

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
February 16, 2011 – 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: Gertrude Baker, Kim Harden, Bill James, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, and Jim Wagoner.
Members Absent: Carlos Gant, Craig Roberts, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson.
Staff Members Present: Cart Blackwell and Sandra Franks.
2. Mr. Oswalt moved to approve the minutes of the January 5, 2010 and January 19, 2011 meetings. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. After receiving clarifications regarding certain staff approvals, Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Ben Cummings**
 - a. Property Address: 1 Houston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/19/11
 - c. Project: Replace rotten wooden siding and columnar bases to match the existing. Replace the wooden handrails. Repaint to match the existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant: Angela Ladnier**
 - a. Property Address: 61 South Julia Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/18/11
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with architectural shingles.
3. **Applicant: J & J Painting**
 - a. Property Address: 160 Rapier Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/18/11
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the submitted color scheme. The walls will be painted Valspar's Daffodil. The moldings, soffits, entablature, columns, and other detailing will be white.
4. **Applicant: Stauter Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 257 Charles Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/14/11
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated siding, moldings, and decking to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the house. The color scheme will be the same as the existing.
5. **Applicant: David Calametti**
 - a. Property Address: 453 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/11/11
 - c. Project: Install a wooden hanging sign. The sign will be suspended from a metal bracket. The sign will measure 4 feet in height and three feet six inches in length. The sign will feature the name of the establishment.
6. **Applicant: John Wyre**
 - a. Property Address: 659 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/18/11
 - c. Project: Install a six foot interior lot privacy fence with a boxed top to the rear of the building.

7. **Applicant: Christopher McGough**
 - a. Property Address: 912 Charleston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/24/11
 - c. Project: Paint the house in the following Valspar colors: Churchill Hotel Wheat (3005-10B); trim white; porch floor and skirting Bellingrath Green.
8. **Applicant: Delta Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 1015 Savannah Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/24/11
 - c. Project: Repair, level, and repoint foundation piers.
9. **Applicant: Ben Cummings for McGill-Toolen High School**
 - a. Property Address: 1413 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/21/11
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork and replace wooden canopies to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the work to match the existing.
10. **Applicant: Brian and Kimberly Stewart**
 - a. Property Address: 1515 Eslava Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/21/11
 - c. Project: Remove vinyl window units. Install one-over-one wooden windows.
11. **Applicant: Paul Howen**
 - a. Property Address: 1706 McGill Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/24/11
 - c. Project: Paint house with the following color scheme: Trim: Roycroft Vellum (off-white, Sherwin Williams) and Body: Weathered Shingle (tan, Sherwin Williams).
12. **Applicant: Tony Moore for Spot of Tea**
 - a. Property Address: 310 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/25/11
 - c. Project: Install a 30 square foot sign over the front entrance to the building. The sign will measure 10' in length and 3' in height. The aluminum-faced sign will feature the name of the establishment.
13. **Applicant: Robert Barnes**
 - a. Property Address: 116 Houston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/25/11
 - c. Project: Install a prefabricated ancillary structure in the backyard. The structure will feature board-and-batten siding painted a reddish hue so to blend with the brick walls of the main house. The unit will be placed so meet the setback requirements of the lot. The structure will be situated in the northwest corner of the backyard.
14. **Applicant: Mary Hollis**
 - a. Property Address: 1765 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/26/11
 - c. Project: Replace rotten boards and woodwork to match the existing. Paint the house per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme. The body of the house will be Soulmate. The trim will be Discreet White.
15. **Applicant: Jason McLendon**
 - a. Property Address: 211 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/26/11
 - c. Project: Install a 2' high by 8' long metal sign within the existing overhanging sign frame (per submitted plans). The sign will feature the name of the establishment.

