

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
April 4, 2012 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Jim Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Gertrude Baker, David Barr, Nick Holmes, III, Thomas Karwinski, Craig Roberts, Jim Wagoner, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Members Absent: Carlos Gant, Kim Harden, Bradford Ladd, and Harris Oswalt.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the March 21, 2012 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Tony Franks**
 - a. Property Address: 1350 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/16/12
 - c. Project: Patch roof to match color.
2. **Applicant: Gina Finnegan**
 - a. Property Address: 1306 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/15/12
 - c. Project: Erect 8' foot privacy fence on rear property line between residential and multi-family parcels. Privacy fence to match and connect to existing fence.
3. **Applicant: Bill Cross**
 - a. Property Address: 1050 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/14/12
 - c. Project: Retain a car cover for ninety day period.
4. **Applicant: Mark MacInnes**
 - a. Property Address: 959 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/14/12
 - c. Project: Install a wood framed glazed door on the rear entrance.
5. **Applicant: Melissa Rankin**
 - a. Property Address: 312 North Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/14/12
 - c. Project: Repaint per existing color scheme.
6. **Applicant: William Gill for Roberts Brothers**
 - a. Property Address: 61 South Catherine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/19/12
 - c. Project: Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme. Repaint a fence.
7. **Applicant: Eugene Morgan**
 - a. Property Address: 158 South Warren Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/21/12
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint to match the existing color scheme.

- 8. Applicant: Oakleigh Custom Woodwork for Bruce Rockstad and Ricky Bradford**
 - a. Property Address: 50 South Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/21/12
 - c. Project: Repair and/or replace deteriorated wooden windows to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme. Replace later aluminum windows with period appropriate wooden windows of the same light configuration.
- 9. Applicant: Thomas King**
 - a. Property Address: 1132 Montauk Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/21/12
 - c. Project: Repair/replace rail on upper balcony, matching existing in profile, dimensions, and materials. Paint white to match.
- 10. Applicant: Robert Dueitt with Dueitt Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 51 North Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/22/12
 - c. Project: Repair and replace woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint to match the existing.
- 11. Applicant: First Baptist Church of Mobile**
 - a. Property Address: 802 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/22/12
 - c. Project: Reroof with slate gray asphalt shingles.
- 12. Applicant: Lewis Goldman**
 - a. Property Address: 22 South Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/22/12
 - c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood, repaint to match.
- 13. Applicant: 15 Place Shelter**
 - a. Property Address: 15 North Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/26/12
 - c. Project: Erect six foot privacy fence around HVAC unit alley.
- 14. Applicant: Jim Curran**
 - a. Property Address: 14 South Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/26/12
 - c. Project: Paint steps and woodwork to match.
- 15. Applicant: Lance Carbary for Roof Doctors**
 - a. Property Address: 3 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/26/12
 - c. Project: Tear off Built up roofing; install duro-last single ply membrane roof.
- 16. Applicant: Thad Phillips**
 - a. Property Address: 200 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/26/12
 - c. Project: Reroof an ancillary structure with shingles matching the existing.
- 17. Applicant: Melanie Glenn**
 - a. Property Address: 20 South Catherine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/27/12
 - c. Project: Remove a small section of infill from the porch. The siding of the re-exposed walls will match the existing. Porch decking will be re-exposed or match the existing.
- 18. Applicant: Mr. Gartman**
 - a. Property Address: 305 South Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/26/12
 - c. Project: Reroof flat garage with roll roofing

APPLICATIONS

1. 2012-24-CA: 360 Rapier Avenue

- a. Applicant: Kimberly E. Harden with REN Group Architects for the Wooden Boat Ministry
- b. Project: Restoration and Renovation – Adaptively reuse an unoccupied corner store.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2012-25-CA: 315 Dexter Avenue

- a. Applicant: David Catron with Southern Building Structures for Cherie & Dennis Hansen
- b. Project: Ancillary Construction– Install a prefabricated ancillary structure.

HELDOVER AT THE REQUEST OF THE APPLICANT. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Window Replacements

Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that the previously scheduled window replacement discussion would take place during the May 2, 2012 Meeting.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-24-CA: 360 Rapier Avenue
Applicant: Kimberly E. Harden with REN Group Architects for the Wooden Boat Ministry
Received: 3/19/12
Meeting: 4/6/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Restoration and Renovation – Adaptively reuse an unoccupied corner store.

