

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA**  
**October 3, 2012 – 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: HDH General Contractors**
  - a. Property Address: 17 North Monterey Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/21/12
  - c. Reroof garage using architectural shingles to match house. Replace any rotten decking as needed.
2. **Applicant: Dandi Dolbear**
  - a. Property Address: 157 South Jefferson Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/31/12
  - c. Paint house the existing color scheme: Body: Capetown Green (Devoe), Trim: White, Porch Deck & Shutters: Bellingrath Green, Repair siding as needed matching existing in profile, dimension and material.
3. **Applicant: Kelly L. Baker**
  - a. Property Address: 255 State Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/31/12
  - c. Install a 6/6 wood window salvaged from the original house on the second floor, west side. The window will be installed in a previous window area and the trim and casings will match that original to the house. Repairs will be painted to match the existing house.
4. **Applicant: Amy Murchison**
  - a. Property Address: 1501 Brown Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/11/12
  - c. Paint the house in the following Valspar colors: Body – Opal Slate: Trim – White Shutters and Porch Deck – Black Strap: Ceiling – Meander Blue. Repair front porch post to match existing in profile, dimension and materials.
5. **Applicant: Vincent Henderson**
  - a. Property Address: 1416 Eslava Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/10/12
  - c. Project: Install an ancillary structure in the rear of the property. The installation will feature siding matching that found on the principal dwelling.
6. **Applicant: Ron Suggs for Liz Manz-Walters**
  - a. Property Address: 1150 Texas Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/12/12
  - c. Project: Patch existing roof over porch / front face with 3-tab shingles to match existing; replace rotten fascia and soffit boards to match existing in dimension and materials; replace rotten siding as necessary to match existing in dimension and material; replace sills as necessary to match existing in dimension and material.
7. **Applicant: Pete's Foundation**
  - a. Property Address: 311 Chatham Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/10/12
  - c. Project: Level the house. Repair the brick foundation piers.

- 8. Applicant: Joseph Meaher**
  - a. Property Address: 173 South Georgia Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/11/12
  - c. Project: Secure railings on the rear gallery. Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing. Repair a portion of the roof.
- 9. Applicant: Blackard Roofing**
  - a. Property Address: 30 Houston Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/11/12
  - c. Project: Reroof with charcoal black shingles, lifetime roof.
- 10. Applicant: Ronald G. Seale**
  - a. Property Address: 170 Hannon Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/18/12
  - c. Project: Construct a wooden handicap access ramp off the side elevation.
- 11. Applicant: Napoleon Nelson**
  - a. Property Address: 355 Regina Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/17/12
  - c. Project: Re-deck rotten porch first story with tongue and groove to match.
- 12. Applicant: Jason Robinson**
  - a. Property Address: 119 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/17/12
  - c. Project: Paint exterior color Lion's Mane, Olympic color chart.
- 13. Applicant: Richard Brown**
  - a. Property Address: 167 South Georgia Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/18/12
  - c. Project: Remove gutters. Replace rotten fascia, repaint bad spots on body of house, repaint front porch to match.
- 14. Applicant: Bob & Janie Windham**
  - a. Property Address: 17 Blacklawn
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/19/12
  - c. Project: Reroof with asphalt shingles.
- 15. Applicant: Greg Jones**
  - a. Property Address: 1115 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/24/12
  - c. Project: Revise a portion of a Certificate of Appropriateness issued on 7 March 2012. This revision calls for a 4' 2" x 6' menu sign.
- 16. Applicant: Linda Matt**
  - a. Property Address: 460 Wisconsin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/21/12
  - c. Project: Reroof with GAF Timberline, slate in color.
- 17. Applicant: Patrick Reed with Foresite Towers, LLC**
  - a. Property Address: 401 Civic Center Drive
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/24/12
  - c. Project: Replace mechanical equipment located within the existing electrical and cellular enclosure.
- 18. Applicant: John V. Lee**
  - a. Property Address: 263 North Conception Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/21/12
  - c. Project: Repair / replace rotten siding, lattice work, column bases, steps, handrails as needed to match existing in dimension and material. Repaint existing paint scheme. Reglaze windows as necessary.
- 19. Applicant: Jim Webb**

- a. Property Address: 250 South Georgia Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 9/21/12
- c. Project: Replacing rotten boards and paint to match.

**20. Applicant: Ida Knapp**

- a. Property Address: 115 Houston Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/21/12
- c. Project: Install 3' picket fence around the perimeter of front yard. To be painted white or color of house (light grey).

**C. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2012-54-CA: 714 Dauphin Street**

- a. Applicant: Robert A. Cummings for Wendell Quimby
- b. Project: Site Redevelopment – Install hardscaping, landscaping, and fencing.

**2. 2012-57-CA: 211 Dauphin Street**

- a. Applicant: Richard Armstrong with Modern Signs for Pita Pit
- b. Project: Signage – Install new wall signage.

**3. 2012-58-CA: 3-5 South Royal Street**

- a. Applicant: Rick Armstrong with Modern Signs for John Serda
- b. Project: Signage - Install a new hanging sign.