16. **Applicant: Corrina Stellitano**
 - a. Property Address: 5 North Jackson Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/26/11
 - c. Project: Install a hanging metal sign that will measure 4' by 2' (per submitted plans).
17. **Applicant: Brian & Kimberly Stewart**
 - a. Property Address: 1515 Eslava Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/28/11
 - c. Project: Install siding to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Paint the work to match the existing.
18. **Applicant: Craig Lindsey**
 - a. Property Address: Renaissance Development within Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/26/11
 - c. Project: Plant Crepe Myrtles within both sides of the right of way in the 700 block of Monroe Street and the 200 block of South Scott Street..
19. **Applicant: Buzz Jordan**
 - a. Property Address: 401 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/27/11
 - c. Project: Replace and secure plyboard over the boarded up storefront.
20. **Applicant: Linda and Jeff Grill**
 - a. Property Address: 1124 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/28/11
 - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted Benjamin Moore color scheme. The body will be Alexandria Tan and the trim will be white.
21. **Applicant: Jeremy Cox**
 - a. Property Address: 210 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/1/11
 - c. Project: Place a vinyl canvas sign across the security boarding for the period of Mardi Gras. The sign will be removed by March 11, 2011.
22. **Applicant: Chris McGough**
 - a. Property Address: 912 Charleston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/2/11
 - c. Project: Remove the existing replacement door. Install a glazed and paneled door more in keeping with the style and period of the house.
23. **Applicant: Martha Hencken**
 - a. Property Address: 107 South Dearborn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/3/11
 - c. Project: Replace and repoint deteriorated brickwork to match the existing.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2011-09-CA: 257 Saint Anthony Street**
 - a. Applicant: Barry Friedman
 - b. Project: Construct a handicap access ramp and an overhanging porch-like umbrage.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
2. **2011-10-CA: 116 Ryan Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: David McConnell for Mr. & Mrs. George Finkbohner
 - b. Project: Relocate an ancillary structure and construct an ancillary structure.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. **2011-11-CA: 407 Conti Street**
 - a. Applicant: N. Andrew Rotenstreich with Haskell Slaughter & Reiker for Ezell House Corporation and New Cingular Wireless
 - b. Project: Place a Cell on Wheels (“COW”) mobile telecommunications facility on a rear portion of the larger property on a biannual basis.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
4. **2011-12-CA: 107 Saint Francis Street / 31 North Royal Street**
 - a. Applicant: Don McGlynn with Clearstream Consulting, Inc. for Open Range Communications.
 - b. Project: Install six microwave dish antennas atop the building’s pent-house or utility shaft.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
5. **2011-13-CA: 957 Savannah Street**
 - a. Applicant: Steve May
 - b. Project: Install a 5-V crimp metal roof.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
6. **2011-14-CA: 932 Conti Street**
 - a. Applicant: Steve May
 - b. Project: Install a 5-V crimp metal roof.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
7. **2011-15-CA: 706 Government Street**
 - a. Applicant: Paul Carpenter Davis
 - b. Project: Construct a rear addition.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Metal Roofs

Mr. Blackwell distributed to the Board a proposed amendment to the Midmonth Approval List. The amendment called for Staff approval of metal roofs. Midmonth approvals of traditional 5-V crimp metal roofs would only be issued to buildings where the installation was appropriate to the style and period of the building. Said roofing approvals on buildings where a metal roof would not impair the architectural of the historical integrity of the building.

2. “COWS”

Mr. Blackwell distributed to the Board a proposed amendment to the Midmonth Approval List. The amendment called for Staff approval of temporary installation of mechanical devices, such as “COWS” or Cells on Wheels, within Mobile’s historic districts for restricted periods of time and in where their presence would not impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building. After some preliminary discussion, the Board moved to review both of the proposed amendments in the time between the present and the following meeting.

3. Katrina Housing

Mr. Blackwell distributed to the Board elevations and specifications for so-called “Katrina” shotgun installations – prefabricated houses based on traditional shotgun dwellings that were developed in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. Mr. Blackwell

explained to the Board that a property owner in Mobile's historic districts wanted preliminary feedback regarding the installation of shotgun installations in the vacant lots in the Oakleigh Garden District. Mr. Blackwell told the Board that he had explained to the interested party that applications presented to the Board are reviewed on a case by case basis. Each application is reviewed with regard to its location within a district, its relationship to a lot/streetscape, its proposed design/materials, etc... After discussing the design (proportions and detailing in particular) and quality of the schematic drawings, the Board informed Mr. Blackwell that applicant should submit plans indicating how the proposed installations would be treated. Photographs of actual examples of the same or similar installation should be provided. Mr. James and Mr. Blackwell noted that these installations vary in design, detail, and quality.

