

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA
September 15, 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: Coulson Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 261 Rapier Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/20/10
 - c. Project: Patch/repair roof matching existing in profile, dimension, materials and color.
- 2. Applicant: Valerie & Michael Dumas**
 - a. Property Address: 963 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/24/10
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten siding to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint.
- 3. Applicant: R & J Home & Repair, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 357-359 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/24/10
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork on the rear of the building. Paint the work to match the existing.
- 4. Applicant: R & J Home & Repair, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 126 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/24/10
 - c. Project: Repair the roof joists and rafters. Reroof the building with shingles to match the existing. Repair and replace window frames and sashes to match the existing. Repaint the work per the existing color scheme.
- 5. Applicant: Brian & Julie Evans**
 - a. Property Address: 21 South Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/24/10
 - c. Project: Repaint the porch bricks white.
- 6. Applicant: Joe Pomeroy with Thomas Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 33 Houston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/26/10
 - c. Project: Reroof the house to match the existing.
- 7. Applicant: Juanita Owens**
 - a. Property Address: 7 North Pine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/27/10
 - c. Project: Paint the house per a color scheme to be submitted at a later date.
- 8. Applicant: Juanita Owens**
 - a. Property Address: 153 South Broad Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/27/10
 - c. Project: Paint the house per a color scheme to be submitted at a later date.
- 9. Applicant: Montdrakgo Caldwell**
 - a. Property Address: 1064 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/27/10

- c. Project: Repair and replace woodwork to match the existing. Touch up the paint to match the existing. Repair and repaint the fence.
- 10. Applicant: Margaret Stone**
 - a. Property Address: 103 Houston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/30/10
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with 3-tab asphalt shingles.
- 11. Applicant: Homer McClure**
 - a. Property Address: 113 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/31/10
 - c. Project: Repair tree damage to roof, and reroof damaged area to match.
- 12. Applicant: Sign Pro**
 - a. Property Address: 111 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: Sign Pro for Tracy Host
 - c. Project: Suspend a wooden sign measuring 2' 5" in height and 2' 6" in length from brackets located under the overhang.
- 13. Applicant: Murray School**
 - a. Property Address: 1257 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/30/10
 - c. Project: Alter the metal lettering of the existing monument sign.
- 14. Applicant: Ray Lamb**
 - a. Property Address: 1551 Monterey Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/1/10
 - c. Project: Add flashing about the chimney.
- 15. Applicant: Liz Carnahan**
 - a. Property Address: 103 Levert Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/1/10
 - c. Project: Rebuild a fence in the same location, same design and six feet in height. The finished side will be to the outside. The fence will be left natural.
- 16. Applicant: Caroline Gage**
 - a. Property Address: 260 Roper Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/2/10
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with grey asphalt shingles to match the existing.
- 17. Applicant: First Baptist Church of Mobile**
 - a. Property Address: 806 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/2/10
 - c. Project: Temporarily remove the corner stone for repairs. The corner stone will be reinstalled once the repairs are complete. Repoint brickwork. The repair work will be done to match the existing.

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 2010-66-CA: 1055 Augusta Street**
 - a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Mr. Palmer C. Hamilton
 - b. Project: Restore and alter the front elevation. Alter the rear elevation. Install fencing.
- 2. 2010-67-CA: 115 Dauphin Street**
 - a. Applicant: Ben Cummings for Hargrove and Associates
 - b. Project: Remodel the first floor storefront.
- 3. 2010-68-CA: 76 South Lafayette Street**
 - a. Applicant: Tracy Nelson
 - b. Project: Reroof the house with metal shingles.

4. 2010-69-CA: 1564 Old Shell Road

- a. Applicant: Ronald G. E. Smith
- b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain an interior lot privacy fence.

