

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA**  
**September 16, 2009 – 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: Carolyn Jeffers**
  - a. Property Address: 108 Ryan Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 08/31/09
  - c. Project: Reroof house and garage. Repair siding on garage. All work to match existing in profile, dimension, color and material. Paint any repairs as necessary.
2. **Applicant: Leak-Proof Roofing**
  - a. Property Address: 1557 Luling Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 08/28/09
  - c. Project: Replace roofing tiles to match existing. Repair and replace fascia and cornice. All work to match existing.
3. **Applicant: Jepp Cobb**
  - a. Property Address: 60 Fearnway
  - b. Date of Approval: 08/27/09
  - c. Project: Construct 8 foot privacy fence and install double gates along interior rear lot line, abutting commercial property.
4. **Applicant: Chris Huff**
  - a. Property Address: 11 Semmes Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 08/28/09
  - c. Project: Replace front porch column with one to match the existing. Replace fascia board. Replace deteriorated window sash. Replace rear French door. All work to match existing.
5. **Applicant: Warren Bettis**
  - a. Property Address: 62 Bradford Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 08/31/09
  - c. Project: Paint house per submitted Benjamin Moore color scheme. Body is to be Alexandria Beige. Trim is to be Mountain Peak White. Skirt and steps are to black.
6. **Applicant: Philip Foster**
  - a. Property Address: 1319 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 08/31/09
  - c. Project: Demolish non-descript shed in backyard.
7. **Applicant: John Leach**
  - a. Property Address: 2251 Ashland Place
  - b. Date of Approval: 09/01/09
  - c. Project: Repaint shutters Bellingrath Green.
8. **Applicant: Jarrod White**
  - a. Property Address: 1204 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 09/01/09
  - c. Project: Repair existing flat roof to match existing.
9. **Applicant: MHDC/ Restore Mobile**
  - a. Property Address: 454 Chatham Street

- b. Date of Approval: 09/01/09
- c. Project: Demolish inappropriate rear addition to board and batten portion of house.

**10. Applicant: Robert G. Nichols**

- a. Property Address: Hannon Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 09/03/09
- c. Project: Install storm windows and door to front and rear elevations .

**11. Applicant: Mizell Roofing for Owners**

- a. Property Address: 23 South Julia Street
- b. Date of Approval: 09/03/09
- c. Project: Reroof with three tab shingles to match existing.

**12. Applicant: Manja Leyk**

- a. Property Address: 18 North Ann Street
- b. Date of Approval: 09/04/09
- c. Project: Repair and replace pickets on existing fence. Install a 6 foot interior lot wooden privacy fence along west lot line with finished side to face outward.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

1. 094-09: 12 South Lafayette Street
  - a. Applicant: Thomas Karwinski for Bill and Pam Miller
  - b. Project: Rear Addition Tom Karwinski
  - c. HELD OVER FROM SEPTEMBER 2, 2009
2. 095-09: 1862 Government Street
  - a. Applicant: Chip Hackett with Ultra Car Wash
  - b. Project: Sign Approval.
3. 096-09: 65 LeMoyné Place
  - a. Applicant: John L. DeWitt
  - b. Project: Metal Roofing Approval.
4. 097-09: 1904 Government Street
  - a. Applicant: Wrico Signs for Sherwin Williams
  - b. Project: Sign Approval
5. 098-09: 7-9 North Conception Street
  - a. Applicant: Ronald V. Nance for Clint Flowers
  - b. Project: .
6. 099-09: 1119 Dauphin Street
  - a. Applicant: Sara and Michael Kindt
  - b. Project: Fencing Approval.

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Guidelines Update
2. Design Review Committees
3. Discussion

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

**095-09-CA:** 1862 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Chip Hackett  
**Received:** 08/24/09  
**Meeting:** 09/16/09

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Out of District  
Classification: Not Applicable  
Zoning: B-2  
Project: Sign Approval

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This recent infill, a brick car wash, was completed in 2009.

**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 Board on June 3, 2009. The Board approved a monument sign and two wall signs. The monument sign and the two wall signs face south and can be seen along the Government Street frontage. This lot also has frontage along Airport Boulevard. The applicant returns to the Board with a proposal for two menu boards and a wall sign facing Airport Boulevard.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Signage in Mobile’s Historic Districts and along Government Street state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs. 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.
  - 2. “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 40 square feet.
  - 3. “Menu Boards for drive-through windows at restaurants need to be reviewed for size, material, etc. They are not counted toward the maximum square footage allowed for on-site signs. Menu boards are limited to a maximum of 25 square feet and shall not have information or signage on the reverse side.
  - 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. For double faced signs, each side shall be counted toward the maximum allowable square footage.
  - 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

6. Internally lit signs are prohibited. 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. Light fixtures mounted on the ground shall be screened by landscaping.

