

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA
September 5, 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: Chris Bowen**
 - a. Property Address: 1121 Montauk Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/9/12
 - c. Project: Replace existing asphalt roof with 3-tab, black shingles.
- 2. Applicant: Naomi Maurer**
 - a. Property Address: 501 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/6/12
 - c. Project: Install a 42" x 18" vinyl banner per the submitted design on a pole perpendicular to the building. The pole will be centered above the transom to the right of center. This is a permanent installation to serve as signage not a temporary banner.
- 3. Applicant: Teddy Lee**
 - a. Property Address: 256 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/8/12
 - c. Project: Repaint ironwork per the existing color scheme
- 4. Applicant: Maggie May Pettway**
 - a. Property Address: 910 Savannah Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/13/12
 - c. Project: Install a wooden handicap access ramp off the rear entrance.
- 5. Applicant: William Cutts**
 - a. Property Address: 51 South Jackson Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/13/12
 - c. Project: Repair stucco. Paint the stucco work per the submitted Benjamin Moore color (Ashley Gray). Replace downspouts.
- 6. Applicant: Charles Bowman for the RSA**
 - a. Property Address: 107 Saint Francis Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/14/12
 - c. Project: Install pavers matching those found elsewhere on the property.
- 7. Applicant: Jean Butler**
 - a. Property Address: 1221 Elmira Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/14/12
 - c. Project: Install metal handrails about the front and side steps.
- 8. Applicant: William and Cydney Halliday**
 - a. Property Address: 258 West Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/15/12
 - c. Project: Remove aluminum siding from the façade. Repair and replace deteriorated and/or missing woodwork and moldings to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Paint the affected areas white.
- 9. Applicant: Melanie Glenn**
 - a. Property Address: 20 South Catherine Street

- b. Date of Approval: 8/16/12
- c. Project: Relocate a column.
- 10. Applicant: Sydney Betbeze**
 - a. Property Address: 1210 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/20/12
 - c. Project: Replace the front porch's roofing.
- 11. Applicant: Candace B. Cooksey**
 - a. Property Address: 63 North Reed Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/21/12
 - c. Project: Repaint per the existing color scheme. Any deteriorated woodwork will be repaired and replaced to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
- 12. Applicant: Matt Golden**
 - a. Property Address: 251 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/21/12
 - c. Project: Paint the building per the submitted color scheme Repaint areas per the existing. Detailing will be red, black, and gold.
- 13. Applicant: Edward Robinson**
 - a. Property Address: 65 North Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/23/12
 - c. Project: Finish a partially completed carport initially approved 2007. This COA updates one from July 11, 2011.
- 14. Applicant: Liberty Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 200 South Warren Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/24/12
 - c. Project: Reroof with charcoal colored shingles.
- 15. Applicant: Sheridan Dunnam**
 - a. Property Address: 1008 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/24/12
 - c. Project: Repair porch decking and trim, replacing as needed matching the original in profile, dimension and material. Paint repairs as necessary. Paint the house to match existing. Repair wood where necessary to match existing in profile, dimension and material.

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 2012-53-CA: 207 South Georgia Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Fred and Julie Hoffmeyer
 - b. Project: New Construction – Construct a rear porch addition.
- 2. 2012-54-CA: 714 Dauphin Street**
 - a. Applicant: Robert Alden Cummings for Wendell Quimby
 - b. Project: New Construction/Site Redevelopment – Pave portions of a lot, install landscaping, and install fencing.
- 3. 2012-55-CA: 957 Palmetto Street**
 - a. Applicant: William W. Gadd
 - b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain an unapproved front door.
- 4. 2012-56-CA: 77 Etheridge Street**
 - a. Applicant: Samantha Kaaa with THD At-Home Services, Inc.
 - b. Project: Window Replacement – Remove wooden windows and install vinyl windows.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2012-53-CA: 207 South Georgia Avenue
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Fred and Julie Hoffmeyer
Received: 8/20/12
Meeting: 9/5/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a rear porch addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This classically detailed foursquare type dwelling dates from 1909. Like many houses located on South Georgia Avenue, the house’s two-story block-like massing is fronted by full-length gallery. This house features a richly ornamented aedicule located between the façade’s two second story windows.