4. Alternative Fencing Materials

Mr. Karwinski distributed brochures and exhibited an example (with accompanying sections of wooden) of a wood core plastic-faced privacy fence board. A discussion ensued. Mr. Karwinski told his fellow Board members that he intended to test the product to see how the embedded colors and overall structure handled Mobile's climatic conditions.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-09-CA: 257 Saint Anthony Street
Applicant: Barry Friedman
Received: 1/21/11
Meeting: 2/16/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Detonti Square
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Construct a handicap access ramp and an overhanging porch-like umbrage.

BUILDING HISTORY

This building was constructed as a four unit apartment house. The building's second story was lost in the 1980s.

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 September 11, 2000. At that time, the Board denied a request to install a handicap access ramp off the building's west elevation. With this application, the present applicant proposes the construction of handicap access with an overhanging porch-like umbrage off the east elevation.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."
 - 2. "New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired."

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

- 1. Construct a handicap access ramp and an overhanging porch-like umbrage (per submitted plans).
 - a. The porch and porch-like umbrage will be located off the building's east elevation.
 - b. The upper section of the dog-leg-shaped concrete ramp will extend southward from the existing concrete stoop. The existing steps will be demolished. An intermediate landing will provide transition to the north-facing lower section of the ramp.
 - c. Both legs of the two part ramp will measure five feet in width.

- d. An aluminum railing will enclose the ramp. The aluminum railing will measure 3' 6" in height.
- e. The overhanging porch-like umbrage will extend over the ramp and into the parking lot.
- f. The umbrage will measure 15' in width and 27' in depth.
- g. The umbrage will be supported by three equidistantly spaced square section wooden posts featuring wooden brackets.
- h. The posts will support a hipped roof with shingles that match the shingles found on the body of the building.
- i. The fascia and eave line will match that of the house in dimensions and detailing.
- j. The woodwork will be painted to match the trim color found on the body of the building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a handicap access ramp and an overhanging porch-like umbrage. The building has been extensively altered over the course of the last third of the twentieth century. A second-story was removed. Porches were infilled.

The proposed ramp and umbrage would be constructed off the three southernmost bays of the side or east elevation. The roof form will be of the same type and adopt the same pitch as that found on the body of the house. The roofing material will match the existing. The detailing is in accord with the design and material standards established by the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural integrity of the surrounding district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Barry Friedman was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Friedman if he had comments to make or questions to ask with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Friedman said no. Mr. Ladd asked his fellow board member if they had any questions to ask the applicant. Upon hearing no response, 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 commented on the application. Mr. Ladd 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: 2/16/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-10-CA: 116 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: David McConnell for Mr. & Mrs. George Finkbohner
Received: 1/24/11
Meeting: 2/16/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Relocate an ancillary structure and construct an ancillary structure.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story brick house is a Colonial Revival influenced design. The house was constructed in 1938 for C. E. Jones by the builder B. Greene.

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 relocation of an existing ancillary structure and the construction of a second ancillary structure.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for 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 to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Relocate a small ancillary structure from the rear (eastern) lot line roughly fifteen feet further into the lot from its existing location.
 - 2. Construct a new ancillary structure.
 - a. Remove an existing grade level deck and brick borders.
 - b. The ancillary structure will measure 18’ in length and 12’ in depth.
 - c. The building will be located 7.6 from the existing rear or eastern lot line’s wooden fence.
 - d. The building will rest atop a 12’ height concrete foundation.
 - e. The walls of the building will be sheathed with hardiboard siding.
 - f. The building’s color scheme will match that of the main house.
 - g. The building’s gable roof will be sheathed with architectural shingles as

- those found on the main house.
- h. The East (rear or alley-facing) Elevation will not feature fenestration.
 - i. The South Elevation will feature a pair of six-over-six wooden windows.
 - j. The West Elevation (facing the rear of the house) will feature a six paneled wooden door.
 - k. The North Elevation will not feature fenestration.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This two part application concerns the relocation of an existing ancillary structure and the construction of a new ancillary structure. Both the sites of the proposed relocation and the new construction are not visible from the public of way. By virtue of the position of the main residence, the presence of fencing, and the growth of landscaping, the two buildings would only be visible upon entering the property's backyard.

