

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

August 6, 2014 – 3:00 P.M.

Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Bob Allen, Catarina Echols, Kim Harden, Bradford Ladd, Andrew Martin, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone.
Members Absent: Robert Brown, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes, and Jim Wagoner
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and Keri Coumanis.
2. Steve Stone moved to approve the minutes for the July 23, 2014 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. Craig Roberts moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Shirla Lunsford-Gaston**
 - a. Property Address: 56 N. Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/11/14
 - c. Project: Rebuild porch to match the existing in profile, dimension and materials. Reroof with 25 year architectural shingle, black in color.
2. **Applicant: Barry McPhail**
 - a. Property Address: 60 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/16/14
 - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted Valspar color scheme: body, Aspen Gray; trim and details, Sunday Times; porch deck, Humbolt Earth; and additional accents/etc..., black. When and where necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing.
3. **Applicant: Barry McPhail**
 - a. Property Address: 62 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/16/14
 - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted Valspar color scheme: body, Lush Sage; trim and details, Snowy Dusk; porch deck, black; and additional accents/etc..., black. When and where necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing.
4. **Applicant: TCM Remodelers**
 - a. Property Address: 109 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/16/14
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, material, etc... Repaint per the existing color scheme.
5. **Applicant: Gillian Faircloth**
 - a. Property Address: 173 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/15/14
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated stucco work when and where necessary. Replace deteriorated woodwork (fascia, rafter tails, entablature, porch decking, siding, etc...) to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Make repairs to windows when and where necessary. Said repairs will adopt the form, materials, and design of the existing. Pressure wash the wall's. Remove later siding, lattice, and a door enclosing shielding a

portion of the rear porch. Stabilize the rear porch. Remove chain link fencing. Install a six foot tall wooden privacy fence atop the location of said chain link fencing.

6. Applicant: David Rowe

- a. Property Address: 55 North Monterey Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/16/14
- c. Project: Paint the the house per the submitted Mobile Paints and Sherewing Williamscolor schemes; body, Detonti Square Off White; shutters, Magnolia Homestead; porch floor, Fort Conde Gray Beige; front steps, Muddled Basil; porch ceiling, Atmospheric; and trim, Dover White.

7. Applicant: Luther, Collier, Hodges & Cash

- a. Property Address: 401 Church Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/15/14
- c. Project: Repaint the building per the existing color scheme.

8. Applicant: Jim McKinley

- a. Property Address: 302 South Georgia Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/17/14
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint per the existing colors scheme.

9. Applicant: Kevin Ollis

- a. Property Address: 32 S. Lafayette Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/18/14
- c. Project: Repaint house Conti Street Gray Green and porch deck Bellingrath Green.

10. Applicant: Marcio Simao

- a. Property Address: 1056 Elmira Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/18/14
- c. Project: Reroof with five v-crimp aluminum, repair/replace rotten wood.

11. Applicant: Graham Roofing

- a. Property Address: 357 Tuttle Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 7/21/14
- c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.

12. Applicant: Lesley and Chris Rainosek

- a. Property Address: 153 Macy Place
- b. Date of Approval: 7/21/14
- c. Project: Construct an interior lot privacy fence. Said fence will be eight feet in height (located adjacent to multi-family property) and will be located behind the front plane of the house.

13. Applicant: Todd Fowler

- a. Property Address: 1161 New Saint Francis Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/22/14
- c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme. Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match.

14. Applicant: Tony Jones

- a. Property Address: 221 South Dearborn Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/22/14
- c. Project: Construct an ancillary building per submitted designs. The building will be approximately 11' x 9'. The materials meet the guidelines.