**4. 2012-59-CA: 1550 Government Street**

- a. Applicant: Craig Inabinett with Rainbow Signs for Winn Dixie
- b. Project: Signage – Install additional signage on an existing pole sign.

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

- 1. Midmonth Approvals – Staff request for additional approvals
- 2. 1401 Blacklawn - Roofing Review and Discussion
- 3. Discussion

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

**2012-54-CA: 714 Dauphin Street**  
**Applicant: Wendell Quimby**  
**Received: 9/17/12**  
**Meeting: 10/3/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Site Redevelopment – Install hardscaping, landscaping, and fencing.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This single story commercial building dates from the 1930s.

**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 September 5, 2012. At that time, the applicant withdrew an application calling for the redevelopment of the rear portion of the lot. The applicant’s representative returns to the Board with a revised application reflecting recommendations included in the earlier Staff Report and suggestions discussed during the September 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “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.”
  - 2. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.”
  - 3. “Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting. Asphalt is inappropriate for walkways.”
  - 4. “The appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design. New materials such as grasspave and grasscrete, which provide a solid parking surface while still allowing grass to grow giving the appearance of a continuance of the lawn, may be a feasible alternative.”
  - 5. “Parking areas should be screened from view by use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences or landscaping.”
  - 6. “Ordinances relating to parking and landscaping will be enforced by the City of Mobile Urban Development Department in reviewing requests for parking lots.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Conduct site preparations.
  - a. Remove the existing concrete paving.
  - b. Remove wooden posts located in the northern portion of the lot.
2. Install hardscaping (curbcuts, curbing, and parking surfaces).
  - a. The total square footage of asphalt hardscaping will be 2358.23 square feet.
  - b. Concrete curbing will be employed.
  - c. A west-facing curbcut accessing North Scott Street will allow for ingress and egress.
    - i. The inner width of the curbcut will measure 24'.
    - ii. The outer width of the curbcut will measure 46.97'.
3. Install fencing.
  - a. Install a 4' high powder-coated, black painted aluminum fence.
  - b. The fence will feature fleur-de-lis finials.
4. Install landscaping.
  - a. Landscaping will extend the lengths of the western and northern portions of the rear lot. A landscape station will be located in the area's southeast corner.
  - b. Seven Live Oak trees will be planted along the Spring Hill Avenue and North Scott Street perimeters.
  - c. Pride of Mobile azaleas and oleanders will be planted along the Spring Hill Avenue and North Scott Street perimeters.
  - d. A Bradford Pear tree and azaleas will be planted in the southeast corner landscape station.

### **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application calls for the redevelopment of a vacant rear portion of property whose principle building faces Dauphin Street. The lot would be utilized for parking and the redevelopment would entail the installation of hardscaping, fencing, and landscaping. In this revised application, the amount of green space has increased, the type and number of plantings have increased, and the plan has been altered. These changes reflect previous Staff recommendations and Board discussion.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that good site planning and landscaping can minimize the effect of parking areas (See B-4). By locating a single curbcut along North Scott Street, the more trafficked Spring Hill Avenue expanse will not be affected by hardsurfacing that would engage the right of way. Landscaping would extend along both North Scott and Spring Hill Avenue sides of the lot and will therefore minimize the visual impact of the paved surfaces (See B-3). A large section of landscaping would be located in the prominent northwest corner. The overall square footage of landscape exceeds the required. The fencing is of an appropriate design, approved height, and acceptable material (See B-1)

Staff has consulted City Planning, Right of Way, and Traffic Engineering with regard to the plan. Representatives of all three of these departments do not foresee issues relating to their respective approvals (See B-6).

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-6), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

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

**2012-57-CA: 211 Dauphin Street**  
**Applicant: Ricky Armstrong with Modern Signs for Matt Lemond and Carlos Serrano**  
**Received: 9/17/12**  
**Meeting: 10/3/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Signage – Install a wall sign.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to MHDC Staff files, the shell of this building dates from 1876. A vestige of the building’s nineteenth-century appearance can be discerned in the façade’s stepped and raked parapet. Remodeled during the middle third of the Twentieth Century, the building’s ground floor features a theatrical recessed 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 property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application appearing before the Board calls for the installation of a wall sign.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Signs shall be mounted or placed so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building.”
  - 2. “The overall design of all signage including the mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property.”
  - 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 building, not exceed 64 square feet.”
  - 5. With regard to materials “neon may be appropriate.”

**C. Scope of Work (per submitted design):**

- 1. Install a wall sign within centered lower portion of the façade’s upper story.
  - a. The total square footage will amount to 31.8 square feet.
  - b. The aluminum sign will feature a neon outline.
  - c. The name of the franchise will constitute the sign design.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the installation of a new wall sign. When reviewing applications for wall signage the following criteria are taken into account: size, placement/mounting, materials, lighting, and design.

