

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
December 17, 2008 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER – Chair

The meeting was called to order by the chair Tilmon Brown at 3:01.

The Introductory Statement was read by the staff.

The members present were Tilmon Brown, Tom Karwinski, Harris Oswalt, Bunky Ralph, Craig Roberts, Jim Wagoner and Barja Wilson.

Staff present was: Devereaux Bemis; Keri Coumanis; and John Lawler.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved as posted per a motion of Harris Oswalt.

The Mid-Month Requests were approved as submitted per a motion of Bunky Ralph.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

- 1. Applicant's Name: Beth Legett**
 - a. Property Address: 1208 Selma
 - b. Date of Approval: December 5, 2008
 - c. Project: Repaint in existing scheme, except trim to be white, shutters black.

- 2. Applicant's Name: Tim Dozier**
 - a. Property Address: 13 S. Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: December 3, 2008
 - c. Project: Replace rear modern door to match Barnett Millworks 686-MRBL but in wood with Luan cladding.

- 3. Applicant's Name: A.J. Edwards Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 162 S. Lawrence St.
 - b. Date of Approval: November 26, 2008
 - c. Project: Reroof flat portion with Duralast system and replace metal gutters and downspouts. Place metal coping on walls.

- 4. Applicant's Name: Hernandez Calhoun**
 - a. Property Address: 354 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: December 8, 2008
 - c. Project: Hang shingle sign per plans, 12 square footage total.

- 5. Applicant's Name: Gary Henderson**
 - a. Property Address: 458 Chatham Street
 - b. Date of Approval: December 3, 2008
 - c. Project: Stabilize structure, including repairing and or securing loose boards; Close up doors and windows with plywood to fit securely over existing opening; Applicant to come back with detailed work proposal for fixing up property at a later date.

6. **Applicant's Name: Barbara Hamilton**
 - a. Property Address: 1110 Savannah
 - b. Date of Approval: December 2, 2008
 - c. Project: Replace rotten front porch decking with 5/4 inch tongue and groove decking. Paint entire porch floor to match the existing.

7. **Applicant's Name: 1601 Dauphin Building Partnership, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 1601 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: December 4, 2008
 - c. Project: Install new roof and decking as necessary. Roof to be: 40 year, GAF Timberline Prestique High Definition Charcoal Black in color.

C. APPLICATIONS

**Approved
Certified Record Attached.**

1. **160-08-CA: 208 Dauphin Street**
 - a. Applicant: JSM, LLC
 - b. Request: façade treatment approval

2. **179-08-CA: 301 Government Street**
 - a. Applicant: SignMgmt
 - b. Request: Signage

3. **184-08-CA: 1133 Montauk Avenuee**
 - a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley
 - b. Request: Renovation

4. **185-08-CA: 102 Dauphin Street**
 - a. Applicant: Quality Sign Co., Inc.
 - b. Request: Signage

5. **178-08-CA: 109 Bradford Ave**
 - a. Applicant: Pope
 - b. Request: window approval

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. New Guidelines: Staff discussed mailing out a final draft of a portion of the guidelines at the first of the year.
2. Board Orientation for New Members: Devereaux announced that there would be a training session for Bradford Ladd next Monday, December 22, 2008, at noon if anyone would like to sit in. Though Bradford would probably not be appointed to the Board yet, his appointment is anticipated before the end of the year.
3. January 7, 2009 Meeting: Staff discussed the need to make sure there would be a quorum. Board members indicated enough would be present.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 3:45

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

160-08-CA: 208 Dauphin Street
Applicant: JSMM, LLC.
Received: 11/26/08
Meeting: 12/17/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: B-4
Project: Façade approval

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a new, two-story commercial building where there was a shell of a former historic building which burned.