15. Applicant: John Prince Contracting

- a. Property Address: 1753 Hunter Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 7/22/14

- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, material, etc... Repaint per the existing color scheme.
- 16. Applicant: Wrico Signs**
- a. Property Address: **452 Government Street - D**
- b. Date of Approval: 7/23/14
- c. Project: Install an upper wall sign. The 3' x 5' metal sign will measure the name of the business establishment.
- 17. Applicant: Bill and Yvonne DeMouy**
- a. Property Address: 105 Levert Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 7/24/14
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the house per the submitted color Valspar color scheme: the body will be Oatbran; the skirt will be Ivory Brown; the porch decking will be Fired Earth; and the trim will be white
- 18. Applicant: Bradley and Courtney Robertson**
- a. Property Address: 360 South Ann Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/24/14
- c. Project: Install interior lot privacy (6' in height around the rear portion of the property). Said wooden privacy fencing will not extend beyond the front plane of the house. Repair deteriorated woodwork on the principle dwelling to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.
- 19. Applicant: Thiry and Caddell**
- a. Property Address: 1911 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/24/14
- c. Project: Install a monument sign. The wooden armature sign will measure a height of five feet. The total square footage of the sign, the materials, and design of the sign meet the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. No lighting will be employed.
- 20. Applicant: Stoney-Erin Boatman**
- a. Property Address: 1254 Texas Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/28/14
- c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair any deteriorated woodwork (when and where necessary) to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.
- 21. Applicant: Layla Tweddell**
- a. Property Address: 69 South Julia Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/28/14
- c. Project: Reroof with 30 year architectural shingle, charcoal, repair rotten wood and repaint to match, replace damaged garage door, install handrail back steps.
- 22. Applicant: Renovations by Fred South LLC**
- a. Property Address: 1461 Eslava Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/28/14
- c. Project: Repair and replace exterior siding and trim as needed and paint in the following BLP color scheme: body: Fort Morgan Sand; trim White; accent Claiborne Street Red; repair windows and doors; repair roof as needed; level foundations as needed; repair porch opening to original configuration. All repairs to match original in profile, dimension and materials.
- 23. Applicant: Vaughan Drinkard**
- a. Property Address: 966 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/29/14
- c. Project: Install a temporary vehicular cover in the rear portion of the lot.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2014-36-CA: 312 North Jackson Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Michelle Harbin
- b. Project: Fenestration and Ancillary Construction – Construct a dormer window off the rear elevation and construct a new ancillary building in the rear lot.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD.

2. 2014-37-CA: 1741 Hunter Avenue

- a. Applicant: Keri Coumanis and David Ray
- b. Project: Ironwork, fenestration, Paint, and Eaves – Remove ironwork from the front entrance (later burglar door, railing, and decorative supports); repair metal casement windows; replace metal casement windows (when necessary); repaint iron, paved, and wooden elements; and remove alterations to house’s fascia.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2014-36-CA: 312 North Jackson Street
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Michelle Harbin
Received: 7/22/14
Meeting: 8/6/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Ancillary Construction – Construct a dormer window off the rear elevation and construct an ancillary building in the rear lot.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house, a turn of century Queen Anne dwelling, features an irregular massing, a wraparound porch and projecting gables. The house was relocated to the subject lot in 2002 from Toulminville.

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 31, 2005. At that time, the Board approved the reconstruction of the house’s front porch, the replacement of fenestration, and the alteration of fenestration. With this application, the applicant proposes the construction of a dormer off of the rear elevation and the construction of an ancillary building.
- B. The Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
 - 2. “An ancillary 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 to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
 - 3. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in historic districts. However, it is important that design, location, and materials be compatible with the property.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Construct a dormer.
 - a. The dormer will be centered on the East (rear) Elevation’s hipped roof.
 - b. The dormer’s walls will be faced with wooden siding.
 - c. The aforementioned siding will match that employed on the body of the house.

- d. The dormer will feature a wooden four light window.
 - e. The dormer will feature a gabled roof.
 - f. The roofing shingles will match those employed on the body of the house.
2. Construct an ancillary building.
- a. The ancillary building, a carport, will be located within the northeast corner of the lot.
 - b. The building will measure 24' in width and 26' in depth.
 - c. The building will be located 4' from both the North and East property lines.
 - d. The building will rest atop a concrete foundation.
 - e. Six square section columnar posts featuring necking and capitals will be employed.
 - f. Said columnar supports will extend along the North and South Elevations.
 - g. A 4' 6" by 26' storage room will occupy the eastern portion of the carport.
 - h. A single door (wooden) will provide access into the storage.
 - i. The height of the building (up to the top of the columnar supports) will be 10'.
 - j. A continuous entablature will surround the building.
 - k. A hipped roof featuring a 5/12 slope will surmount the building.
 - l. The building's roofing shingles will match those employed on the main house.
3. Install concrete paving connecting the new carport with existing concrete driveway.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a dormer off of the East (rear) Elevation and the construction of an ancillary building.

