

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
February 5, 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: David Barr, Nick Holmes III, Bradford Ladd, Craig Roberts, and Jim Wagoner.
Members Absent: Robert Allen, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and Keri Coumanis.
2. The minutes for the January 22, 2014 meeting were heldover for approval until the February 19, 2014 meeting.
3. The midmonth COA's granted by Staff were heldover for approval until the February 19, 2014 meeting.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant: William Appling**
 - a. Property Address: 12 South Conception Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/14/14
 - c. Project: Repaint the storefront per the submitted Glidden color (green).
2. **Applicant: Joseph Patterson**
 - a. Property Address: 263 Houston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/14/14
 - c. Project: Reroof the building. The roofing shingles will match the existing. Replace rotten boards and repaint as needed.
3. **Applicant: Antonio Petite**
 - a. Property Address: 1053 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/13/14
 - c. Project: Replace deteriorated woodwork (when and where necessary) to match the exiting in profile, dimension, and material. Replace porch decking to match the existing (tongue-and-groove). Reinstall porch railings. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
4. **Applicant: Kinnon Phillips**
 - a. Property Address: 1108 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/15/14
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the submitted Benjamin Moore color scheme. The body will be mink, the trim will be bleaker beige, and the door will be light blue. Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in composition, profile, and dimension.
5. **Applicant: Wrico Signs**
 - a. Property Address: 1960 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/21/14
 - c. Project: Install two wall signs (on the front and rear of the building). Both signs will measure 23.36 square feet in size. The aluminum signs will feature the name of the occupying tenant and will employ reverse channel LED lighting.
6. **Applicant: Melanie Bunting**
 - a. Property Address: 33 South Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/21/14

- c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing when and where necessary. If the original turned posts survive within the existing square section posts, re-expose the former. If the original posts, are in a too deteriorated state, the existing porch post will be repaired. Paint the house per the submitted Sherwin Williams' color scheme: body, Comfort Gray; trim will be Alabaster; and detailing and door will be Rockwood Red. Construct a six tall wooden privacy fence. The aforementioned fence will not extend beyond the front plane of the house.
7. **Applicant: S. Bohannon**
a. Property Address: 201 South Georgia Avenue
b. Date of Approval: 1/22/14
c. Project: Install a wooden door on the garage's rear elevation.
8. **Applicant: David Brister**
a. Property Address: 63 South Monterey Street
b. Date of Approval: 1/22/14
c. Project: Repaint the building per the existing color scheme.
9. **Applicant: Elyzabeth Wilder**
a. Property Address: 1004 Charleston Street
b. Date of Approval: 1/23/14
c. Project: Repaint the house per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme. The body will be Cay, the trim will be White, the porch decking will be Serious Gray, and the accents will be White. Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
10. **Applicant: People's Construction**
a. Property Address: 112 South Broad Street
b. Date of Approval: 1/24/14
c. Project: Patch the roof.
11. **Applicant: Steve May**
a. Property Address: 1104 Old Shell
b. Date of Approval: 1/24/14
c. Project: Install a picket fence around the front yard.
12. **Applicant: Steve May**
a. Property Address: 25 Lee Street
b. Date of Approval: 1/24/14
c. Project: Install an interior lot privacy fence. Said fence will be located behind the front plane of the house.
13. **Applicant: Chris Hawkins**
a. Property Address: 110 South Dearborn Street
b. Date of Approval: 1/27/14
c. Project: Erect six foot wooden dog eared privacy fence per site plan in file. Step fence down as it approaches street.
14. **Applicant: Dharam Pannu**
a. Property Address: 907 Elmira Street
b. Date of Approval: 1/27/14
c. Project: Install six foot interior lot fence. Said fence will extend beyond the front plane of the house. As the fence extends in front of the body of the house, it will drop down to three feet in height and extend around the front yard.
15. **Applicant: Dharam Pannu**
a. Property Address: 505 Eslava Street
b. Date of Approval: 1/27/14
c. Project: Renew a Certificate of Appropriateness issued on 6 June 2012. The aforementioned approval called for the construction of a dormer.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2014-04-CA: 1062 Church Street**
 - a. Applicant: Mack Lewis for Barbara Turley
 - b. Project: Construct a rear addition.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
2. **2014-05-CA: 55 North Monterey Street**
 - a. Applicant: David Rowe for John and Dena Howell
 - b. Project: Construct a rear addition.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
3. **2014-06-CA: 12 South Conception Street**
 - a. Applicant: William Appling
 - b. Project: Fenestration – Install a new unit in one of the storefront entrances.
HELDOVER. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
4. **2014-07-CA: 10 Saint Emanuel Street**
 - a. Applicant: J. Barrett Penney with Penney Design Group for Will Dumas
 - b. Project: Renovate a commercial storefront.
REFERRED TO DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-04-CA: 1062 Church Street
Applicant: Mack Lewis for Barbara Turley
Received: 1/21/14
Meeting: 2/5/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Aesthetics Movement inspired Queen Anne residence dates from 1907. The house originally stood at 1700 Spring Hill Avenue. The house was relocated to Oakleigh Garden District in 1999/2000.

