

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

April 7, 2010 – 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, Bill James, Thomas Karwinski, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, Jim Wagoner, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson.
Members Absent: Carlos Gant, Kim Harden, and Bradford Ladd.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, Keri Coumanis, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Oswalt moved to approve the minutes of the March 17, 2009 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COAs granted by Staff.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Curtis Giarrusso and Steve Normand**
 - a. Property Address: 23 South Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/08/10
 - c. Project: Paint the lattice foundation skirting green to match the shutters. Strip paint from the front door. Stain the door a natural finish.
2. **Applicant: Keith Oliver Professional Painting Service**
 - a. Property Address: 1417 Brown Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/8/10
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Reroof the house with 3-tab shingles to match the existing.
3. **Applicant: Bienville Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 109 North Catherine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/8/10
 - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted BLP color scheme. The body will be Theatre Street Dark Gold. The trim will be Dauphin Street Light Gold. The front door will be Summerville Red. The porch floor will be Bellingrath Green. The porch ceiling will match the trim in color.
4. **Applicant: Donald Dreaper for Bay Building Maintenance**
 - a. Property Address: 1365 Brown Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/8/10
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair any rotten woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
5. **Applicant: Ron Diegan Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 1558 Luling Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/9/10
 - c. Project: Reroof the house using architectural shingles.
6. **Applicant: Pat Woolf**
 - a. Property Address: 1115 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/10/10
 - c. Project: Install a handicap access ramp in the backyard. The ramp will not be visible from the street. The ramp will measure four feet in width, consist of two flights broken by an intermediate landing.
7. **Applicant: John Moore**

- a. Property Address: 310 Charles Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/11/10
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
- 8. Applicant: LE Construction**
- a. Property Address: 254 Marine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/12/10
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with 3-tab shingles to match the existing.
- 9. Applicant: Kattie White**
- a. Property Address: 18 Semmes Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/12/10
 - c. Project: Paint the house in the following BLP Paint scheme: Hyacinth Haze 7185; Trim: Silver Queen 8298; and Porch: Diamond Heights 8296.
- 10. Applicant: Sara Averette**
- a. Property Address: 12 South Hallett Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/15/10
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the submitted color scheme. Repaint the trim black and white. Paint the body Lemon Pound Cake.
- 11. Applicant: Juanita/Renita Smith**
- a. Property Address: 100 Michael Donald Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/15/10
 - c. Project: Reroof the house using three tab shingles, including roof over porch; repair rotten boards as needed; prime exterior; fix existing windows so they operate properly.
- 12. Applicant: Darnell Stiell**
- a. Property Address: 202 South Broad Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/15/10
 - c. Project: Paint house per the submitted BLP color scheme. The body will be Oakleigh Place Ivory. Paint the trim white. Paint the foundation Savannah Street Dark Brown. Repair and replace woodwork to match the existing. The work will match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
- 13. Applicant: Charles Bowen**
- a. Property Address: 1414 Brown Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/15/10
 - c. Project: Repair exterior wood matching the existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint repairs to match the existing color scheme.
- 14. Applicant: Bienville Construction**
- a. Property Address: 109 North Catherine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/17/10
 - c. Project: Remove a chain link fence. Install two sections of six foot wood privacy fencing. The first section of fencing will extend between at a point just east of the west corner of the house the south lot line. The section of fencing will extend between along northern lot line.
- 15. Applicant: Integrity Remodeling**
- a. Property Address: 7 McPhillips
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/17/10
 - c. Project: Replace rotten wood to match original in profile and dimension, repaint to match.
- 16. Applicant: Jimmie Todd**
- a. Property Address: 912 Elmira Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/18/10

- c. Project: Repair & replace rotten siding matching existing in profile, dimension and materials. Replace roof matching existing in profile and dimension. Repair the windows, matching the original in profile, dimensions and material. Repair front porch screen. Repair the porch deck using 5/4 inch tongue and groove. Repair the front steps matching the original in profile, dimension and materials. Paint the house white with white trim and a medium brown porch deck.

17. Applicant: Chloe Tyner

- a. Property Address: 1677 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/17/10
- c. Project: Install 66 feet of wood, dog-eared, privacy fence along the east property line beginning approximately 40 feet from the sidewalk to the current rear fence in the rear.