5. 2010-70-CA: 1515 Eslava Street

- a. Applicant: Kimberly Stewart
- b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Remove front porch infill. Install a new hollow panel front door. Remove a later rear addition. Retain the aluminum window replacements.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Guidelines
- 2. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2010-66-CA: 1055 Augusta Street
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Mr. Palmer C. Hamilton
Received: 8/25/10
Meeting: 9/15/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Restore and alter the front elevation. Alter the rear elevation. Install fencing.

BUILDING HISTORY

This circa 1850 Creole cottage was originally located on Conti Street. The house was renovated in the 1920s and relocated to Augusta Street in 1975.

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 house has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. In an effort to restore the house to its 1850s appearance, the applicant proposes removing the Arts and Crafts influenced features dating from 1920s.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
1. “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.”
 2. “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with the style of the building.”
 3. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
 4. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
 5. “The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
 6. “Original doors and openings should be retained. Replacements should reflect the age and style of the building.”

7. “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. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Alter the front porch’s columnar piers.
 - a. Remove the later bases from the pier shafts.
 - b. Repair the bases. The subtle tapering of the shafts will be maintained.
 - c. Cut 3” half round ventilation holes in the bases of the columnar piers.
 - d. Install cornice moldings and necking on the columnar piers.
2. Reinstall a railing between the front porch’s columnar piers. The railing will match the original (as evidenced by “ghost” marks documenting the form and measurements of the original railing).
3. Alter the eave treatment.
 - a. Clip the rafters, sheathing, and roofing (for the northern elevation/facade only).
 - b. Box the porch cornice.
 - c. Add cornice returns.
 - d. Install a prefabricated drip edge to match the existing.
 - e. Remove the existing cove moulding.
 - f. Install a 2” wooden bead mold.
4. Alter aspects of the rear elevation.
 - a. Remove a later window located on the rear elevation’s enclosed porch.
 - b. Extend the lattice field to cover C (4).
 - c. Remove the existing wooden steps.
 - d. Install new wooden steps.
 - e. Remove the existing French doors.
 - f. Install a pair of paneled and glazed wooden French doors.
 - g. Extend the roof overhang over the new steps.
5. Install a 6’ section of fence between the southwest corner of the house and the south lot line.
 - a. The wooden fence will feature a centrally located wooden gate.

STAFF ANALYSIS

In applications that call for the removal later features, the significance of those later alterations must be taken into account. This application involves the restoration and renovation of a Creole cottage. The restoration calls for the removal of later bungalow-like details and treatments. Based on the 1970s relocation and alterations to the house, Staff does not believe that the remaining Craftsman-influenced alterations constitute the essential character-defining features of the house.

The front porch’s columnar piers were altered at a later date. The Guidelines state that historic porches should reflect their period. The existing bases are not an original feature. The repair of the piers will adhere to the subtle tapering of the shafts. Cutting ventilation holes in the piers will not jeopardize the integrity or structure of the piers. The installation of necking and mouldings on the piers would alter neither the historical nor aesthetic integrity of the house. Necking and mouldings of the types proposed were standard pier features for the period.

“Ghost” marks on the corner posts indicate the presence of a porch railing. The proposed railing will replicate the missing original railing. The Staff File for the property has photographs indicating the presence of the railings. The reinstallation will recapture additional historical integrity.

The Guidelines state that roofs should maintain their historic appearance. This roof has been altered on multiple occasions. Two earlier roofs survive under the existing roof. The existing roof has been altered on at least one occasion. Given the altered state of the existing later roof, the alteration of the eave treatment to one more in keeping with style and date of the house would not jeopardize the historical or architectural integrity of the building.

The work proposed for the rear elevation will be restricted to the enclosed porch located off the later rear wing. The removal of the modern window and the subsequent extension of lattice would allow the enclosed space to “read” more as a porch than as a part of the body of the house. The stairs and windows meet the design and material standards established by the Guidelines.

The fencing meets the height and material standards established by the Guidelines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2010-67-CA: **115 Dauphin Street**
Applicant: **Ben Cummings for Hargrove and Associates**
Received: **8//10**
Meeting: **9/15/10**

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Remodel the first floor storefront and restore the second story.