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 21, 1999. At that time, the Board approved the relocation of the building from its original site to the present location. With this submission, the current owner proposes the construction of a small rear addition.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design 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, size, 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 plans):
 - 1. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The addition will measure approximately 14’ in depth by 6’ in width.
 - b. The addition will rest atop brick foundation piers matching those supporting the body of the house.
 - c. Framed and recessed wooden lattice screening will extend between the foundation piers.
 - d. Existing corner boards will remain in place on both the East (side) and North (rear) Elevations.

- e. “Hardi”plank siding featuring reveals matching the wooden siding found on the body of the house will face the walls of the addition.
- f. A salvaged two-over-two wooden window will be employed on the East (side) Elevation.
- g. A hipped roof will extend over the addition. Said hipped roof will be an extension of an existing hipped roof addition/enclosure.
- h. The hipped roof’s roofing shingles will match those employed on the body of the house.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a small rear addition. Said addition will not be visible from the public view. The proposed addition would take the form of an extension of an existing shed roofed porch. Said porch has already been partially enclosed. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards state that new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment (See B-1.). The retention of corner boards will allow for the addition to “read” as a later alteration to existing fabric, while the adoption of massing, proportions, materials, and features will provide a sense of continuity.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

After observing the slides in the PowerPoint presentation, reviewing the literature (drawings and photographs) submitted by the applicant’s representative, and listening to the Staff’s recommendation, no Board discussion took place. Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. No questions or comments ensued from the audience.

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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/5/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-05-CA: 55 North Monterey Street
Applicant: John and Dena Howell
Received: 1/17/14
Meeting: 2/5/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This classically detailed American Foursquare type dwelling dates from 1913.

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 (Old Dauphin Way) on September 14, 1995. At that time the Board approved the construction of a single-story rear addition. The application up for review calls for the construction of a second-story atop the earlier and aforementioned addition.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic 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, size, 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 plans):
 - 1. Construct a rear addition
 - a. The addition will be located atop an earlier addition and an original one-story ell.
 - b. The addition will measure 13’ 5” in depth and 32’ 2” in width.
 - c. The addition will feature wooden siding matching that employed on the body of the house with regard to profile, dimension, and material.
 - d. The addition will employ six-over-six wooden windows matching those employed on the body of the house.

- e. The East (rear) elevation will feature two six-over-six windows.
- f. The North and South Elevations will each feature a single six-over-six window.
- g. The house's hipped roof will extend over the addition.
- h. The fascia and cornice work and detailing will match the original in profile, dimension, and material.
- i. The roofing shingles will match the existing as per type and color.
- j. Corner boards will be removed from the North and South (side) Elevations.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of rear addition. Minimally visible from the public view, the proposed addition would be located atop an existing addition and shed extension. The addition would "square out" the house's upper-story. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment (See B-1.). The renderings submitted show that corner boards would be removed thereby removing the visual break that would distinguish the old from the new work. The Board has consistently required that either corner boards be retained or setbacks employed as a means providing differentiation. The employment of corner boards would allow the two-story form of the continued hipped roof addition to "read" as a later intervention. Also the integration of the new roof into the old adds to the appearance of the addition being original to the house. Staff also believes the lack of a covering for the rear doors will result in their deterioration and suggests the applicant consider some type of roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