The existing ancillary structure, a play house, would be moved roughly fifteen feet forward into the lot from its present location. The relocated installation would be located roughly in plan with the rear plan of the house's existing carport, which features a walled storage area. Staff does not believe the relocation of the existing ancillary structure will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

New ancillary construction is reviewed according with design standards outlined by the Guidelines for New Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts. The design and materials meet the standards specified by the Guidelines. Staff does not believe the proposed ancillary construction will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

David McConnell was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. McConnell if he had any comments to add or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report.

Mr. McConnell addressed the Board saying that he had already spoken with Mr. Blackwell regarding the foundation treatment of the new ancillary structure. He told the Board that the new structure would not rest on a continuous concrete foundation because the installation of such a foundation would jeopardize existing plantings and paving. He said that the proposed structure would be situated atop wooden pilings.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant's representative. Mr. Karwinski said that he had several questions. He asked Mr. McConnell if the new ancillary structure's foundation would be screened by lattice skirting. Mr. McConnell answered yes. Mr. Karwinski then asked Mr. McConnell how the structure would be detailed, particularly the windows, corner boards, and trim. Mr. McConnell answered that the detailing would match that of the house. Mr.

Karwinski said that the proposed treatment was not indicated in the drawings. Mr. McConnell said that he did not think he needed to go into that level of detail for a shed.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd 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, amending facts to note that the new ancillary structure would rest of wooden pilings and the detailing of the structure would match that of the main residence.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. 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: 2/16/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-11-CA: 407 Conti Street
Applicant: N. Andrew Rotenstreich with Haskell Slaughter & Reiker for Ezell House Corporation and New Cingular Wireless
Received: 1/24/11
Meeting: 2/16/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Place a Cell on Wheels (“COW”) mobile telecommunications facility on a rear portion of the larger property on a biannual basis.

BUILDING HISTORY

The 1867 Martin Horst House is one of Mobile’s finest extant Italianate double pile residences. The property, featuring an extensive assortment of iron street furnishings and largely intact service court, is among finest 19th-century residential complexes.

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 biannual installation of a Cell on Wheels (“COW”) mobile telecommunications facility on a rear portion of the larger property.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans, photographs, and drawings):
 - 1. Place a Cell on Wheels (“COW”) mobile telecommunications facility behind the service wing of the main building within the rear parking lot accessed via Franklin Street.
 - 2. The mobile communications unit will be setback approximately 30’ from Hamilton Street and approximately 45’ from the rear of the property.
 - 3. The mobile communications unit will feature a mast measuring 67’ in height
 - 4. The mobile communications facility will be placed on the property for a two week period coinciding with Bayfest and a four week period coinciding with Mardi Gras.
 - 5. The mobile communications facility will be secured by a meshed enclosure that will be located roughly several feet from the unit.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The mobile telecommunications unit or “COW” though listed associated with 407 Conti Street, will not be located within the historic Horst House complex. It would be located within the northwest corner of a parking lot situated between Government and Conti Streets. The parking lot is a part of a larger complex featuring the historic buildings oriented toward Conti Street.

The unit would be most visible from Hamilton Street, were it would be set back within the block behind a coping wall, an elevated section of grass and a recessed wall. The telecommunications unit would be placed on the site on a biannual basis, two weeks coinciding with Bayfest and four weeks coinciding with Mardi Gras.

Staff contacted the Vieux Carre Commission and the Historic Districts Landmark Commission of New Orleans regarding this application. Staff in both offices communicated that mobile communication units of this type are placed at various points in and around the Vieux Carre during the Mardi Gras Season. The approval of the “COW” units in New Orleans is done administratively on account of the temporary nature of the installations and the need for increased cellular coverage during Carnival.

Taking into account the policy adopted by the New Orleans commissions, the temporality of the mobile communication device’s installation, and the inner lot location of the proposed unit, Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Andrew Rotenstreich was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant’s representative. He asked Mr. Rotenstreich if he had any clarifications to make or comments to add with regard to the Staff Report.