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 March 13, 1999. At that time, the Board approved the construction of an addition. This application calls for the removal of a 1990s rear porch and the construction of a new rear porch. The proposed porch would be an enlargement and elaboration of the existing porch.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
 - 2. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Remove a 1990s porch.
 - 2. Salvage and reuse columns, rafters, and other details from the porch.
 - 3. Construct a new rear porch addition.
 - a. The porch will measure 14’ in depth by 31’ 10” in width (not counting an approximate 2’ deep east-facing splay).
 - b. The porch will rest atop wooden posts that will be interspersed with framed, suspended, and recessed lattice skirting.

- c. The porch deck will be floored with tongue-and-groove decking.
- d. The three bay east-facing porch will be supported by squared section posts salvaged from the existing porch.
- e. Salvaged cloud lift-like brackets will surmount the paired posts.
- f. Exposed and molded rafter tails will be employed. Said rafter tails will be salvaged from the existing porch.
- g. Regularly disposed wood framed metal porch screening will be employed.
- h. Boxed lattice panels will be suspended between the East Elevations outer pair of paired columns.
- i. A brick chimney with corbelled shoulders and a capped stack will be located off the porch's South Elevation.
- j. A telescoping flight of treated wood steps will be located off the porch's North Elevation.
- k. A shed roof will surmount the porch structure. Roofing shingles matching those found on the house will sheath said roof. The side faces of the shed roof will be faced with wooden siding matching that found on the body of the house.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the construction of a rear porch. The addition would be, at best, minimally visible from the public view. The porch would be in essence an enlargement of the existing rear porch. The existing porch was constructed during the 1990s.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that additions should be differentiated from yet compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the existing historic fabric. In accord with Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the single story format provides a clear break between the two-story body of the house and the proposed new construction. While some historic facings and elements will match those on the building, others will be of the period therefore affording complementary differentiation. The impact of the historic fabric will be minimal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2012-54-CA: 714 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Robert A. Cummings for Wendell Quimby
Received: 8/20/12
Meeting: 9/5/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

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 March 14, 2005. At that time, the Board approved the demolition of a rear portion of the building. With this application, the owner/applicant proposes the redevelopment of the rear portion of the property.
- 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 site plan):**
 - 1. Conduct site preparations.
 - a. Remove a raised concrete slab.
 - b. Remove wooden posts located in the northern section of the lot.

2. Install hardscaping (curbcuts, curbing, and a parking surfaces).
 - a. The total square footage of the asphalt hardscaping will be 3370.17 square feet.
 - b. Concrete curbing will be employed.
 - c. Two west-facing curbcuts will access the asphalt parking lot from North Scott Street.
 - d. The widths of the southernmost curbcut will be:
 - i. Inner – 12’
 - ii. Outer – 46.34’
 - e. The widths of the northernmost curbcut will be:
 - i. Inner – 13.93’
 - ii. Outer – 41.74’
3. Install fencing.
 - a. Install a 4’ tall powder-coated, black painted aluminum fence.
 - b. The fence will feature fleur-de-lis finials.
4. Install landscaping
 - a. Landscaping strips will be located along the northern and western sides of property.
 - b. Grass will be planted within the planting strips.
 - c. Five Live Oak trees will be planted.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. What is happening to the southern portion of the lot?
2. Is the west-facing ramp an existing feature
3. Will the fence feature integral or crimped top finials?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the redevelopment of a vacant rear portion of property whose principal building faces Dauphin Street. The lot would be utilized for parking and the redevelopment would entail the installation of hardscaping, fencing, and landscaping.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts that good site planning and landscaping can minimize effect of parking areas. By locating the curbcuts along North Scott Street, the more trafficked Spring Hill Avenue expansion will be not be affected by hardsurfacing that would engage the right of way. Landscaping strips 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. The overall square footage of landscape meets the required allotment prescribed by the Office of Urban Development. Staff recommends the use of additional landscaping. Asphalt paving and concrete curbing would be employed. The proposed fencing would provide a sense of definition to currently open lot.

