

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

June 20, 2018 – 3:00 P.M.

Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

### A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:  
**Members Present:** Harris Oswalt, Bob Allen, John Ruzic, Robert Brown, Craig Roberts and Steve Stone.  
**Members Absent:** Nick Holmes III, Carolyn Hasser, Catarina Echols, Jim Wagoner, David Barr, and Kim Harden.  
**Staff Members Present:** Marion McElroy, Bridget Daniel, John Sledge and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Stone moved to approve the minutes of the April 18, 2018 and June 6, 2018 meetings. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.
3. Mr. Stone moved to approve the Midmonths. The motion received a second and was approved with one opposed, Mr. Allen.

### B. MIDMONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

#### 1. Applicant: Jennifer Weed

- a. Property Address: 1743 Hunter Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 5/29/2018
- c. Project: Replace rear of roof to match existing asphalt singles. Repair and replace damaged wooden trim around windows and wood around gutters to match in dimension, profile and material. Repaint to match. Reflash chimney. TPO portion of roof in rear to match existing.

#### 2. Applicant: Steven Slanke

- a. Property Address: 255 Dexter Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 5/29/2018
- c. Project: Replace balusters to match; replace lattice.

#### 3. Applicant: Stephen and Ellen Harvey

- a. Property Address: 120 Ryan Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 5/30/2018
- c. Project: Remove wood siding in good condition to repurpose. Replace wood siding, deteriorated, to match existing in dimension, profile and material. Repair and replace wood trim to match existing. Repaint to match.

#### 4. Applicant: Matthew and Karen McDonald

- a. Property Address: 1260 Selma Street
- b. Date of Approval: 5/30/2018
- c. Project: Reroof and reconstruct balustrade to match existing in dimension, profile and material.

#### 5. Applicant: St. Francis Joachim, LLC

- a. Property Address: 15 N. Joachim Street
- b. Date of Approval: 5/30/2018
- c. Project: Build three foot high masonry wall in front of parking area along Jackson St. Along north property line wall will be six feet high.

- 6. Applicant: National Society of the Colonial Dames**  
a. Property Address: 104 Theatre Street  
b. Date of Approval: 5/30/2018  
c. Project: Reroof small section to match.
- 7. Applicant: Gregory Benke**  
a. Property Address: 158 S. Catherine Street  
b. Date of Approval: 5/31/2018  
c. Project: Reroof with GAF weatherwood shingles.
- 8. Applicant: John Ferguson**  
a. Property Address: 59 S. Lafayette Street  
b. Date of Approval: 5/31/2018  
c. Project: Reroof with new asphalt shingles to match.
- 9. Applicant: Talitrum Investments**  
a. Property Address: 204 Rapier Avenue  
b. Date of Approval: 6/5/2018  
c. Project: Repair/replace exterior wood to match existing, repair existing shutters, install framed lattice, repaint. Build six foot wooden privacy fence up to front plane of house.
- 10. Applicant: Robert Hunter**  
a. Property Address: 561 Eslava Street  
b. Date of Approval: 6/5/2018  
c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles, black.
- 11. Applicant: Katie Bracher**  
a. Property Address: 1167 Old Shell Road  
b. Date of Approval: 6/6/2018  
c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles, black.
- 12. Applicant: Emil Kraft**  
a. Property Address: 271 Dauphin Street  
b. Date of Approval: 6/6/2018  
c. Project: Powerwash, Paint, Repair Deck and Dig 4 holes to replace rotten existing pylons.
- 13. Applicant: Jace Aran**  
a. Property Address: 255 S. Georgia Street  
b. Date of Approval: 6/8/2018  
c. Project: Construct inground pool with surrounding paver deck.
- 14. Applicant: Sing Ming Au**  
a. Property Address: 1702 Government Street  
b. Date of Approval: 6/6/2018  
c. Project: Construct fence on west and east side property behind front facade of commercial building. Fence to be wooden or metal.
- 15. Applicant: WGBuchanan Residual Trust**  
a. Property Address: 316 Dauphin Street  
b. Date of Approval: 6/8/2018  
c. Project: Remove deteriorated canopy in rear of building.
- 16. Applicant: Church Religious Services**  
a. Property Address: 60 N. Ann Street  
b. Date of Approval: 6/11/2018  
c. Project: Repaint building medium gray with white trim.

