

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

February 20, 2008 – 3:00 P.M.

Pre-Council Chambers – Mobile Government Plaza

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by the chair at 3:00. The members present were Bobby Brown, Tom Karwinski, Harris Oswalt, Tilmon Brown, Bunky Ralph, Craig Roberts and Barja Wilson.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were unanimously approved per a motion of Harris Oswalt and second of Craig Roberts. The Mid-Month Requests were approved as submitted per a motion of Bobby Brown and a second of Tom Karwinski.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant's Name:** Robert G. Randall
Property Address: 1621 Springhill Avenue
Date of Approval: January 30, 2008
Replace damaged front metal gate with a new metal gate to match existing. Replace metal rails at the balconies with new 42" metal rails.
2. **Applicant's Name:** Fauver House Movers and Construction
Property Address: 262 Dexter Avenue
Date of Approval: January 30, 2008
Replace portions of the rotted sill. Repair and expand existing pier foundation with materials to match.
3. **Applicant's Name:** James Lawrence
Property Address: 1205 New St Francis Street
Date of Approval: February 1, 2008
Repaint house exterior:
 - Body – Sears Berber Ivory
 - Trim – Off White
 - Porch Deck – Dark Green
4. **Applicant's Name:** Howle Lacy Contractors, Inc.
Property Address: 501 Government Street
Date of Approval: February 1, 2008
Install new black 3-tab shingle roof to match existing.
5. **Applicant's Name:** Caroline Coker
Property Address: 16 Semmes Avenue
Date of Approval: February 6, 2008
Install new roof using GAF Timberline architectural 30-year shingles, Onyx Black in color.
6. **Applicant's Name:** Jeff Mizell
Property Address: 57 South Julia Street
Date of Approval: February 6, 2008
Install new dark brown 3-tab shingle roof to match existing.
7. **Applicant's Name:** Wendell Quimby
Property Address: 256 North Franklin Street
Date of Approval: February 6, 2008
Install new black 3-tab shingle roof to match existing.
8. **Applicant's Name:** Nathaniel Gibbs
Property Address: 1325 Springhill Avenue
Date of Approval: February 8, 2008
Repair hole in roof, repair any damage to decking and match the existing black shingles.
9. **Applicant's Name:** Charles Bowen
Property Address: 1560 Macy Court
Date of Approval: February 11, 2008
Install new dark brown 3-tab shingle roof to match existing.

10. **Applicant's Name:** Patrick Thistlewaite
Property Address: 22 Hannon Avenue
Date of Approval: February 11, 2008
Replace rotten wood on existing shed, reroof to match house (charcoal gray) and repaint to match.
11. **Applicant's Name:** David Slepian
Property Address: 5 North Claiborne Street
Date of Approval: February 11, 2008
Install a 2SF cast bronze – raised bronze letters with a black background – wall sign above the historic plaque next to the front door.
12. **Applicant's Name:** Lamar Elliott Construction
Property Address: 100 Bradford Street
Date of Approval: February 12, 2008
Replace rotten wood on sills, siding and rafters with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material.
13. **Applicant's Name:** Diane Maisel
Property Address: 252 West Street
Date of Approval: February 12, 2008
Paint the house in the following ICI colors:
- Body – Icy Peach
 - Trim – Forest Black
14. **Applicant's Name:** Thomas Roofing
Property Address: 210 Government Street
Date of Approval: February 12, 2008
Reroof building using built-up materials to match existing.

C. OLD BUSINESS

1. **003-08-CA:** 121 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Kevin Hannon of Trimmer Smith Awnings
Request: Install an awning with sign. **Approved.**

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. **012-08-CA:** 116 Houston Street
Applicant: Robert Barnes
Request: Install a privacy fence. **Approved:** Board noted the fence was to be on the applicant's property.
2. **013-08-CA:** 16 Semmes Avenue
Applicant: Caroline Coker
Request: Remove the chimney. **Denied.**
3. **014-08-CA:** 309 West Street
Applicant: Tim Gibson
Request: Raise pitch of porch roof, replace single rear door with doubles and lower a rear window. **Approved.**
4. **015-08-CA:** 255 Church Street
Applicant: Robin Sanders
Request: Install a wind turbine with wind directors. **Approved:** Board noted that the Urban Development Department might comment on the wind rating of the turbine.

E. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Guidelines will be discussed at the next meeting. No one else committed to the NAPC conference. The Board agreed that per the letter written by Holmes and Holmes the renovation to the wing of the Hall Ford House did not need to come before Board, provided the exterior remained the same and the work was done in accordance with the tax credit.

F. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:40.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

003-08-CA: 121 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Kevin Hannon of Trimmer Smith Awnings
Received: 01/15/08 **Resubmitted:** 02/11/08
Meeting: 02/06/08 **Meeting:** 02/20/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install an awning with sign.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous research, this three-story brick commercial building with stone veneer was constructed circa 1940. With the exception of a glass and aluminum storefront installed circa 1965 and rehabbed in 2007, the façade remains intact.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Ordinance states, “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the proposed 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 building has 42.6 linear feet of frontage. There is a metal band along the front that originally housed a fabric awning and a 2SF neon open sign on the storefront. This application was tabled on 02/06/08 due to the way the awning was going to be attached to the building, which would obscure and possibly damage the building’s architectural features.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile state that signs shall “not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building...shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property...shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs...should match the historic materials of the building...[and] shall use focused, low intensity illumination.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Install a 3’-3” d by 3’-3” t by 40’-6” w Forest Green Sunbrella canvas awning over the storefront that will be attached to the existing signboard.
 - 2. Paint a 20SF Subway logo onto the canvas per the submitted specifications.
 - 3. The total amount of existing and proposed signage is 22SF; the total amount allowed for this building is 64SF.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that an awning and sign will not impair the historic integrity of the building or district. As mentioned above, this building had an awning in the past and the proposed unlit sign brings the sign total to well below the allowable limit. Staff feels that the new proposed awning is more amenable to the building as it will be attached to an existing sign board and will not obscure or damage the building’s architectural features. Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Kevin Hannon of Trimmer Smith presented the application. The sign will be as wide as the existing framework and will be a traditional shape with straight edges.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the size and shape of the awning and understood that the building would suffer no damage in the installation of the awning.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Carlos Gant and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/20/09.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