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. In previous applications, the Board has recommended the use of shrubbery, as well as pedestrian entrances.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-6), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the historic district. Pending address of the above cited clarification and discussion of the aforementioned recommendations, Staff recommends approval of this application. Staff further recommends increased landscaping.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2012-55-CA: 957 Palmetto Street
Applicant: William W. Gadd
Received: 8/8/12
Meeting: 9/5/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain an unapproved door.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to documentation found in the MHDC property file, the core of this house could date from circa 1890. The house was extensively altered and enlarged circa 1909. The façade of this classically detailed dwelling features a full-length gallery with bay window.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on November 18, 1996. At that time, the Board approved the alteration of fenestration. This application is a result of a 311 that was received on August 6, 2012. The current owner/applicants appear before the Board with a request to retain an unauthorized door. The door was installed without the issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacements should reflect the age and style of the building.”
 - 2. “Doors with leaded or art glass may be appropriate when documentation exists for their use, or when they are compatible with the design and style of the structure.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**
 - 1. After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain a door.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the unauthorized replacement of a front door. The application appears before the Board as a result of a 311 call. The applicants wish to retain the replacement door.

The Design Review Guidelines state that original doors and openings should be retained. While not original to the house, the door which was removed was more in keeping with historic period which the house was built. The Design Review Guidelines go on to state that replacements should respect the age and style of the building and that leaded glass may be appropriate when historically and stylistically appropriate. It is doubtful that this house originally featured either oval-shaped glazing or leading.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and the historical character of the building. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2012-56-CA: 77 Etheridge Street
Applicant: Samantha Kaaa with THD At-Home Services for Jim Wilson
Received: 8/15/12
Meeting: 9/5/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Window Replacement – Remove wooden windows and install vinyl windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house dates was constructed between 1950 and 1955. Described as “minimally traditionally,” the wood siding faced house features a block-like massing and infilled side porch.

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 wholesale replacement of the houses windows. Largely original, the houses fenestration is a mixture of original wooden multi light windows and a single picture window, and later replacement windows. The proposed windows would be vinyl in composition and operational in construction.
- 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. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted materials):
 - 1. Remove the house’s existing windows.
 - 2. Install one-over-one vinyl windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the removal of original wooden and some later replacement windows with vinyl windows. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that original windows

should be retained. When replacement is necessary, the replacement windows should be compatible with existing. Additionally, applications for wholesale window replacement entail review of the significance of the building, condition of the existing windows, and the design of the proposed windows.

This house is listed as a non-contributing residence in the Old Dauphin Way Historic Districts. Described as “minimally traditional” in the National Register listing for the District, the dwelling is representative of the period of which it was built. Horizontal in format, featuring multi-light and one picture, and a side porch (now infilled), houses of this appearance can be found across the United States.

The house features numerous multi-light, a single picture, and several replacement windows. As evidenced by the photographs submitted with the application and staff inspection of the site, this house’s windows do show signs of deterioration. While the frames are painted shut and the caulking is flaking, the windows are repairable.

The proposed replacement windows would be vinyl in composition and one-over-one in configuration. While vinyl windows have been allowed in the Historic Districts. There approval has been of an exploratory, test-like nature. Significantly, all of the aforementioned approvals have been on non-contributing whose originals windows had long-since removed. This house retains its original windows. With regard to the proposed light configuration, the proposed one-over-one configuration does not match the existing. Though this treatment is preferable to one employing snap-on muntins, the one-over-one configuration is not in keeping with style of the house.

Based on the condition of the existing windows and the design and composition of the proposed replacement windows, Staff recommends that the applicants investigate the repair of the windows as opposed to wholesale removal and replacement.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and the historical character of the building. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