**17.Applicant: Sign Art on behalf of Bank of the Ozarks**

- a. Property Address: 7 N. Royal Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/12/2018
- c. Project: Install one storefront sign, one wall sign, one incidental sign. Install one vinyl decal on inside of door.

**18.Applicant: Jerry Jackson on Jackson Investments**

- a. Property Address: 3004 Michigan Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 6/13/2018
- c. Project: Repaint in approved color scheme: gray body with white trim. Replace windows on non-contributing with either aluminum clad or extruded aluminum. Repair and replace deteriorated wood to match in dimension, profile and material when necessary.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2018-18-CA: 55 S. Julia Street**

- a. Applicant: Mr., Adam Metcalfe
- b. Project: Install metal roofing panels on a residential building.

**DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**2. 2018-19-CA: 205 Church Street**

- a. Applicant: Mr. Timothy E. Howell on behalf of Briskman and Binion
- b. Project: Fenestration Related: Replace three wooden windows.

**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

- 1. There will be no meeting on July 4<sup>th</sup> due to it falling on a holiday.
- 2. Mr. Roberts welcomed Build Mobile's interns through the "YES" program.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2018-18-CA:** 55 S. Julia Street  
**Applicant:** Mr. Adam Metcalfe  
**Received:** 5/30/2018  
**Meeting:** 6/20/18

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Install metal roofing panels on a residential building.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This residence, known as the Langlois House, was constructed in 1924 as a bungalow. It has no particular stylistic details.

**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 Old Dauphin Way Architectural Review Board on January 29, 1982 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time approval was granted for the repainting of the house. The proposed scope of work includes removing existing shingle roof and replacing it with a metal roof.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Preserve the original form of a historic roof.”
  - 2. “Preserve the original eave depth of a roof.”
  - 3. “Use new roof materials that convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally.”
  - 4. “If installing a new metal roof, apply and detail it in a manner that is compatible with the historic character of the roof, period and style.”
  - 5. “Use standing seam metal, metal shingles or five v-crimp.”
  - 6. “Use metal with a matte, non-reflective finish.”
  - 7. “Install the roof to have low profile seams.”
  - 8. “Finish roof edges in a similar fashion to those seen traditionally.”
  - 9. “Materials that do not appear similar to the original in texture, pattern, finish and color range to the original are unacceptable. These often include: Corrugated fiberglass; Asphalt roll roofing (unless obscured by parapet walls); Built-up membrane roof on steep sloping roofs (greater than 3:12); Panel and batten; Brightly colored metal”

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

1. Install new roof.
  - a. Remove existing shingles.
  - b. Install metal roof panels.
  - c. Metal roof will be corrugated, 26 gauge galvalume, with a non-reflective finish.