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Install wall sign on north elevation
  - a. Approximately 6' x 2'8" oval sign;
    1. 12.56 total square feet
  - b. Non-illuminated
2. Install two menu boards at entrance/driveways to car wash
  - a. Located on north side of existing car wash building
    1. Signs will be seen from Airport Boulevard frontage
  - b. Menu boards are 3' x 6'
    1. Total menu board sq. ft. equals 18
  - c. Menu boards are internally-illuminated
3. Install three – double faced directional signage
  - a. 3' tall
  - b. 2'-6" wide
  - c. Non-illuminated
  - d. No logos present

## STAFF ANALYSIS

Under the Guidelines, signage along Government Street (to Dauphin Island Parkway) and within the Historic Districts may not exceed 64 sq.ft. per site. The applicants have applied for and received a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment to allow for 126.38 square feet of total signage. They are now seeking ARB approval. In the past, the ARB has allowed variances from this particular guideline when a site encompasses multiples parcels or has dual street frontage. In this instance, the applicant's site possesses frontage both along Airport Boulevard and Government Street. The proposed wall sign will face Airport Boulevard and is the precisely the same size as the wall sign which presently faces Government Street. The proposed wall sign will bring the total square footage of the signage to 76 square feet. Presently, the site has a variance to allow up to 126.38 square feet of signage. Since the site has double frontage on two major roads, the second wall sign will face Airport, not Government Street, and the total proposed signage is not significantly more than 64 square feet, Staff recommends a variance from the 64 sq. ft. guideline and approval of the proposed wall sign as described in C(1).

Under the Sign Design Guidelines, menu boards may not exceed 25 square feet. Since these are 18 sq. ft., the menu boards conform to the Guidelines. Presently, it is unclear, under the Guidelines, whether menu boards may be internally-illuminated or not. The applicants have cited to examples of internally-illuminated menu boards along Government Street. Because the Guidelines are unclear, and these menu boards face Airport Boulevard and are not visible from Government Street, Staff recommends approval of the menu boards as detailed in C(2).

The Sign Design Guidelines do not require directional signage to be reviewed; however Staff has submitted these to the Board as a courtesy requested by the applicants.

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

**096-09-CA:** 65 LeMoyne Place  
**Applicant:** John L. Dewitt  
**Received:** 08/31/09  
**Meeting:** 09/16/09

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Metal Roofing Approval

**BUILDING HISTORY**

With its low-lying mass, large front porch, and overhanging eaves this house typifies the bungalow craze that swept the nation during the first third of the Twentieth Century.

**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 Review Board. The applicant proposes replacing the existing asphalt shingles with a galvalume metal roof. Proposals involving metal roofing within the historic districts are reviewed on an individual, case-by-case basis.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “A roof is one the most characteristic 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 (per submitted plans):
  - 1. Remove the existing asphalt shingles.
  - 2. Install a 26 gauge galvalume metal roof.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

In recent years metal roofing options have grown in scope and quality. Applications for metal roofing are thus reviewed on an individual basis. Certain criteria determine the appropriateness of the available options. The pitch of the roofing, the treatment of the finish, and the style of the house are determining factors when considering metal roofs. A metal roof is not an inappropriate for this house, a Craftsman inspired Arts and Crafts bungalow. Arts and Crafts houses had shingle or slate roofs. Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and historical integrity of the house and the district and does not recommend approval.

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

**097-09-CA:** 1904 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Wrico Signs for Sherwin Williams  
**Received:** 08/21/09  
**Meeting:** 09/16/09

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Out of District  
Classification: NA  
Zoning: B-2  
Project: Sign Approval