While the Staff does object to the addition in concept, the proposal as submitted does not allow differentiation between historic fabric and proposed new work. Based on B (1-2), Staff believes the application (as submitted) would impair the architectural and the historical character of the building and the district. Staff suggests a visual break and perhaps a reconsideration of the roof to indicate an addition.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

David Rowe was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell notified the Board that the applicants were amenable to amending the application. He stated that corner boards would be employed on side elevations. Said corner boards would serve differentiate the existing fabric from the proposed work. Mr. Blackwell also noted that the existing pergola extending off the Rear Elevation would remain in place.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Rowe if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Rowe responded with a no, saying that Staff had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Holmes and Mr. Roberts asked for clarification as per the umbrage located off the Rear Elevation. Mr. Rowe addressed the two queries. He stated that the covering would remain in place, as would the deck upon which it rests.

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.

No further Board discussion ensued.

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 that corner boards would be employed on the side elevations. Additionally, the existing deck and surmounting pergola would remain in place.

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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/5/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-06-CA: 12 South Conception Street
Applicant: William Appling
Received: 1/14/14
Meeting: 2/5/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Fenestration – Alter a door unit.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to the Lower Dauphin Commercial District's National Register Nomination, the façade of this building, which is known as the Lindsey Building, dates circa 1920.

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 owner/applicant proposes the removal of door and surmounting transom and the installation of a new door unit.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "Often one of the most important decorative features of a house [or commercial or institutional structure], doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms, and sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and period of the building."
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted drawing):
 - 1. Remove a double door unit and surmounting transom.
 - 2. Install double door unit in the place of the aforementioned doors and transom.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject building is comprised of three separate units. This application involves the removal and replacement of a double door unit affording access to the central unit. As indicated by documentary, physical, and formal evidence, the existing door constitutes a 1960s alteration to the storefront unit. The unit in question employs a layering of elements and installations dating from the 1920s to the 1980s. The Design Review Guidelines state that replacement units should respect the age and period of the building (See B-1). While Staff does not believe the removal of the existing door-transom unit would impair the building, the replacement doors as submitted do not relate to the design of the building. The arched form

and use of muntins did not characterize commercial storefront design of the period. The panels at the bottom of the doors relate to the bulkhead wall but do not relate to the sidelights of the doorway.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Though Staff does not object to the removal of the existing door-transom unit, the design as submitted is not in keeping with the building. Based on B (1), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff encourages the use of glazed and paneled units not featuring muntins.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board examined the rendering submitted by the applicant.

The application was heldover to a time when the applicant could be present to speak to the proposal.

Mr. Blackwell notified the Board that he had been in contact with Mr. Appling and that Mr. Appling was aware of the meeting date and time.

HELDOVER.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-07-CA: 10 Saint Emanuel Street
Applicant: J. Barrett Penney with Penney Design Group for Will Dumas
Received: 1/21/14
Meeting: 2/5/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning:
Project: Renovate a long unoccupied commercial building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This three-story stucco-faced commercial building dates circa 1907.

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 July 3, 2008. At that time the Board approved an extensive renovation to the façade of the commercial façade. The work approved called for the following: construction of a new ground-floor fenestration, the construction of four balconies, the conversion of four upper-story windows to door units opening onto the aforementioned balconies, and the installation of new windows. With this submission, the applicant brings before the Board a revised application partially based on the previously approved scope of work.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state and the Lower Dauphin Commercial District Guidelines 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, size, 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.”
 3. “Residential type doors are not allowed as a primary storefront entrance.”
 4. “Preserve the size and shape of upper-story windows.”
- C. Scope of Work:
1. Renovate a ground floor storefront.
 - a. Remove a later storefront system.