BUILDING HISTORY

This single story corner store dates from the first third of the 20th Century. The building features a canted southeast entrance.

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. As part of the adaptive reuse of the derelict property, the applicant proposes the exterior restoration and renovation of the building’s exterior.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The exterior of a building helps define its style, quality, and period. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material. Particular care must be taken with masonry. Consult the Staff concerning the mortar mixture for re-pointing historic brick. Brick and mortar should match the original in color, finish (strike) and thickness. The original scoring of new stucco should match the original.”
 - 2. “Often one of the most important decorative features of a house [building], 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.”
 - 3. “Wood or metal garage doors should be simple in design and compatible with the main 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 sashes and glazing.”
 - 5. “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 site plan):

1. East Elevation
 - a. Repair the existing stucco and install stucco over brick sills and rowlocks.
 - b. For the canted corner entry see C (7) a.
2. South Elevation
 - a. Remove the existing double doors, framing, and infill from the canted corner entrance.
 - b. Install a single wood framed, glazed door with flanking sidelights. A transom bar (whose position will be same as the transoms of South Elevation windows) will separate the door unit from the fixed, multi-light transom.
 - c. Remove unsympathetic replacement windows from the bays just west of the canted corner entry.
 - d. Install wood framed single light storefront windows in those two easternmost windows. Install fixed, multi-light, wooden transom windows above the same.
 - e. Reconfigure three partially infilled transom windows. The reopened windows will be restored to their original dimensions. Broken glass block glazing will be removed.
 - f. Install fixed, multi-light wooden transom windows within the restored transom window bays.
 - g. Remove two metal doors located on the western section of the East Elevation.
 - h. Install glazed wooden doors in the aforementioned bays.
 - i. Remove the concrete blocks filing and the brick courses located below an infilled window. The resulting vehicular bay (located between the two aforementioned doors) will feature a metal garage door.
 - j. Remove security bars.
3. West Elevation
 - a. Clean and refinish the two southernmost metal windows.
 - b. Remove metal frames from the northernmost window.
 - c. Install metal louvers in the aforementioned window bay.
4. North Elevation
 - a. Clean, refinish, and re-glaze existing metal windows.
5. Paint the building per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme.
 - a. Galvano
 - b. Anchor Gray
 - c. High Reflectance White
6. Install a handicap access ramp off the South Elevation

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application, an exterior restoration and renovation of a former corner store, is part of larger adaptive reuse effort. The restoration and renovation initiative involves the following: in kind repair and replacement of existing features and finishes; the removal of unsympathetic window and door units and their replacement with historically appropriate units; reclamation of infilled fenestration; and the alteration of fenestration.

This building's brick walls are largely faced with stucco. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile Historic Districts, the stucco repairs will match the existing. (See B (1) of the Staff Report.) Stuccoing the brick sills and rowlocks will not adversely impact the integrity of the building.

The building's most prominent exterior feature is the canted corner entrance. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic District state that replacement doors should reflect age and period of the building. (See B (2) of the Staff Report.) The existing door unit has been altered and the original door has

been replaced. The proposed door treatment would restore the original transom height. Though a double door would be more in keeping with the architectural and historical character of the building, the single glazed door with flanking sidelight intimates the openness of a double door unit.

With the exception of metal windows located on the North and West Elevation, the historic windows have been removed. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that window types, sizes, and configurations aid in establishing the historic character of a building. When windows cannot be repaired or have been removed, replacement windows should be compatible with existing. (See B (4-5) of the Staff Report.)

One portion of the window replacement portion of the application involves the removal of later unsympathetic windows from the South Elevations and their replacement with wooden windows. The window configuration, a large display windows surmounted by a transom, is historically appropriate to the building type and architectural period. The transoms of the windows will align with the transoms windows located to the east of the windows.

The aforementioned transom windows are partially infilled. The surviving sills provide physical evidence of the original transom expanses. The proposed restoration of the transoms to their original dimensions would recapture additional architectural and historical integrity.

The proposed vehicular bay would be located within an infilled window bay. The window infill and wall space below would be removed. A metal garage door is proposed for the reopened bay. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts allow metal garage doors if they are simple in design and compatible with the building. (See B (3) of the Staff Report.) The paneled treatment of the proposed door is in keeping with the historical character and architectural integrity of the traditional corner store.