Mr. Rotenstreich replied saying that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the request. He went on to describe the reasoning behind the submission. Mr. Rotenstreich told the Board that during times of increased cellular activity, such as Bayfest and Mardi Gras, calls were blocked. He said that that situation posed a threat to public safety, as well as convenience.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant’s representative. Mr. Karwinski said he had several questions. He asked Mr. Rotenstreich who owned the parking lot in question. Mr. Rotenstreich responded saying it was owned by Ezell House Corporation. Mr. Karwinski stated that it was his understanding that the parking lot was owned by the Mobile Archdiocese. A discussion of the actual location of the proposed mobile communications device ensued. After a comparison of the two applicant submitted site plans it was realized that the proposed site of the device was the inner or western portion of a vacant lot/parking lot located one block west of the site described in Staff Report and marked on one of the two site plans.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Oswalt 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 that the mobile communications device would be located in the inner or western or inner portion of the vacant lot of the block immediately west of the one described in the Staff Report.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Oswalt 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: 2/16/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-12-CA: 107 Saint Francis Street / 31 North Royal Street
Applicant: Don McGlynn with Clearstream Consulting, Inc. for Open Range Communications
Received: 1/24/11
Meeting: 2/16/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install six microwave dish antennas atop the building's penthouse (or utility shaft).

BUILDING HISTORY

This thirty-four story skyscraper originally housed the First National Bank. From the time of its completion in 1965 to 1986, the building was the tallest structure in the State of Alabama. Commercial establishments occupy the ground floor. Floors two through six serve as a parking deck. The seventh through the thirty-third floors house offices. The Bienville Club is situated on the thirty-fourth floor .

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 November 17, 2010. At that time, the Board approved the installation of a comprehensive signage package and the construction of a special amenity.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Accessory roof elements not original to the structure, such as vents, skylights, satellite dishes, etc. shall be located inconspicuously.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Install six microwave dish antennas atop the building's penthouse or utility shaft.
 - 2. Four of the dish antenna will be located along the perimeter the penthouse's north elevation.
 - 3. Two of the dish antenna will be located along the perimeter of the penthouse's west elevation
 - 4. Four of the dishes will have a 6' diameter. Two of the dishes will have a 4' diameter.
 - 5. Install an equipment cabinet atop the penthouse roof.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of six microwave dish antenna atop a thirty-four story skyscraper's rooftop penthouse or utility shaft. The six dish antennas would be located along the perimeter of the two inner sides of the roof top penthouse or utility shaft, a component extending from the southern wall of the building. Based on the height of the building, the presence of existing mechanical

equipment, the location of the dishes on the utility shaft, and the removable nature of these installations, Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical integrity of the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the historic district. Staff recommends approval of this application. Staff further recommends that if the satellite dishes cease to be used, they should be removed from the rooftop.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Don McGlynn with Clearstream Consulting was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. McGlynn if he had any questions to ask or comments to make or questions to ask with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. McGlynn answered no.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant's representative. Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. McConnell if anything could be done to reduce the amount of clutter atop the building. Mr. Glynn addressed the Board saying that the building is owned by the Retirement Systems of Alabama. Since his client Open Range Communications rents only a portion of the roof he could not speak on behalf of the Retirement Systems of Alabama's intentions for the remainder of the rooftop.

Ms. Harden asked Mr. Glynn to clarify exactly where the rooftop devices would be positioned. Mr. McGlynn addressed Ms. Harden's query. Referencing the proposed plans, Mr. James asked Mr. McGlynn for clarification for regarding existing and proposed features. Mr. McGlynn addressed Mr. James' concerns.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Oswalt 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. Oswalt 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: 2/11/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-13-CA: 957 Savannah Street
Applicant: Steve May
Received: 1/26/11
Meeting: 2/16/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install a 5-V crimp metal roof.

BUILDING HISTORY

This late 19th-Century shotgun house features a pedimented gable with clapboard siding.

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 the installation of a 5v crimp metal roof.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “A roof is one of the most dominate features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Install a 5-V crimp metal roof.
 - 2. The roofing panels will be silver in color.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of a 5-V crimp metal roof. Applications for metal roofs are reviewed on a case by case basis. 5-V crimp metal roofs have been a common roofing treatment across the American South for over a century. Metal roofs of this type often sheathed shotgun dwellings.

An existing metal roof covers the body of the building. The applicant proposes sheathing the whole roof with 5 v crimp metal roofing panels. The Guidelines state that roofing materials should be appropriate to a roof’s form, color, and pitch. This shotgun is surmounted by a typical street facing A-frame roof. By virtue of this simple roof form, the roofing material will not have to adjust to projecting bays or wings. The color selected is the traditional metal roofing color. The pitch of the roof is typical to a two bay shotgun and the installation of metal roofing would not result in an inappropriateness of appearance.