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. The applicants consulted the MHDC, as required, in order to acquire a certificate of occupancy for their new movie theater and loft condos. Staff visited the building and realized the façade deviated from the submitted plan. The applicants appeared before the ARB on November 5, 2008, seeking approval for the as-built facade. The Board suggested, and the applicants agreed to participate in, a Design Review Committee in order to determine alternate treatments for the façade.
- B. The original plan called for the transom (now mezzanine windows) to be directly above the doorways. As illustrated by the attached photos, the transom windows have been placed higher in order to accommodate interior floor plan changes. Any change from the submitted plan requires a reappearance before the ARB.
- C. Applicants seek approval to:
 - 1. to paint lower story of front façade per submitted plan;
 - 2. to apply decorative stucco to lower story of front façade per submitted plan.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicants’ proposal follows the recommendations of the Design Review Committee. Therefore, Staff recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

John Switzer with JSMM, LLC was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Board discussed how the applicant was following the suggestions of the Design Review Committee.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph 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

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts in the Staff Report and as determined 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: 12/17/09

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

166-08-CA: 301 Government Street
Applicant: Maura Garino for Holiday Inn
Received: 10/16/08
Meeting: 11/05/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing Property
Zoning: B-4
Project: Lighting and Signage

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this 16-story masonry building was built as a Sheraton in 1975. It now houses a Holiday Inn.

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 contemporary building in the Church Street East district is now the Holiday Inn and has been undergoing an exterior renovation these last few months, including new windows and fresh paint. As part of the exterior renovation, the Holiday Inn would like to install new lighting and signage. The applicants appeared before the ARB on November 5, 2008 and received approval for the following:
 - 1. Exterior lighting, per submitted plan;
 - 2. 6 exterior, reverse-channel, illuminated signs.
- B. Since that time, the Holiday Inn’s national sign contractor, SignMgmt, has contacted the MHDC and indicated they would like to amend their request. SignMgmt will install the reverse-channel illuminated signage on the first floor of the building, as approved. However, SignMgmt is now seeking approval to install internally-illuminated (or back-lit signage) on the 17th floor of the building. Currently, the Holiday Inn has two internally-illuminated signs on the 17th floor of the building. The proposed signs would replace those.
- C. As discussed at the November 5 meeting, the proposed (and existing signage) exceeds the maximum square footage allotted for this parcel under the sign ordinance. However, Holiday Inn received a variance following the November 6, 2006 Board of Zoning Adjustment meeting allowing the Holiday Inn to exceed the allotted square footage for its signage. Staff has consulted the BZA. At this time, the Holiday Inn will not need to reappear before the BZA for the proposed signage since the square footage is equal to or lesser than the existing signage. Furthermore, the proposed signage is fewer square feet than existing.
- D. The Mobile Historic District Sign Guidelines read, in pertinent part:
 - 1. Internally lit signs are prohibited.
 - 2. Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination.

- E. Applicants propose:
1. Two internally illuminated signs at roofline
 - a. 23' long
 - b. 4' tall
 - c. white script
 - d. 95 square feet total

STAFF ANALYSIS

According to the sign guidelines, internally-lit signs are not allowed in the historic districts. The applicants argue the approved, reverse-channel, illuminated signage will be useless, given the low amount of light emitted, on the 17th floor. The applicants have included a rendering of the nighttime elevation for the approved, reverse-channel illuminated sign (see attached photo marked “approved”). The applicants have also included a photo of what the proposed signage will look like as installed. See attached photo marked “proposed”(note: the signage for this site will only say “Holiday Inn”, not “Holiday Inn Express”).

As demonstrated by the renderings, given the height of this building and the placement of the proposed signage, Staff is inclined to agree with the applicants that reverse-channel, illuminated signage would not be particularly useful from that elevation. Therefore, and since the proposed signage replaces similarly-illuminated existing signage, Staff recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

A board discussion took place. Several Boardmembers indicated that they did not agree with the staff recommendation. Staff indicated there was disagreement within the office regarding the recommendation for this project. The Board discussed the sign guidelines and the fact that the sign guidelines prohibit internally illuminated signage. The Board further discussed how they have not allowed internally lit signage to be installed within a historic district or along Government Street. A discussion was held about the applicability of the design guidelines to taller buildings within the district. Staff indicated there was disagreement within the office regarding the recommendation for this project.

FINDING OF FACT

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district, , that a Certificate of Appropriateness be denied and the Board reaffirms the original approval. The motion received a second. Six voted in favor; one in opposition.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

184-08-CA: 1133 Montauk Avenue
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Received: 11/26/08
Meeting: 12/17/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Porch renovation

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a large two-story, Victorian in the Old Dauphin Way district. Most likely constructed at the turn of the century, the original northeast corner of the porch was filled-in at a later date.