18. Applicant: Skip Shirah

- a. Property Address: 963 Palmetto Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/19/10
- c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork as needed. The work will match the existing. Reroof the house with architectural shingles. Paint the house. The colors will be submitted at a later date.

19. Applicant: Sandra Atzin for A. J. Roofing

- a. Property Address: 201 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/19/10
- c. Project: Reroof the building with 3-tab shingles to match the existing.

20. Applicant: Chris Miller

- a. Property Address: 1451 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/19/10
- c. Project: Construct a sixteen foot square deck off the rear elevation of the house. A picket railing will encircle three sides of the deck. The deck will feature a flight of steps and a handicap access ramp. The deck will not be visible from the street. A latter shed awning supported by posts and a flight of wood steps will be removed. The lattice screening of the porch will remain intact.

21. Applicant: Your Handy Man

- a. Property Address: 7 Gladys Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 3/22/10
- c. Project: Repair and replace rotten tongue-and-groove porch decking to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.

22. Applicant: Cain Roofing

- a. Property Address: 14 McPhillips Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 3/22/10
- c. Project: Reroof the house using 30 year GAF architectural shingles.

23. Applicant: Carisa Anderson

- a. Property Address: 1456 Brown Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/23/10
- c. Project: Repaint in the following BLP color scheme: Body Flo Claire Yellow, Bellingrath Green as trim and lattice.

24. Applicant: Mark and Ramon MacInnes

- a. Property Address: 959 Palmetto Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/25/10
- c. Project: Paint the house in the following BLP Color scheme: Body – Palmetto Street Bronze; Trim & Porch Floor – Fort Conde Beige; Ironwork – Bellingrath Green; Front Door – Moroccan Red; and Porch Ceiling – Fort Gaines Blue. This renews a COA of March 7, 2008 and March 5, 2009

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2010-32-CA: 206 South Dearborn Street

- a. Applicant: Thomas Karwinski for Richard J. Gibson
- b. Project: Construct a rear porch at the northwest corner off the house.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2010-33-CA: 1363 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Advantage Signs for N & N Food Mart #2
- b. Project: Construct a monument sign.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. 2313 Spring Hill Avenue

Mr. Bemis explained that the homeowners were retuning to the Board with pre-construction changes to the previously approved plans. Five alternative treatments of additions hyphen were presented to the Board. Mr. Douglas B. Kearley, the homeowners' representative, addressed the changes. He explained the reasons behind the proposed alterations. He told the Board that the homeowners feared the approved plan would begat drainage and mold issues. Additionally, the approved plan inhibited interior circulation. Mr. Kearley told the Board that the applicants would like to move the north wall of the addition's hyphen eight feet forward. The enlarged plan, which would still be under fifty percent of the existing house's total square footage, would maintain setbacks differentiating the main house and the addition. The hyphen would be setback 2' from the existing house and 8' from the addition, thereby providing transition from the old to new work. Mr. Kearley said the enlarged plan would provide improved circulation and prevent rising damp. The north elevation of the hyphen would maintain the approved fenestration. He added that the only other proposed change pertained to fenestration on the body of the addition. He told the Board that the homeowners would like to utilize an larger casement window, one matching the projecting bay on rear of the house, in place of the approved transom window. Mr. James made a motion authorizing Staff to approve the changes on a midmonth basis. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

2. 1050 Selma Street

Ms. Coumanis addressed the Board. She told the Board that owner of the property, Ms. Devin Singleton, would like to construct a house on the currently vacant lot. Ms. Coumanis showed images of surrounding houses and two proposed designs as part of the pre review design session. Board members addressed the two preliminary proposals. Roof types, side elevations, attached garages, and foundation heights were among the design issues discussed. Mr. Karwinski told Ms. Singleton that before she ordered plans, she should have the lot surveyed in order to determine how the plans would be situated on the property. Staff told the Board that they would continue to work with the property owner. Mr. Wagoner congratulated Ms. Singleton on wanting to move into the historic districts. Ms. Singleton thanked the Board for their time and comments.