Given the presence of the existing metal roof, the traditional use of the roofing material, and the building type addressed, Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical integrity of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to represent the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions regarding the application. Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Blackwell about the color of the proposed roofing. Mr. Blackwell addressed Mr. Karwinski's query.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Oswalt 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. Oswalt 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: 2/16/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-14-CA: 932 Conti Street
Applicant: Steve May
Received: 1/26/11
Meeting: 2/16/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install a 5-V crimp metal roof.

BUILDING HISTORY

This late 19th Century shotgun house was situated within a working class enclave located between affluent Government and Dauphin Streets

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 the installation of 5v crimp metal roof.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “A roof is one of the most dominate features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Install a 5-V crimp metal roof.
 - 2. The roofing panels will be silver in color.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of a 5-V crimp metal roof. Applications for metal roofs are reviewed on a case by case basis. 5-V crimp metal roofs have been a common roofing treatment across the American South for over a century. Metal roofs of this type often sheathed shotgun dwellings.

The Guidelines state that roofing materials should be appropriate to a roof’s form, color, and pitch. This shotgun is surmounted by a street facing A-frame roof therefore the roofing material will not have to adjust to projecting bays or wings. The color selected is the traditional metal roofing color. The pitch of the roof is typical to a two bay shotgun and the installation of metal roofing would not result in an inappropriateness of appearance.

Given the presence of the existing metal roof, the traditional use of the roofing material, and the building type addressed, Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical integrity of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions regarding the application. No discussion ensued.

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: 2/16/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-15-CA: 706 Government Street
Applicant: Paul Carpenter Davis
Received: 1/31/11
Meeting: 2/16/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Construct a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This single story commercial storefront is a regional interpretation of mid-twentieth century Modern architecture, albeit one maintaining a traditional local flavor. The asymmetrical façade and non-historical treatment espouse contemporary tracts, but the use of brick and ironwork hark back to traditional construction and decoration.

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 May 5, 2009. At that time, the Board approved the installation of shutters over façade’s concrete bay. The current applicant proposes the construction of a rear addition.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. The rear addition will be adjusted to the dimensions of the urban lot. The east elevation (side) will measure 56’ in depth. The west elevation (side) will measure 54’ in depth. The north elevation (rear) measure 32’ in length.
 - 2. The addition’s principle rear or north-facing elevation will feature a taller stuccoed bay and a lower brick-veneered bay.
 - 3. The taller stuccoed bay will feature a large glazed opening comprised of nine lights within an aluminum storefront frame.
 - 4. The lower brick bay will divided into four fenestrated units.

5. The easternmost fenestrated unit of the rear elevation's lower brick-veneered bay will feature a four paneled wooden door.
6. Three vertically oriented aluminum storefront windows will be located to the west of the rear elevation's aforementioned door.
7. Four transoms will surmount the four fenestrated bays of the lower stucco-veneered portion of the rear addition.
8. A canopy will extend across the lower stucco-veneered portion of the rear elevation. The canopy will be located between the fenestrated bays and the transoms.
9. The addition's east-facing wall will be faced with stucco.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of rear addition to a non-contributing building. The building constitutes small scale mid-twentieth century commercial infill. The building's Government Street façade is located on the lot line. A deep parking lot extends from the utilitarian rear elevation to the Conti Street right of way. While the proposed addition would more than double the building in size, the square footage of the lot, the depth of the lot, and the location of the addition will not allow the addition to overwhelm the existing building.

In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, the addition is differentiated from, yet compatible with the design of the existing building. The proposed rear elevation, like the south elevation or façade, is asymmetrical in form. One half is masonry (on the proposed addition it will be stucco-faced) and the other half is brick. The treatment is rendered in modern manner thereby allowing the addition to "read" as a later alteration to an older structure.

Both the design and the materials meet the standards outlined in the Design Review Guideline's for Mobile's Historic Districts. Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical integrity of the surrounding district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), 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

Paul Carpenter Davis was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Davis if he had any comments to add or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Davis answered no.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask Mr. Davis. Mr. Karwinski said he had one question. He asked Mr. Davis how the eastern half of the rear elevation would be treated. Mr. Davis addressed Mr. Karwinski's concerns.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Wagoner 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. Wagoner 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: 2/16/12