On account of the elevation (rear) of the proposed work and location of the house within the block, the dormer would not be visible from the public view. The body of the roof would remain unaltered. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building (See B-1.). Four light in construction, the dormer's window complement the pattern established by the first floor's larger two-over-two windows.

The proposed ancillary building would be located in the northeast corner of the property. Set back within the lot, the building would not directly impact the streetscape. The location of the building is in accord with setback restrictions and the dimensions do not exceed lot coverage requirements. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that new ancillary construction should complement the design and scale of the main building (See B-2.). Wood in construction, proportionally attuned, and adopting the roof pitch of the main dwelling, the carport respects the existing design context which informs the lot.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that modern paving materials are acceptable in historic districts (See B-3.). The additional sections of concrete paving would connect the carport to an existing concrete drive. The surface material is compatible with the existing context.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), 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

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

After providing a brief explication of how the form-based code guidelines currently affect projects within the Downtown Loop, Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that the application up for review was being revised. He went on to state that the roof pitch of the carport would be 6/12 instead of 5/12.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Kearley if he had any clarifications to make, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Kearley responded by saying that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Roberts and Ms. Harden spoke briefly of the form based code, the project, and procedure (form based code)/ Mr. Kearley and Ms. Harden agreed this meeting was not the place for discussion of the latter. Ms. Harden and Mr. Blackwell stated that efforts were being made to address valid concerns of how City staff and applicants receive and review applications.

No further discussion ensued.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application the application. No one from the audience voiced concern. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd 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, amending facts to note the change in the roof pitch of the ancillary building from 5/12 to 6/12.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as amended 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: 8/6/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2014-37-CA: 1741 Hunter Avenue
Applicant: Keri Coumanis and David Ray
Received: 7/21/14
Meeting: 8/6/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing (Staff notes that when the Old Dauphin Way Historic District is next resurveyed this house is already eligible in terms of its period and style to be classed as a contributing dwelling.)
Zoning: R-1
Project: Ironwork, fenestration, Paint, and Eaves – Remove ironwork from the front entrance (later burglar door, railing, and decorative supports); repair metal casement windows; replace metal casement windows (when necessary); repaint iron, paved, and wooden elements; and remove alterations to house’s fascia.

BUILDING HISTORY

While the Polk City Directories for Mobile do not contain a listing for this residence in their combined 1947-1948 edition, an Edwin P. Pierce is listed as living on this lot in 1949-1950. The residence, a classic mid century “ranch house”, is distinguished by distinctive bricks, casement windows, and an overall horizontal massing. With its volume defined form (spaces/uses determining massing), asymmetrical composition, and ahistorical treatment, the house is a fine example of “Modern” residential architecture of the mid 20th-Century period.

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. With this application, the new owner/applicants propose: the removal of ironwork from around the front entrance (later burglar door and decorative posts); the repair metal casement windows; the replacement of metal casement windows (when necessary); the repainting of iron, paved, and wooden elements; and the removal of alterations to house’s fascia.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The type, size, and dividing light of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help to establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing. Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”

2. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions, and decorative details.”
3. “The form and shape of the porch should maintain their historic appearance.”
4. “Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted photographs, color samples, etc...):

1. Remove ironwork from the front entrance.
 - a. Remove the later burglar door located in front of the front door.
 - b. Remove the iron grillwork located to either side of the façade’s recessed front entrance.
 - c. Remove the section of railing located to the left of the recessed entrance
 - d. Also with relation to the front entrance, stain the porch floor Sealskin by Sherwin Williams (charcoal).
2. Reglaze and repair windows.
 - a. Reglaze windows to match the existing.
 - b. Paint the muntins Sealskin.
 - c. Paint the sills White Duck by Sherwin Williams (off white).
3. Replace fenestration.
 - a. Replace deteriorated casement windows as required.
 - a. Replace only those severely deteriorated casement windows with salvaged casement windows that will match the original windows with regard to material, dimension, and profile.
 - b. Paint the casement windows per the aforementioned color scheme (See C-2).
4. Remove later alterations to the house’s eaves.
 - a. Remove vinyl fascia boards covering the house’s eaves.
 - b. Paint the trim per the submitted color (White Duck).