3. Alternative Sidewalk Pilot Proposal

Mr. Cedric Moore of Citismart, Mr. David Daughenbaugh of Urban Forestry, and Ron Jackson of Urban Development spoke to the Board regarding a proposed pilot project for sidewalk repairs. Mr. Wagoner welcomed the three city representatives. Mr. Moore reminded the Board that he appeared before them at the March 17, 2010 meeting. He provided the Board with sample sections of the proposed sidewalk treatment. Mr. Moore informed the Board that the plastic sectional panels were in use in over seventy cities across the United States, including Washington, DC and Boston. Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Moore if the sidewalk panels were used in historic districts. Mr. Moore answered yes, saying he would like to see them used in Mobile's historic districts, thus he was appearing before the Board. He told the Board that the Mayor, the Office of Urban Development, and the Alabama Department of Environmental Management supported the project. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Moore why the Alabama Department of Environmental Management was involved in the proposed project. Mr. Moore told the Board that recycled materials would be used to make the sectional panels. He informed the Board that the City would like to install the sidewalk panels in highly visible and trafficked areas such as downtown to determine their applicability in other areas of the city. He told the Board that there were over four miles of damaged sidewalks in the city and if approved the City would receive \$100,000 to implement the pilot project.

Mr. Jackson addressed the Board. He told the Board that the panels would solve problems particular to Mobile. Mr. Jackson pointed out that expanding root systems cause of most of the damage to sidewalks in the historic districts. He said that the proposed panels adjust to the terrain and prevent the disturbances to the root systems. Mr. Bemis reiterated that the proposal was a pilot project for selected locations. Mr. Roberts asked to see pictures of sidewalks utilizing the proposed panels. Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Moore how long the panels had been on the market. Mr. Moore told the Board that municipalities across the country had using the panels for approximately ten years. Mr. Karwinski said that since the panels had been in use only ten years, they had not stood the test of time. He asked how long the panels were guaranteed. Mr. Karwinski noted that as a new, untested material, the panels might not be appropriate for use downtown.

Mr. Moore explained to the Board that the City would like to install the panels in prominent downtown location to determine their applicability elsewhere in the city. Mr. James asked how the panels would turn at curbs and adjust to roots. Mr. Jackson said that the panels would lessen the load of Urban Forestry and public works, as well as provide for safer pedestrian traffic. He told the Board that the panels vary in color and texture. Mr. Bemis and Ms. Baker discussed a possible location for the pilot project, the sidewalk in front of the Museum of Mobile. Mr. Roberts reiterated the need to see images of the panels as implemented in other cities. Mr. Bemis told the Board that over seventy percent of the damaged sidewalks are located in the historic districts. Ms. Whitt-Mitchell asked if entire stretches or only damaged sections of sidewalks would be replaced. Mr. Moore said he would coordinate with Staff regarding imagery. Mr. Wagoner said that upon receiving pictures of sidewalks utilizing the panels the Board would further consider the request.

4. Municipal Preservation Standards

A discussion of City infrastructure and maintenance ensued. Mr. Karwinski voiced concerns regarding the material and color changes that result from sidewalk repairs. Mr. James expressed similar concerns regarding the replacement of lighting fixtures. The Board discussed the need of a standard of review regarding municipal repairs, particularly for entrance gates, lighting fixtures, street curbing, and sidewalks. Mr. Bemis agreed to address the issue in the form of letters to Mr. Nick Amberson and the PEA.

5. Midmonth Approvals

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-32-CA: 206 South Dearborn Street
Applicant: Thomas Karwinski for Richard J. Gibson
Received: 3/17/10
Meeting: 4/7/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a rear porch off the northwest corner of the house.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house dates from circa 1853. The 1 ½ story dwelling, which features a full length gallery, two front entries, gable ends and a passageless interior, constitutes a quintessential Creole cottage.

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 applicant proposes constructing a covered porch off the northwest corner of the house.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and preserved to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
 - 2. “The form and shape of the porch should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with the style of the house.”
 - 3. “The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and the materials of the porch.”
 - 4. ”The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on a building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Construct a rear porch off the northwest corner of the house.
 - a. The porch will measure 14’ in length and 8’ in depth.
 - b. The porch will rest on brick foundation piers.
 - c. Suspended, framed, and recessed lattice skirting will extend between the foundation piers.
 - d. Tongue-and-groove decking will cover the porch floor
 - e. Three wooden posts will support the porch’s shed roof.
 - f. A MHDC stock balustrade will extend between the porch posts.