BUILDING HISTORY

This building was constructed in 1914. As an early manifestation of the Kress Five & Dime’s emerging corporate identity, the façade features buff colored brick and bas relief carvings.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

1. 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 portion of the Old Kress Building has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicant’s representative proposes minor alterations to the altered ground floor store front and maintenance related repairs for the second story.
- B. The Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Design Review Guidelines state, in pertinent part:
 1. “Preserve original ornamentation and details of the façade.”
 2. “Maintain the established relationships of the existing detail.”
 3. Patterns and rhythms create a visual harmony in commercial districts. New construction and alterations should respect the already established streetscape.”
 4. “Many changes over time occurred to storefronts in the LDSCD...Maintaining the line of the storefronts at the edge is an important tangible pedestrian element. Maintaining recessed entries is also an important design element. The rhythm of recessed entrances on the street contributes to the visual continuity and is encouraged on all buildings. Recessed entries identify the entrance and provide shelter.”
 5. “Use doors with large areas of glass.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 1. Alter the fenestration of the later first floor storefront.
 - a. Remove the easternmost pair of aluminum doors comprising the first floor’s later recessed entrance.
 - b. The frame of C (1) (a) will remain in situ.
 - c. Remove the threshold and hardware of C (1) (a).
 - d. Install a new storefront unit in the location of C (1) (a). The dimensions of the bay and

transom will remain the same. The storefront unit will match the existing in both finish and treatment.

- e. Install a single door in the recessed entrance's canted eastern bay.
 - f. The aluminum unit will feature sidelights and a transom.
 - g. Remove the red banner board. The architect will consult Staff once the banner board is removed in order to discuss possible treatments for that portion of the façade.
2. Clean and repair the storefront's second story.
- a. Clean the brick and terracotta ornamentation with soap and water.
 - b. Remove all non-functioning electrical equipment from the façade.
 - c. Scrape, grind, and sand the steel windows.
 - d. Close and fix the windows, repairing and reglazing when necessary.
 - e. Repair and repaint the intermediate/mezzanine level fenestration. All repairs and Possible replacements will match the existing. The color will match the existing.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The first floor of this building has been altered on at two previous occasions. The fenestration changes proposed for the first floor storefront would not alter the visual rhythm of the façade or the streetscape. The aluminum window unit will fit into the bay occupied by the existing easternmost double door unit. The finish and the materials will match the existing. The frame and finish of the new door unit will match the existing units.

The maintenance-related work proposed for the second story would neither endanger the historic materials nor impair the integrity of the façade. The applicant's representative has expressed in the plans and over the phone that only the gentlest means will be used to clean and repair the façade. Staff will work coordinate with the architect and the Board regarding the treatment of the area occupied by the banner board.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-5), Staff does not believe this application impairs 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

2010-68-CA: 76 South Lafayette Street
Applicant: Tracy Nelson
Received: 8/30/10
Meeting: 9/15/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Reroof the house with metal shingles.

BUILDING HISTORY

This gabled-roofed and porch-fronted bungalow was constructed prior to 1925. A nearly identical house stands several lots north on Lafayette Street.

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 house has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicant proposes replacing the existing asphalt shingled roof with a faux slate roof.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Reroof the house with faux slate shingles.
 - 2. The shingles will match those found at 910 Government Street.
 - 3. The roofing shingles will be grey in color.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Faux and alternative roofing treatments are reviewed on a case by case basis. The style of the house and the type of roofing are two concerns that are taken into consideration. With regard to the style and/or type

of the house, this house is commonly known is an Arts and Crafts informed bungalow. Houses of this style and type did feature slate roofs. As per the proposed roofing type, it has been previously approved by the Board on another property. Staff does not believe the proposed roofing impairs the architectural or the historical integrity of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2010-69-CA: **1564 Old Shell Road**
Applicant: **Ronald E. Smith**
Received: **8/30/10**
Meeting: **8/15/10**

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain an interior lot privacy fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This property features a circa 1840 Creole cottage. The house was remodeled in the 1920s and 1950s.