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 is a large two-story, Victorian in the Old Dauphin Way district. Most likely constructed at the turn of the century, the original northeast corner of the porch was filled-in at a later date. The applicants seek to restore the porch to its original configuration, replicating existing columns and balustrade.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines read in pertinent part: “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. The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch.”
- C. Applicants propose, per submitted plan:
 - 1. Open northeast corner of porch;
 - 2. Install columns, railing, valance and brackets to match existing;
 - 3. Remove roof from rear of porch to east wing;
 - 4. Repair/ replace porch decking with 5/4” x 4” tongue and groove decking as needed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff recommends approval. The application conforms to the applicable guidelines. One window removed from the porch will be reused on-site, per submitted plan. Others will be retained for use elsewhere. Therefore, Staff recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Douglas Kearley confirmed that an original doorway from the house to the east side of the porch would be revealed and reused.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig 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

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts, 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: 12/17/09

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

185-08-CA: 102 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Quality Sign Co., Inc.
Received: 12/01/08
Meeting: 12/17/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a two-story, masonry storefront with Italianate 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. The applicants intend to install a sign.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines provide for the following:
 - 1. For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors.
 - 2. 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.
 - 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. Internally lit signs are prohibited.
 - 5. Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination.
- C. Applicants propose:
 - 1. flag sign mounted on metal arm bracket;
 - 2. heavy duty foam sign (sample to be brought to ARB meeting);
 - 3. approximately 8’ sq. ft.;
 - 4. colors to match building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicant’s proposal conforms to our sign design guidelines. Though the sign is made of a modern material, the ARB has approved this material for signs in the past. Therefore, Staff recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Richard Wayborn and Kenneth Clark from Quality Signs were present to discuss the application. Mr. Wayborn requested to move the placement of the sign on the building from a pilaster to a center column. Staff noted that the size of the sign in the staff report was incorrect and only counted one side of the sign. [Please note: Quality Signs has since called asked to install the sign on the pilaster per the original application.]

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. The Board indicated that either place would be acceptable and it was noted that the pilaster would be a more traditional location. The Board also took an opportunity to examine the sample material.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswald 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 fact C(1) to “attached to center post” and C(3) to read “16 sq. ft.”

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Harris Oswald 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: 12/17/09

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

178-08-CA: 109 Bradford Avenue
Applicant: Manicore Properties, LLC
Received: 10/28/08
Meeting: 12/17/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Retain non-conforming windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a 4-plex in the Old Dauphin Way district constructed in the 1920s.

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. The applicants are seeking approval for non-conforming windows installed without a COA. The applicants removed steel casement windows without approval from the ARB. Staff cited the applicants and issued a stop work order. The applicants appeared before ARB on November 5, 2008, asking to retain the windows as installed. The ARB suggested the applicant research alternatives and tabled the application. The applicant has completed his research and would like to present alternative windows to the ARB at this point.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines read, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “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.”
- C. Applicants propose:
 - 1. retaining 32-1/1, double-hung, insulated vinyl-clad, wood window framing OR
 - a. removing the new, single-pane sashes
 - b. replacing with either 4/4 or 6/6 sashes on the larger windows;
 - c. replacing with either 2/2 or 3/3 sashes on the smaller windows;
 - d. all proposed windows will have interior, faux muntins.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff intends to research this issue, as well, and present any findings at the upcoming ARB meeting.

STAFF ANALYSIS REVISED

By consulting with the window provider, Staff determined the existing window casings could not be retrofitted to allow for casement sashes. Staff determined that the alternative window sashes suggested by the applicants were not appropriate. Staff reiterated the recommendation from the November 19, 2008 meeting: under the guidelines, new, replacement, vinyl-clad, wood windows are not appropriate for this historic building.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Jay Altmayer, Jr., Josh Altmayer, Randy Pope and Ricky Dean were present to discuss the application. The applicants stated that they misinterpreted the map and were not aware the building was located in a historic district. The applicants indicated it would not be cost effective to replace the windows with more historically appropriate windows. The applicants admitted they had not received a building permit to do the work.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. The Board discussed the fact that the applicants failed to get a building permit before installing the windows. The Board discussed the guidelines and reiterated that vinyl-clad wood windows are not allowed as replacement windows on historic buildings within the historic districts. The Board also pointed out that the original windows were casements windows and these were sash. It was noted that the black casements matched the French doors on the front of the building in operation and that converting the windows to sash significantly altered the original design of the building.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig 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

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and a Certificate of Appropriateness be denied.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.