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This contemporary 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 applicants propose the installation of two wall signs. One sign would face Government Street. The second sign would be visible from Airport Boulevard.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Signage in Mobile’s Historic Districts and along Government Street state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs. 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.”
  - 2. “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 40 square feet.”
  - 3. “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.”
  - 4. “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.”
  - 5. “Internally lit signs are prohibited. 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. Light fixtures mounted on the ground shall be screened by landscaping.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Remove existing signage.
2. Mount a sign 3 foot by 15 painted aluminum sign to the building's Government Street façade.
  - A. The height of the sign from ground level to the top of sign is to measure 11 feet.
  - B. The height of the sign from ground level to the bottom of the sign is to measure 8 feet.
  - C. The sign is to measure 3 feet in height by 15 feet in width.
  - D. The total square footage of sign is to measure 45 feet.
  - E. The sign is to feature internal fluorescent illumination.
  - F. The sign is to be painted aluminum with a flex glass face.
  - G. The total square footage of front of building is 90 feet.
  - H. The sign is to be single-faced.
  - I. The sign is to be mounted with 3/8 inch althread studs with wood blocking.
3. Mount a 5 foot by 3 foot 9 ½ inch vinyl faced aluminum sign to the building's rear west elevation (visible from Airport Boulevard).
  - A. The height of sign from ground level to the top of sign to measures 11 feet.
  - B. The height of sign from ground level to the bottom of sign to measure 6 feet.
  - C. The sign is to measure 5 feet in height by 3 feet 9 ½ inches in length.
  - D. The total square footage of sign is to measure 19 feet.
  - E. The sign does not feature illumination
  - F. The sign is to be painted aluminum faced with vinyl.
  - G. The total square footage of front of building measures 90 feet.
  - H. The sign is to be single faced.
  - I. The sign is to be mounted with 3/16 inch althread studs.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

Contemporary signage can detract from the integrity of a historic setting. Government Street and its environs comprise one of Mobile's principle historic thoroughfares and traffic arteries. Therefore, proposed signs along the street bear special scrutiny. While this signage application does not exceed the maximum signage limit for buildings in the historic districts and along Government Street, certain aspects do not met the standards set by the Guidelines. The Government Street facing sign is internally light. Internally illuminated signs are not allowed in the historic districts. Staff recommends approval of the Government Street sign on the condition that the sign not be illuminated. The sign facing Airport Boulevard uses vinyl, a material not acceptable for signage in the historic districts. Staff recommends approval of Airport Boulevard sign on the condition that the sign use a material that meets the standards set by the Guidelines.

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

**098-09-CA:** 7-9 North Conception Street  
**Applicant:** Ronald V. Nance for Clint Flowers  
**Received:** 08/28/09  
**Meeting:** 09/16/09

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: After the fact construction approval - Extend a balcony; Alter fenestration; Add a door.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story masonry commercial building was constructed circa 1907. It might possibly incorporate portions of an older building. As with many older commercial buildings, the storefront was altered in subsequent years.

**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 Board on May 7, 2008. The Board approved the reopening of mezzanine windows and the installation of a balcony on the buildings facade. In September of 2008, Staff approved slight revisions in the approved plans. When inspecting the building for a Certificate of Occupancy in mid August 2009, City inspectors noticed departures from approved plans and revisions. The mezzanine level fenestration was altered. The balcony was extended to wrap around the northeast corner of the building. A door accessing the balcony was added was added off the north elevation. A temporary Certificate of Occupancy was issued on August 12, 2009.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Often one of the most important features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and opening should be retained with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and the style of the building.”
  - 2. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the character of a building. Original windows openings should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing.”
  - 3. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture.”
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Regularize the mezzanine level fenestration on the East Elevation.
    - A. Install six two-light vertical windows instead of two window-door-window groupings.
  - 2. Wrap the balcony around northeast corner of the building.



3. Install a door accessing the balcony. This door replaces the two not executed on the east elevation (see C (1) A) as only means of access to balcony.

### **STAFF ANALYSIS**

The approved plans do not correlate with completed work. The reopening of the mezzanine windows and the construction of balcony did not allow the full height windows and doors. The alteration of the façade's fenestration removed all means of access to and from the balcony. The north elevation door affords the only point of ingress to and egress from the balcony. Staff recommends approval of the built work on the condition that the applicant paint the mezzanine window surrounds the same color as the body of the building. The change in color would bring about greater unity to the façade.

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

**099-09-CA: 1119 Dauphin Street**  
**Applicant: Sara and Michael Kindt**  
**Received: 08/28/09**  
**Meeting: 09/16/09**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: B-1  
Project: Fencing Approval.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to Staff files, this house was built during the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century according to the designs of Rudolf Benz. In the first decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, the house was more than doubled in size.