The West Elevation is minimally visible from the street. The proposed removal of the one of metal transom windows and its replacement with a metal louvered unit would not adversely affect the architectural or the historical character of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-5) of the Staff Report, Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Kim Harden and Jonathan Stebbins were present to discuss the application

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Wagoner asked Ms. Harden and Mr. Stebbins if they had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Referencing a revised window drawing which Mr. Bemis had distributed to the Board, Ms. Harden explained how the proposed windows would be constructed.

Mr. Stebbins was asked to introduce himself.

Discussion ensued as to the use of the building.

Mr. Wagoner returned the discussion to the application submitted for review. He asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask Ms. Harden or Mr. Stebbins.

Mr. Karwinski said that he had several comments and concerns. He stated that in this instance he did not have an objection to a metal storefront system, but he did have concerns regarding the proposed wood cladding. Mr. Karwinski asked Ms. Harden if had she considered how long it would withstand the weather. Ms. Harden responded to Mr. Karwinski's concerns saying she initially held similar trepidations. She explained to Mr. Karwinski and the Board that the applicants wanted to use wood on account of the name of their ministry. Mr. Karwinski asked Ms. Harden to please notify him of the wood that was used. He said that he was curious to see how it would withstand the elements.

Mr. Karwinski then asked Ms. Harden for clarification regarding the door height. He noted that the drawings depicted 8' while the specifications stated 7'. Ms. Harden said that the door would be 8' in height.

Mr. Holmes asked Ms. Harden if she had been able to obtain impact resistance glass of the required size. Ms. Hardin answered yes. She added that it was expensive. Mr. Holmes asked her if she had received approval from the Permitting office for the use of the glass. Ms. Harden answered no saying that the Architectural Review Board was the first regulatory body which the application had been submitted for review. Mr. Holmes asked Mr. Karwinski if he thought the glazed expanses could be approved. Mr. Karwinski said yes if plywood panels were provided and employed in case of storm. Recollecting the height of the building, Mr. Holmes concurred.

Upon hearing no further comments from his fellow Board members, Mr. Wagoner closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 4/4/13

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-25-CA: 315 Dexter Avenue
Applicant: David Catron with Southern Building Structures for Cherie & Dennis Hansen
Received: 3/20/12
Meeting: 4/4/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Ancillary Construction – Install a prefabricated ancillary structure in the rear lot of the property.

BUILDING HISTORY

This hipped roofed “Craftsman” bungalow dates from 1935. The rectilinear house features an asymmetrically positioned gabled front 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 construction of a garage within the rear lot.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable for new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
 - 2. “In new buildings, exterior materials - both traditional and modern – should closely resemble surrounding historic examples. Modern materials having the same textural qualities and character as materials located on nearby historical examples maybe acceptable.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - a. The building will be located 17’ from the East (rear) property line, 13’ from the North property line, and 10’ 6” from the South property line.
 - b. The building will measure 24’ 1” in width, 28’ 1” in depth, and 8’ in height (not counting a roof pitch of 4”/12).
 - c. The building will rest atop a raised concrete slab foundation
 - d. The building will feature metal siding and roofing.

- e. The A-framed roofed building will be sheathed with metal panels.
- f. The West Elevation will feature a metal vehicular garage door.
- g. The North Elevation will feature a vinyl clad steel door with a small glazed light and a sixteen light vinyl window.
- h. The East (Rear) Elevation will not feature fenestration.
- i. The South Elevation will not feature fenestration.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a storage shed in the rear of the property.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts require that ancillary construction be measured according to the Guidelines applicable to New Residential Construction. The Guidelines further state that design and scale of ancillary construction complement the property’s main building. (See B (1) of the Staff Report.)

Assembled out of pre-fabricated components, this installation would be minimally visible from the public view. The Board has approved and authorized Staff to approve the installation of small scale storage buildings. Location, design, and materials are subject to review.

While the proposed installation would be minimally visible from the public view, the scale, materials, and detailing of the proposed structure are not in keeping with historic integrity of the property’s principal building. Metal siding is not approved for replacements on and additions to historic buildings. Metal roofing is reviewed on a case by case basis. Vinyl windows are not approved.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that the applicants had requested that the application be heldover to the next meeting.