- b. Face the in plane façade wall with stucco.
 - c. Construct a vehicular entrance featuring aluminum overhead door.
 - d. Construct a new pedestrian entrance taking the form of a double door. A stuccoed architrave will surround a glazed and paneled mahogany (stained) door unit. A fanlight will surmount the door.
2. Alter upper-story fenestration.
 - a. Remove any remaining upper-story fenestration.
 - b. Convert the two outer window bays of the second and third floors to full-length openings.
 - c. Install aluminum framed windows (Pella Architect Series) within all the fenestrated bays.
 - d. Surrounding masonry and stucco will be altered and repaired to accommodate the aforementioned window units.
 3. Clean, repair, feather, and replace (to match the existing) stucco work.
 4. Remove existing headers and downspouts.
 5. Install new copper headers and downspouts.
 6. Paint the body of the building per the submitted Benjamin Moore color scheme. The body will be “Bleeker Beige” and the fascia will be “Fairview Taupe”.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the renovation of a commercial façade. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards state that new works should be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment (See B-1.). The Lower Dauphin Commercial District Guidelines go on to state that the size and shape of upper-story windows should be preserved (See B-4.). The units proposed for the upper-story fenestration would alter the size of the four units. Said alterations would also jeopardize the property’s eligibility for future historic tax credits. As per the ground floor vehicular and pedestrian entrances, the Lower Dauphin Commercial District Guidelines state that residential type doors are not allowed on primary entrances (See B-4). The suburban nature of the proposed entrance and garage doors are not in keeping with the historic character of the building and the district. An example of a more successful vehicular entrance can be found just opposite the subject property at 9 Saint Emanuel Street. Staff encourages the applicant to develop a design that is either traditional or contemporary, not a combination of the two.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-4), Staff believes the application (as submitted) would impair the architectural and the historical character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

William Dumas 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. Dumas if had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Dumas answered yes. He explained to the Board that he had acquired the property in 2006. Mr. Dumas elaborated by saying that since the acquisition of the property, he made sacrifices to retain the

property and move forward with the building's renovation. Mr. Dumas stated that he lives near the property and knows the surrounding area well.

As Mr. Dumas began addressing components of the Staff Report, he apologized for possibly repeating himself. With regard to the windows, Mr. Dumas stated that the proposed windows would be made by Pella, a high quality window manufacturer. He added that the vehicular door would be specially crafted as well. Mr. Dumas noted the previously approved plans called for more residential units than the present plan. He reduced said number and consequently more spacious units would benefit downtown. Mr. Dumas said that though the changes had been made for reasons of economics, he expressed his commitment to the project. He said that while the balconies approved in the previous application were not submitted in the subject proposal (for the aforementioned budget related reasons), said balconies would be submitted and installed at a later date. Mr. Dumas pointed out that the proposed window units were the same as those approved in 2008.

Redirecting the discussion to the ground floor storefront, Mr. Dumas stated it would be shame for a residential design to be denied for a building that had been rezoned residential. The applicant returned the discussion to the proposed vehicular doors. Making reference to garage doors mentioned in the Staff Report (doors located across the street), he stated there was then precedent for the same intervention he was now proposing. Mr. Dumas closed by saying that he was trying to renovate an empty building and bring back an abandoned stretch of street.

Mr. Ladd again welcomed the applicant. He explained to Mr. Dumas that the mission of the Review is to work with not against applicants. After reviewing several of the points in the Staff Report, he stated that without the balconies the design was altered. Mr. Ladd stated that if a time frame was provided for the construction of the balconies, the Board could possibly entertain moving forward with the project.

Mr. Roberts addressed the applicant. He explained to Mr. Dumas that the removal of the balconies (and by consequence the loss of the railings) did much to alter the appearance of the project. Mr. Roberts pointed out that the railings worked in concert with the windows by bringing a contemporary feel to the design. He further noted that a vehicular entrance was now being proposed. Mr. Roberts stated that while he did not object to an intervention of that type, the juxtaposition of traditional and more modern features posed concerns. He urged for a more cohesive design.

Mr. Roberts and Mr. Ladd highly recommended the convention of a design review committee.

Mr. Wagoner addressed the applicant. He explained that in previous applications for garage doors in downtown settings right of way concerns had come into play. He explained that the garage door might have to be recessed within the building. Mr. Roberts stated that the swing of the door could pose similar concerns as per code related requirements.

Mr. Holmes apologized to the applicant. He explained that his attendance was required at another municipal meeting. Before exiting the room, Mr. Holmes also voiced his support of a design review committee meeting.

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 seconded Mr. Holmes' recommendation as to the convention of a Design Review Committee.