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 installed interior lot privacy fencing along the eastern lot line without obtaining a Certificate of Appropriateness or a building permit. The applicant appears before the Board with a request to retain the fence.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation 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. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face toward [the] public view. All variances required by the Board of Adjustment must be obtained prior to issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.”
- C. Scope of Work :
 - 1. Retain an authorized interior lot privacy fence.
 - a. The wooden fence extends along the eastern lot line.
 - b. The fence steps down in height from 6’ to 5’ to 4’ as it advances southward.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Most houses in Mobile's historic districts feature relatively small front lawns. This house, along with the neighboring properties to the east and west, is set back within a large lot. While this fence qualifies as interior lot fencing, portions of the 6' high and the whole of the 5' and 4' high sections of fencing extend beyond the front plane of both 1564 and 1562 Old Shell Road. The Board has generally ruled that fences of six feet or higher should not extend beyond the front plane of the house. Though the fence steps down in height in accordance with previous board rulings, it is partially visible to westward bound traffic. Taking the size of the lawn, distance of the house from the street, and fence's step down to the street, Staff does not believe the fence impairs the integrity of the property or the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of the application on the condition that applicant shadow box those portions which face the public view.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2010-70-CA: 1515 Eslava Street
Applicant: Kimberly Stewart
Received: 8/26/10
Meeting: 9/15/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Remove a front porch infill. Install a new hollow panel front door. Remove a later rear addition. Retain the aluminum window replacements.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Craftsman influenced bungalow was built in the 1928.

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 for the removal a later front porch enclosure, the installation of a metal door, the demolition of a later rear addition, and the installation of vinyl-clad windows.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “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.”
 - 2. “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with the style of the building.”
 - 3. “Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Replacement [doors] should respect the age and style of the building.”
 - 4. “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 openings.”
 - 5. “Where windows cannot be repaired, 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. Remove the front porch infill.
 - 2. Install wooden siding on the portions of the façade once fronted by the porch infill.
 - 3. Install a new hollow paneled front door.

4. Remove a later rear addition.
5. Retain the aluminum replacement windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicant's contractor neglected to obtain a building permit before removing the porch enclosure, rear addition, and windows. Because this work was done without a permit the Board and Staff were not afforded the opportunity to view the conditions of the building before the structure was altered.

The front porch was enclosed at an early date. The removal of the porch infill recaptures architectural integrity of form and detail, as well as improving the visual appeal and historical appearance of the streetscape. The replacement wooden siding facing the reopened porch does not line up with aluminum siding.

The replacement front door is a hollow paneled metal door and is not in keeping with the style of the house. The Guidelines deem metal doors inappropriate for use in the historic districts.

Staff files contain no information regarding the form and appearance of the rear addition. The later rear addition post dates the 1955 Sanborn Maps. The removal of the addition involved the removal of a carport or overhang from the southeast corner of the house. By removing the later addition and overhang, the house has been returned to its original footprint and matches the 1955 Sanborn.

The house originally featured three-over-one wooden sash windows. Some of the windows had already been removed prior to the recent work. One-over-one aluminum windows were used to replace the windows. The prefabricated units do not fit the reveals. The Guidelines deem aluminum windows inappropriate for use in the historic districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe the removal of the porch impairs the architectural or historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of that portion of the application.

Based on B (3), Staff believes the replacement door impairs the architectural and historical character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of the replacement door.

Staff has no documentation of the rear additions. Since the house now occupies its original footprint and the rear additions were post 1955, Staff recommends approval of the removal of the rear additions.

Based on B (4-5), Staff believes the replacement windows impair the architectural and historical character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of the replacement windows.