**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 Board in 1997. The Board approved amended plans for ancillary construction. The current owners appear before the Board with a fencing proposal
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. Fencing “should complement the building not detract from it. Design scale, placement, and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
  - 2. “The height of solid fencing in the 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.”
  - 3. “All variances required by the Board of Adjustment must be obtained prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.”
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. In general, construct iron fence above a brick veneer base around front yard perimeter; construct brick veneer columns as detailed below; install gate at driveway and pedestrian gate at walkway; install stucco wall as detailed below.
    - a. **Iron fence** will be 4’ tall
      - i. See attached photo for sample panel
      - ii. According to plan, fence to be set slightly back from sidewalk.
    - b. Fence will be situated above a 1’ brick veneer **base**
      - i. Base will be concrete block faced with bricks
      - ii. Mortar to be flush jointed
    - c. **Columns** will be concrete block with brick veneer and cap
      - i. See attached sketch for proposed column
      - ii. Cap will be 2” concrete block topper

- iii. Columns at corners of yard and driveway gate will be 66" tall and 19" square
    - iv. Columns at corner of pedestrian gate will be 18" and 60" tall
  - d. Concrete block **wall** will be 60" tall
    - i. Stuccoed
    - ii. 2" block topper
- 2. Per Submitted plans, **west elevation** features:
  - a. Fence to extend 36 feet along lot line.
  - b. Fence to stagger/ stairstep down berm
  - c. Fence to terminate at northwest corner of lot at column
- 3. North elevation:**
  - a. Construct one (1) column at northwest corner
    - i. 66" tall and 19" square with 2" concrete block topper
  - b. Fence to extend 35'-4" from northwest corner to west corner of proposed entry gate located at walkway to house
  - c. Construct two (2) columns at northwest and northeast corner of pedestrian walkway
    - i. 18" square and 60" tall with 2" concrete block topper
  - d. Install gate at walkway to house
    - i. Gate will feature 4' x 5' wrought iron panel with 3" arch
    - ii. Same design and finials as fence panels
  - e. Fence to continue beyond walkway for 43'-8" to southeast corner of lot/entry way to driveway
  - f. Construct one (1) column at northeast corner of lot
    - i. 66" tall and 19" square with 2" concrete block topper
- 4. East Elevation:**
  - a. Fence will extend 59'-4" from column at northeast corner of lot
    - i. to maintain 6' height, fence and base will raise approximately 2" for every 8' section of fencing
    - ii. Fence will terminate at a proposed column at northeast corner of house (approximately)
  - b. Construct two columns
    - i. First column will be located along west side driveway at northeast corner of house
      - 1. Fence will tie into this column
      - 2. This column will also hold electrical conduit for gate.
    - ii. A second column will be located across the drive on the eastern edge of the driveway/ property line
    - iii. Columns are 66" tall and 19" square with 2" concrete block topper
  - c. Install iron gate, featuring
    - i. Finials and pickets to match fence
    - ii. Gate panel will be 11' wide with 5'-6" arch in center
    - iii. Gate will open automatically
  - d. Construct stucco-faced concrete block wall
    - i. Wall will be 5' high
    - ii. Wall will be 13'-3" long and tie into an existing wall along the property line between this house and its neighbor.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

As the westernmost in a row of three large houses, this house is one of the most commanding sites on Dauphin Street in the Old Dauphin Way District. Situated on expansive lots, these houses signify this part of Dauphin Street's development as an early suburb to downtown Mobile. The landscape and the scale of the architecture are easily distinguishable from the urban lots and town homes found east of Broad Street and signify Mobile's early westward expansion. As such, the property's integrity is crucial component to the overall historic landscape of this neighborhood.

While Staff understands the safety concerns motivating the application, Staff believes the fence, as proposed, impairs the architectural and historical character of the house and district. Staff recommends the following:

- 1) the proposed fence be located on the berm, not below it. Staff realizes this change will necessitate reconsideration of where the fence ends once it reaches the northeast corner of the house, where the driveway gate columns are constructed, and how the gated driveway ties into the front yard fence.
- 2) The continuous base should be omitted.
- 3) The proposed fence should not exceed four feet in height.
- 4) The posts should be made of iron not brick-faced concrete.
- 5) Iron fencing should be constructed instead of the proposed stucco-faced concrete block wall on the east lot line. That fence should end at the front plane of the body of the house.

The above recommendations allow for a more traditional treatment. Placing the fence on top of the berm without the concrete base would be more historically appropriate. Doing so would maintain the character of the house and property, as well as provide additional security for the applicants.