell. Though the façade and south elevations appear salvageable, the house is structurally and materially unsound. The applicant is investigating rebuilding options.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), as well as concerns for fire and safety, Staff recommends approval of the demolition request, but reminds the owner that any new structure will have to be approved by the Architectural Review Board.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2010-38-CA: 1550 Government Street
Applicant: Image Designs Inc. for Winn Dixie
Received: 4/14/10
Meeting: 5/5/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Sign Approval – Mount three signs to the building’s east elevation.

BUILDING HISTORY

This non-contributing building houses a Winn Dixie supermarket.

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 January 7, 2009. At that time, the Board approved renovations to the building’s exterior. As part of the ongoing interior and exterior rehabilitations, the applicants propose mounting three aluminum signs to the building’s east elevation. On January 9, 1995, the Board of Zoning Adjustment granted a sign variance allowing up to 200 square feet of signage for the property.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The overall design of the signage including 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, Neo-classic, 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.”
 - 2. “For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors.”
 - 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. Structural supports not bearing information shall not be included in the computation of display area.”

5. "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."
 6. "Internally lit signs are prohibited."
 7. "Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination. Such lighting shall not shine into or create glare at pedestrian or vehicular traffic, nor shall it shine into adjacent areas"
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):
1. Mount a wall sign over the building's main entrance
 - a. "WINN DIXIE" and an intermediate check symbol will comprise the sign design.
 - b. The sign will feature an aluminum face.
 - c. The sign will feature plastic backing.
 - d. The sign will feature "V" Series LED illumination.
 - e. The silhouetted indirect illumination will project toward the wall.
 - f. The sign will measure 5'8" in height and 29' 10 1/2" in length.
 - g. The distance from the ground to the bottom of the sign will measure 16' 4".
 - h. The distance from the ground to the top of the sign will measure 22'.
 2. Mount two individually lettered signs north of the building's main entrance.
 - a. The signs will feature aluminum facings.
 - b. The signs will feature plastic backing.
 - c. The signs will feature "V" Series LED illumination.
 - d. The signs' silhouetted indirect illumination will project toward the wall.
 - e. The sign featuring the lettering "FOOD" will measure 1 1/2' in height & 5' 7" in length.
 - f. The distance from the ground to the bottom of the sign will measure 12'.
 - g. The distance from the ground to the top of the sign will measure 13 1/2'.
 - h. The sign featuring the lettering "PHARMACY" will measure 1 1/2' in height & 12' in length.
 - i. The distance from the ground to the bottom of the sign will measure 12'.
 - j. The distance from the ground to the top of the sign will measure 13 1/2'.

STAFF ANALYSIS

When evaluating signage requests, sign size, material, and lighting are taken into account. The total square footage of the three is under the 200 square foot sign variance granted to the property. The signage designs and materials meet the standards established by the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street. With regard lighting, the proposed indirect, backlit, silhouetted LED illumination is a form of approvable reverse channel lighting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-7), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical integrity of the district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2010-39-CA: 124 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: Charles Weems for Thomas S. Rue
Received: 4/15/10
Meeting: 5/5/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Alter the fenestration on the side elevations. Screen a rear porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

This classically detailed one-and-one-half story house was built in 1927.

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 applicants propose the alteration of side elevation fenestration and the screening of a rear porch.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, 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.”
 - 2. “The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
 - 3. “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 the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Project I – Alter the fenestration on the side elevations.
 - a. Remove the north elevation’s two louvered quadrant windows.
 - b. Install a glazed lunette in the center of the gable.
 - c. The lunette will measure 54” in length x 2 ½’ in height.
 - d. Remove the louvers from the south elevation’s single quadrant window.
 - e. Install a framed and glazed window unit within the existing window opening.
 - f. Paint the work to match the existing color scheme.
 - 2. Project II - Screen the rear porch.
 - a. Dimensional wood framing will secure the screening.

- b. The screening and framing will conform to the existing porch bays.
- c. Paint the work to match the existing color scheme.

STAFF ANALYSIS

While the Guidelines state the window openings should be maintained and preserved, staff believes the proposed alterations to the side elevations' attic level fenestration would not impair the architectural integrity of the house. Converting attic spaces to usable living space is a traditional treatment and the installation of windows in the gable ends is a typical method. The lunette proposed for the north elevation echoes the classical detailing and curved forms of the façade. Trees and landscaping obscure views from the public right of way. The proposed glazing of the south elevation's single quadrant window would likewise be minimally visible from the public right of way. Removing the louvers and installing glazing would not alter the configuration and rhythm of the south elevation's fenestration.

Screening is a prevalent practice characteristic of 20th century regional architecture. The proposed screening of the back porch would not alter the form or integrity of the house. The porch is minimally visible from the public right of way. The framing of the screening will conform to the existing porch bays.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical integrity of the house or the district therefore recommends approval of this application. Staff further recommends that the north elevation's louvered vents be saved on site.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2010-40-CA: 263 South Cedar Street
Applicant: Mr. David L. Thomas, Sr.
Received: 4/19/10
Meeting: 5/5/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace the wooden front porch columns and railing with fiberglass versions matching the existing.

BUILDING HISTORY

This 2000 house constitutes recent infill construction in the Church 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. Since receiving construction approval, this property has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The exterior of a building helps define its style.”
 - 2. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture...Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions, and decorative details.”
 - 3. “Modern materials which have the same textural qualities and character as materials of nearby historic buildings may be acceptable.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Replace the front porch’s wooden columns and balustrade with fiberglass versions replicating the originals.
 - 2. The columns will not be fluted.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This house constitutes non-contributing or non historic infill. The proposed replacement columns and balustrade will match the existing. The Guidelines for New Construction allow the use of modern materials. Given the house's recent construction and the proposed replication, the change will not detract from the integrity of the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical character of the district. Staff recommends approval of the application.