- g. The north elevation will feature two bays.
 - h. The west feature a single bay
 - i. A flight of wooden steps flanked by MHDC stock railings will extend from the porch's western bay.
 - j. The steps will terminate on a concrete pad.
2. Remove a six-over-six window from the north elevation.
 3. Install a four paneled wooden door in the place of the six-over-six window.
 4. Remove a six-over-six window from the west elevation.
 5. Install a wooden paneled and glazed door.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposed porch meets the design and materials standards established by the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. The porch's design and detailing are appropriate to the style and the period of the house. The proposed porch will be minimally visible from the public right of way. While original windows from the body of the house and the rear wing will be removed, the house's fenestration pattern will remain the same since the doors will take the place of the windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical integrity of the house or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application and requests that the removed original windows be properly stored on the property.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Karwinski, the applican'ts representative, recused himself and left the room.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Wagoner told the Board to address any questions to Staff. He then asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak for or against the proposed work. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Wagoner closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts 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. Roberts 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: 4/7/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-33-CA: 1363 Government Street
Applicant: Advantage Signs for N & N Food Mart #2
Received: 2/24/10
Meeting: 4/7/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Construct a monument sign.

BUILDING HISTORY

This gas station/convenience store is non-contributing infill within the Leinkauf Historic District.

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 17, 2010. At that time, the applicant’s representative submitted a proposal calling for the construction of a new monument sign and the replacement of the existing canopy signs. The Board denied the request. The applicant returns to the Board with an altered proposal that takes into the lighting, size, and material standards outlined in the Sign Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street. The altered proposal calls for the construction of a monument sign.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The overall design of the signage including mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property. Buildings with a recognizable style such as Greek Revival, Italianate, Victorian, Queen Anne, Neo-classic, Craftsman, et. al., should use signage of the same style. This can be done through the use of similar decorative features such as columns or brackets.”
 - 2. “For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors.”
 - 3. “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.”
 - 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.”
 - 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

prohibited. Neon, resin to give the appearance of wood, and fabric may be used as appropriate.”

6. “The total allowable square footage for the display area of a monument sign is (50) fifty square feet...”
7. “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 drawing):

1. Remove the existing monument sign located in the northeast corner of the lot
2. Construct a monument sign at the intersection of Government and Everett Streets.
 - a. The monument sign will be set back 2’ from the Government Street sidewalk and 10’ from the Everett Street sidewalk.
 - b. The monument sign will measure a total of 5’ in height.
 - c. The monument sign’s aluminum base will measure 2’ of the overall height.
 - d. The base will be painted gray.
 - e. The sign face will measure 3’ in height
 - f. The sign face will measure 8’ in length.
 - g. The sign frame will be aluminum.
 - h. The sign face will be aluminum.
 - i. The sign face’s design will feature the company name, the company logo, and the current gasoline prices.
 - j. Ground level spotlights will illuminate the sign.
 - k. Plastic copy will be used to indicate gas prices
 - l. The total square footage of the monument sign will be 48 square feet.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Signage, particularly signage relating to gas stations, raises a number of issues. Size, material and illumination are key concerns. The total square footage of the proposed monument sign is under the 64 square foot allotment for properties within the historic districts. The sign does not exceed the 50’ square foot maximum size limit established by the Sign Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts or 5’ height limited established by previous board rulings. The sign’s materials and illumination meet the standards set by the Guidelines, but the sign’s location and height require approval from the office of Traffic and Engineering.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (3-7), Staff believes the overall signage proposal does not impair the architectural and historical character of the district, therefore Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Wagoner asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Wagoner closed the period of public comment.

Mr. Karwinski asked Staff about the location of the sign and the use of landscaping. Mr. Blackwell informed Mr. Karwinski that if granted a Certificate of Appropriateness, the applicant would still be

required to obtain approval from Board of Adjustment in order to construct the proposed sign. To make any further exterior changes, the applicant would be required to submit an application of the proposed work.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 4/7/11