### **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application concerns the re-roofing of a dwelling currently features shingles with metal panels. With exceptions of certain house types (such as shotguns), constructions (such as cast iron galleries), and building typologies (such as industrial/commercial), individual applications for metal roofs are reviewed on a case by case basis. Metal roofing is a traditional roofing material in Mobile. As the 19<sup>th</sup>-century progressed, metal roofs were employed more frequently. Both frame & brick and residential & commercial buildings featured metal roofs. Standing seam panels and individual shingles were the most common metal roofing types. 5-V crimp metal roofing was another alternative. In reviewing previous applications the Board has discussed the number and spacing of ridges. Standing Seam and 5-V crimp have been approved on account of the fewer number and lower height of dividing seams.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that a roof is one of the most dominant features of a building and that original materials should be maintained (See B-1). The forms of the existing roof and gable will remain. The Design Guidelines go on to outline that if installing a metal roof, said roofing panels should be reflective of the historic character of the roof, period and style (See B-4). The proposed metal roof will be 26 gauge. Said metal roofing panels are not listed among the approved metal roofing options (See B-5), however it is not listed as an unapproved roofing material (See B-9). A version of a 5-V Crimp metal roof was approved for 25 Blacklawn on December 2, 2015, and a version of a standing seam metal roof was approved for 30 Hannon Avenue on May 16, 2016.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-9), Staff believes a metal roof will not impair either the architectural or the historical character of the properties or district. The type and construction of said roofing material and its impact on the style of the building has to be considered as well. Staff recommends the consideration of metal panels that have a lower profile such as a 5V crimp or standing seam.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

No one was present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Roberts explained galvalume is metal with both zinc and aluminum metals. Mr. Roberts further explained standing seam metals roofs mimics the aesthetic of original metal roofs seen from the past.

Mr. Stone asked to see images of the front elevation and noted the prominent roof. Mr. Roberts stated the

proposed roof was not an approved material.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

#### **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

#### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and that the application be denied as proposed. Mr. Stone further moved that a 5V Crimp or Standing Seam metal roof be approved.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

**APPLICATION EXPIRES:** June 8, 2019.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2018-09-CA: 205 Church Street**

**Applicant:** Mr. Timothy E. Howell on behalf of Briskman and Binion

**Received:** 6/5/2018

**Meeting:** 6/20/2018

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Church Street East

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: T5.2

Project: Fenestration Related: Replace three wooden windows on a primary façade.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This Federal building was constructed between 1844-1845. Its cast iron balcony was added later in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. A residence turned boarding house, the property was rehabilitated by its current owners in the early 1980's according to the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

**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 February 15, 1989. On the aforementioned date, the Board approved an application to replace repair and replace windows and doors as necessary to match the existing. The application up for review calls for the replacement of three wooden windows on the front façade.
- B. Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. "Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material."
  - 2. "A doubled-paned or clad wood window may be considered as a replacement alternative only if the replacement matches the configuration, dimensions, and profiles of original windows."
  - 3. "Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture, profile and finish to the original are acceptable. These often include: wood sash and aluminum clad."
  - 4. "Historically accurate light patterns shall be employed. Use photographic, physical, and/or documentary evidence for the design."
  - 5. "Use any salvageable window components on a primary elevation."

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

1. Remove three (3) existing wooden six-over-six windows on second story of the North (façade) Elevation.
2. Install three aluminum clad windows to match lite configuration and profile in aforementioned openings.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application calls for the alteration of fenestration. With regard to the windows, specific replacements will match the existing components as per location, dimensions and light configuration. (See B-1). Details such as profile will match as close as possible. The proposed material is an extruded aluminum exterior with wooden interior window.

The property underwent a massive rehabilitation in the early 1980's and it was noted that windows were repaired according to the Secretary of Interior's Standards. (The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts are based on the Secretary of Interior's Standards.) The Design Review Guidelines state where historic windows are intact they should be repaired, rather than replaced (See B-1). Where windows are not in repairable condition replacements may be employed to match in dimension, profile, and material. Aluminum clad or double paned wood can be considered if it appears similar to the original in texture, profile, dimension, finish and configuration. In keeping with the Guidelines the proposed materials of extruded aluminum clad and wood in a six-over-nine light pattern is similar to what is in place (see B-3). Based on photographic evidence and previous Certificate of Appropriateness issued, the amounts of historic windows intact are unknown (See B-2 and B-3). A Certificate of Appropriateness issued December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014 approved the repair and replacement of windows to match "existing in all respects" where "necessary". The primary façade of a building is the most important to keep intact (See B-5). While it is not confirmed the three upper story windows are original to the house, the windows were previously repaired to match the existing or replaced to match the existing per dimension, profile and material.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-5) Staff does believe this application impairs the landscape, and historic integrity of the property. Staff recommends denial of the application, unless further evidence is presented to show the windows are not original.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mrs. Holle Briskman, owner, and Mr. Timothy Howell, representative, were present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mrs. Briskman stated the property was purchased in 1979 and rehabilitated. She explained that water is splashing against the gallery and onto the wooden windows. She further explained the windows proposed are employed on the Carnival Museum and the Battle House. Mr. Howell continued by saying the Kolbe window proposed is an outstanding product.