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the following: the removal of ironwork (a later security door, decorative supports, and section of railing) from the front entrance; the repair of metal casement windows; the replacement of metal casement windows (when necessary); the repainting of iron, paved, and wood elements; and the removal of alterations to house’s fascia.

Ironwork, grillwork, “iron lace”, etc... conjures up a pervasive image of Mobile, one that still defines many people’s vision of Mobile’s architecture. Despite the demolition of a vast number of the 19th-Century commercial and residential buildings which were adorned with ironwork, Mobile possesses an enviable collection of finely wrought and expertly casted specimens. In addition to examples surviving in situ or in museums, houses in Midtown, Spring Hill, Sky Ranch, and other residential developments are distinguished by salvaged ironwork. A distinctive subset of Mobile “ranch houses” built from the 1940s through the 1960s is easily identifiable on account of their use of salvaged ironwork. This 1940s ranch house has an iron burglar door (not original) installed in front of the residence’s original front door, a section of railing located to the left of the recessed entrance, and decorative iron supports located to either side of the main entrance. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period (See B-2). Removal of the later burglar bars, section of railing, and entrance supports (decorative not structural) would not alter the overall form of the porch (See B-3.). While they is likely original to the house, the ironwork railing and supports are neither of the same quality as traditional ironwork nor are they seminal characteristic of the Modern

aesthetic informing the rest of the house. Additional, the lower portions of the iron frames encasing the decorative supports' curvilinear details are rusted out (posing a safety concern).

Though initially touted for their supposed durability and maintenance free qualities, historic casement windows require the same maintenance and care necessitated by wooden windows. Corrosion, structural failure, and over painting are among the principle maladies affecting metal windows. These conditions have taken their toll on the subject house's windows. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the applicants propose both the repair and in kind replacement of (when necessary) of deteriorated windows. The type of intervention has been determined by the degree of deterioration. The replacement of windows would be restricted to the house's picture or "Chicago" windows (See B-1.). Replacement windows of the same dimensions, style, and manufacturer have been secured (See submitted photographs.). As evidenced by photographs provided by the applicant and supplemented by Staff, a number of window panes have cracked. All necessary reglazing will match the original.

On account of the horizontal massing germane to the ranch house typology, relatively low-pitched roofs are a common characteristic of many ranch houses. Houses with low-pitched roofs in semi-tropical locales such as Mobile require constant maintenance. A previous owner faced the houses eaves with vinyl in what can be surmised was an attempt to prevent rot and maintain appearances. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, applicants propose the removal of the later coverings and the reclamation of the original roof treatment (See B-4.). Any repairs will match the original fabric.

The proposed color scheme complements the design and materials of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-4), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the historic district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Keri Coumanis was present to discuss the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Ms. Coumanis if she had any clarifications to make, questions to ask, or comments to make. Ms. Coumanis answered no.

Mr. Roberts inquired as to where Ms. Coumanis had obtained the windows. Ms. Coumanis informed the Board that the windows had been salvaged from the Diamond Residence in Country Club Estates. She elaborated by saying that that the salvaged windows are of the same period, dimension, style, and manufacturer as the windows in her home. Ms. Coumanis explained to the Board that she and her husband are only the third owners of the house and that an earlier owner had with good intention made detrimental interventions to the windows which they were trying to address. After noting the superior condition of the salvaged windows, Ms. Coumanis elaborated as to the method and parties involved in the scope of work.

Ms. Harden complimented Ms. Coumanis with regard to the extent of effort she had extended on examining the windows in situ, conducting historical research, and procuring new windows. After discussing the ailments and structure of casement windows, Ms. Harden asked for clarification as to the

nature of the intervention. Ms. Coumanis stated that where windows cannot be repaired they would be replaced/reglazed to match the existing.

Ms. Coumanis went on to address the removal of iron components, the removal of eave alterations, and painting of the dwelling.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Ms. Coumanis if she had any clarifications to make, questions to ask, or comments to make.

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: 8/6/15