012-08-CA: 116 Houston Street
Applicant: Robert Barnes
Received: 01/30/08 (+45 Days: 03/14/08)
Meeting: 02/20/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install a privacy fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story brick veneer bungalow was constructed circa 1930.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states, “the Board shall not approve an application proposing Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 residence currently has no fence.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that fences “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.”
- C. Mr. Barnes is proposing to install a 6’-0” dog-eared wood privacy fence to enclose the back yard per the submitted site plan.

RECOMMENDATION

The proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the building or district and staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to address the application. However, a letter was read to the Board from Alza Scheuermann, a neighbor, objecting to the fence claiming it encroached on her property. She asked the Board to require that a property survey be required before a COA is issued.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the neighbor’s request. Board members felt that the application was to put the fence on the applicant’s property and it did not have the authority to require a survey. The Board did however agree to make the location part of the approval.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued on the condition that the fence is placed on the applicant’s property per the application. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/20/09.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

013-08-CA: 16 Semmes Avenue
Applicant: Caroline Coker
Received: 02/04/08 (+45 Days: 03/20/08)
Meeting: 02/20/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Remove the chimney.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame Bungalow was built in 1922.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. There is a chimney located at the ridge of the roof toward the front of the residence.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[o]riginal or historic roof forms...should be maintained.”
- C. Ms. Coker is proposing to remove the chimney and reroof area with shingles to match existing.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed work will impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. Chimneys are defining historic features of residences and, as stated in the Guidelines, should be maintained. Staff recommends denying the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Coker was present to address the application. She said that two roofers had suggested that the chimney be removed, but that she understood the historic importance of the chimney. She also said she wanted a historic marker for her house. The Board and staff informed her that the decisions of the ARB were not a guarantee of a marker, which is given by a different organization.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no further Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does IMPAIR the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be denied. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

014-08-CA: 309 West Street
Applicant: Tim Gibson
Received: 02/06/08 (+45 Days: 03/22/08)
Meeting: 02/20/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Raise pitch of porch roof, replace single rear door with doubles and lower a rear window.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story Mediterranean-style residence was built circa 1917.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. Currently, the porch roof is flat, which has been causing considerable rot where the roof meets the house. Also, as mentioned above, there is a single door leading to the back yard.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[a] roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.” The Guidelines also call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of each building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 1. Raise the pitch of the right side of the porch roof to allow for water run-off.
 - a. All new materials will match existing materials and no architectural details will be altered.
 - b. The roofline will be below the band underneath the windows.
 2. Replace the single rear door with a set of wood, 10-lite, double French doors with a transom.
 3. Lower the window adjacent to the rear door and add a transom to match the door height.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the changes will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. Although the porch roof is being altered, the pitch will be very slight to allow for water run-off. It will also match the existing left side of the porch and none of the architectural detailing in the façade will be disturbed. Additionally, the work on the rear façade, which had been previously altered, is sympathetic to the age/style of the building. Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tim Gibson appeared for the owner. There are no plans to put a cover over the rear door and window at this time. The eave details of the new roof will match the eave details of the porch, as will the clay tiles.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no further Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Barja Wilson and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/20/09.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

015-08-CA: 255 Church Street
Applicant: Robin Sanders
Received: 02/06/08 (+45 Days: 03/22/08)
Meeting: 02/20/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install a wind turbine with wind directors.

BUILDING HISTORY

This multiple-story hotel was constructed in the 1960s.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states, “the Board shall not approve an application proposing Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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. There is currently a shed structure housing a turbine on top of the sixth floor.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines do not have any specific guidelines for modern electrical or mechanical structures on rooftops; therefore, each application is reviewed individually.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Remove the existing shed and turbine on the roof.
 - 2. Install a new turbine with wind directors.
 - a. It will be 6’-6” tall.
 - b. It will be located in the middle of the roof (roughly in between the existing shed structure and the elevator box).

RECOMMENDATION

The proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the district and staff recommends approving the application. The new turbine and directors will be placed in the middle of the roof and, at 6’-6” tall, it will be less noticeable than the existing shed to be removed (by contrast, the elevator box on which the flag sits is approximately 6’-0” tall). Also, it will be only minimally seen from the street.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

A representative of the Turbine Company was present to discuss the application. The Board was told the turbine would be slightly shorter than the current shed on the roof. In response to questions from the Board, he stated that in the event of severe weather, the hotel maintenance crew would be responsible for removing the blades on the structure. The Board reiterated its concern about the structure in high winds and warned that Urban Development might review it for wind load.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the appropriateness of the wind load on the turbine. Because of that concern, the COA would refer the matter to the Urban Development Department.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Bobby Brown and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued but that the COA reference the wind load concerns to highlight the issue for the Urban Development Department. The motion was seconded by Bobby Brown and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/20/09.**