Mr. Stone asked if the window proposed was a simulated divided lite. Mr. Roberts stated there are advantages to the installation of aluminum clad windows on contributing buildings. He then stated the

previous aforementioned aluminum windows used on the Carnival Museum were only employed on a later addition. Mr. Roberts further explained the Battle house and Van Antwerp building had used similar product on its upper stories, which were higher up and therefore not as visible from street view. He noted those two buildings are commercial and the building being reviewed was built as a residence.

Mr. Stone stated he was present for both the Battle House and Van Antwerp applications and was under the impression the windows approved were installed above the first story. He further commented that this building's second story is not highly visible due to the gallery and tree canopy in front. Mr. Roberts noted more owners would want to come forward and replace their wooden windows. Mr. Stone stated had a precedent had already been set for the replacement of second story windows. Ms. Largue stated that per the Guidelines primary elevations were of the utmost importance when considering replacement of windows. Mrs. Briskman commented the windows would not be visible from the street since the façade is close to the front property line.

Mr. Stone noted the thin lines of the muntin. Mr. Howell stated the window company works closely with the owner to give a replicated product. Mr. Allen asked if the brochure given was accurately depicting the window proposed. Mr. Howell passed around another image of the proposed window. Mr. Allen noted the inset of the window into the brick of the wall. Mr. Roberts questioned if the replicated wood would match the original exactly in proportion, size, configuration and muntin profile. Mr. Stone replied the replica will be as close to the original as possible.

Mr. Oswalt inquired as to if the house had been awarded a Banner and Shield in previous years. Mrs. Briskman confirmed the house had a Banner and Shield awarded. Ms. Largue explained for Mr. Oswalt the Banner and Shield Committee of the Mobile Historic Development Commission take several items into consideration including fabric that is original or based on original. Mr. Allen noted approval by the ARB does not mean the materials or scope of work would be approved by the Banner and Shield Committee.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

Mr. Brown stated replacing wooden windows is an issue. Ms. Largue noted the replacement of windows on a residential building is different than the replacement of windows on a commercial building. Mr. Stone stated other buildings have had their upper story windows replaced and wooden windows on the first story have been retained and other approvable windows installed on upper stories. Mr. Allen noted that when windows are in repairable condition they should be repaired. He continued by saying he thought the windows in question needed to be repaired or replaced to match existing in all aspects. Ms. Largue stated the protocol of administrative staff has been to approve either repair of wooden windows on a residential building, or replace to match the existing in dimension, profile and material.

Mr. Howell stated two of the windows were extremely deteriorated and irreparable and causing water damage to other parts of the building.

Mr. Allen stated the project was not comparable to window replacement at the Battle House. He further explained commercial buildings in the downtown area referenced had taller first stories than this residential building.

Mr. Ruzic commented that aluminum clad was an acceptable option and that the owner says the windows are not repairable. Mr. Howell stated that if he were to replace the existing windows with wooden windows, the same water damage issue would occur in a short period of time. Mrs. Briskman stated you cannot see the upper story windows because of trees and the balcony.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and that the application be granted a Certificate of Appropriateness.

The motion received a second and was approved with Mr. Brown and Mr. Allen in opposition. .

**APPLICATION EXPIRES:** June 8, 2019.