The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street address signage size on three counts: overall proportion; linear square footage; and maximum square footage (See B-3 and B-4). The overall allowable square footage for this property is thirty-two square feet on account of the one and one half square feet per linear front foot requirement. The total square footage is currently met by a sign that was approved for an existing sign case.

In accord with Sign Design Guidelines, no architectural details and features would be obscured by locating the sign in the proposed location (See B-1). The manner of installation would not impact any historic materials.

Neon signage would not be inappropriate for this remodeled storefront (See B-5).

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (4), Staff believes this sign will impair the architectural and historical character of the building and the surrounding district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application on account of the sign size restrictions.

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

**2012-58-CA: 3-5 South Royal Street**  
**Applicant: Rick Armstrong with Modern Signs for John Serda**  
**Received: 9/17/12**  
**Meeting: 10/3/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Signage – Install a new hanging sign.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This building was constructed circa 1850. Originally four stories in height, the building was reduced in height to three stories and the façade refaced during the middle third of the Twentieth-Century. A 1990s restoration and renovation recaptured much of the building’s architectural and historical character.

**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 17, 2008. At that time, the Board approved the installation of the building’s existing hanging sign. This application calls for the replacement of the aforementioned sign.
- B. The Sign Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Signs shall be mounted or placed so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building.”
  - 2. “The overall design of all signage including the mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property.”
  - 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 building, not exceed 64 square feet.
  - 5. “Internally lit signs are prohibited.”
  - 6. “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 design):**
  - 1. Remove the existing hanging sign.
  - 2. Install a new hanging sign.
    - a. The total square footage of the double-faced sign will measure 28.26 square feet.



- b. The aluminum sign will feature the name and logo of the ground floor commercial establishment.
- c. The sign will be suspended from aluminum overthrow.
- d. The “Serda” lettering will employ reverse channel illumination.
- e. The bird logo and “Coffee Company” lettering will employ LED illumination.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the installation of new hanging sign. When reviewing applications for wall signage the following criteria are taken into account: size, placement, materials, lighting, and design.

Taking into account the building’s existing signage and the sign size regulations, the proposed sign meets the proportional, overall and linear feet sign requirements (See B-3 and B-4). Though staff believes the overall design of the sign is in keeping with the surrounding district, internally lit plastic signs are not allowed (See B-5, possibly B-6).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (5-6), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and the historical character of the surrounding district. Staff does not recommend approval of the sign on account of the proposed lighting.

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

**2012-59-CA: 1550 Government Street**  
**Applicant: Craig Inabinett with Rainbow Signs for Winn Dixie**  
**Received: 9/11/12**  
**Meeting: 10/3/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Signage – Install additional signage on an existing pole sign.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This non-contributing commercial building houses a Winn Dixie. The site has been historically associated with the Weinacker name since the late Nineteenth Century. The property has featured a succession of grocery store buildings whose designs reflected changing notions of architectural form and consumer habits – from a corner store to big box commercial strip.

**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 installation of new wall signage. The proposal before the Board would entail the addition of another sign box on an existing pole sign. The proposed double-faced signage measures a total of 108.8 square feet. The Board of Zoning Adjustment approved this increase to the property’s signage allotment on August 6, 2012. On January 5, 1995, the aforementioned Board granted a variance for up to 200 square feet in wall signage.
- B. The Sign Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. Without issue of a variance, “The total allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not exceed 64 square feet.”
  - 2. “The height of freestanding signs shall not be higher than eight feet.”
  - 3. “The total allowable square footage for the display area of a monument sign is (50) fifty square feet, for pole signs 40 square feet, and for projecting signs 40 square feet.”
  - 4. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.”
  - 5. With regard to materials “plastic, vinyl or similar materials are prohibited.”
  - 6. Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination.”
  - 7. “The overall design of all signage including the mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property. For buildings without a recognizable

style, the sign design shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors.”

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

1. Install a double-faced sign between the supports of an existing pole sign.
  - a. Each face of the sign will measure 4’ in height by 13’ 6” in width.
  - b. The total square footage of the signage will be 108.8’.
  - c. The sign will feature reverse channel LED illumination.
  - d. The metal sign cage will be faced with a panaflex panels.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the installation of new hanging sign. When reviewing applications for wall signage the following criteria are taken into account: size; height; materials; lighting; and design.

While the total square footage of the proposed sign falls within a recently allowed sign variance, pole signs are restricted to a maximum total square footage of 40 square feet (See B-1 and B-3)

The height of free-standing signage is restricted to height of 8’. The proposed sign would be located higher than eight feet above the ground level (See B-2)

The proposed materials are not in accord with the Sign Design Guidelines (See B-5).

Though the Board of Zoning Adjustment has approved an increase in the amount of square footage of signage allowed on the site, this violates the height requirements and size requirements for pole signs. Staff believes that this signage is typical of the signage found along Airport Boulevard and is not appropriate for a historic district.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (2-3), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and the historical character of the surrounding district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application for reasons of its size on this type of sign, its materials, its lighting and its height.