

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
January 4, 2012 – 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, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Jim Wagoner.
Members Absent: Carlos Gant, Thomas Karwinski, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson.
Staff Members Present: Cart Blackwell, Keri Coumanis, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Wagoner moved to approve the minutes of the December 7, 2012 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Wagoner 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: Anita Crigler**
 - a. Property Address: 1 Blacklawn
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/30/11
 - c. Project: Reroof the house using asphalt shingles.
2. **Applicant: Thomas Carpenter**
 - a. Property Address: 60 Bradford Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/30/11
 - c. Project: Install in an interior lot privacy fence. The six foot wooden fence will stop at the front plane of the house. A three fence wooden fence will extend from the point where the interior lot fence stops. The latter section of fencing will stop just short of the inner edge of the sidewalk. Reinstall the wood framed porch screening.
3. **Applicant: David McConnell**
 - a. Property Address: 150 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/29/11
 - c. Project: Replace existing third story windows on S. façade to match existing. Windows will be double hung, single pane wood windows, true divided light, painted cream to match.
4. **Applicant: W. H. Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 1651 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/30/11
 - c. Project: Repair and replace woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint to match the existing color scheme.
5. **Applicant: Refugio Acosto**
 - a. Property Address: 1658 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/30/11
 - c. Project: Repaint exterior as per existing.
6. **Applicant: Richard Tippy**
 - a. Property Address: 102 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/2/11
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and color. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

7. **Applicant: Goodbrad Ironwork**
 - a. Property Address: 205 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/5/11
 - c. Project: Repaint fence and verandah as per existing.
8. **Applicant: Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce**
 - a. Property Address: 451 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/5/11
 - c. Project: Remove the existing temporary banners. Install a new canvas banner on the façade. Install new canvas motifs on the lamps.
9. **Applicant: Southern Ornamental Security for John Pickron**
 - a. Property Address: 1365 Brown Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/5/11
 - c. Project: Remove sections of chain link fencing that are located to either side of the house. Install aluminum fencing. A six foot high section of aluminum fence will be located to one side of the house (behind the front plane of the house). A second section of six foot high aluminum fence largely comprised of a vehicular gate will be located to the other side of the house. A section of four foot high aluminum fencing will extend toward the street.
10. **Applicant: Henry Brewster, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 205 North Conception Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/7/11
 - c. Project: Install a new sign face in the existing monument sign. The single faced sign will measure a total 3' 5" square feet.
11. **Applicant: Mike Williams and Sons**
 - a. Property Address: 1009 Texas Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/7/11
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork and siding to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Remove plywood porch flooring and install tongue-and-groove decking. Repair and when necessary replace double hung sash windows to match the existing. Paint the house per the submitted BLP color scheme #8554 (light beige in color). Replace the asphalt roof.
12. **Applicant: Ray Williams**
 - a. Property Address: 1356 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/9/11
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the submitted BLP color scheme. The body will be Summerville Red. The trim will be Savannah Street Dark Brown. The detailing will be Fort Morgan Sand and the Old Dauphin Way Gold.
13. **Applicant: Sanddollar Properties, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 110 South Dearborn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/9/11
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
14. **Applicant: Eugene Caldwell**
 - a. Property Address: 957 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/12/11
 - c. Project: Repair and replace fire damaged woodwork and siding to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
15. **Applicant: Jim Walker**
 - a. Property Address: 602 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/14/11
 - c. Project: Apply a stain and/or sealant to the front door.

- 16. Applicant: Jimmy Stauter with Stauter Construction for Joe & Donna Camp**
- a. Property Address: 962 Augusta Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/15/11
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile and dimension. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.
- 17. Applicant: Nicole McCaffrey**
- a. Property Address: 201 South Washington Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/16/11
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile and dimension. Repaint the building per the existing color scheme.
- 18. Applicant: Graham Roofing**
- a. Property Address: 307 Rapier Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/19/11
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with charcoal colored shingles.
- 19. Applicant: Chris Bowen**
- a. Property Address: 260 McDonald Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/16/11
 - c. Project: Repair / replace rotten wood on porch columns and siding to match existing in dimension, material and profile. Repair / replace rotten wood on garage apartment to match existing in dimension, material and profile. Paint / scrape as needed (color = white).
- 20. Applicant: Stauter Construction**
- a. Property Address: 307 Rapier Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/19/11
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile and dimension. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
- 21. Applicant: Henry Brewster, LLC**
- a. Property Address: 205 North Conception Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/19/11
 - c. Project: Install a pair of iron railing per the submitted design to either side of the front steps.
- 22. Applicant: Oakleigh Custom Woodwork**
- a. Property Address: 166 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/20/11
 - c. Project: Install a glazed and paneled wooden door

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 2012-01-CA: 259 South Monterey Street**
- a. Applicant: Tjaden O'Dowd for John Michael O'Dowd
 - b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain fencing; Paint an unpainted brick building.
- APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 2. 2012-02-CA: 561 Eslava Street**
- a. Applicant: Gary Porter with Home Depot for Robert T. Hunter
 - b. Project: Replace windows.
- APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 3. 2012-03-CA: 9 Macy Place**
- a. Applicant: H. Todd & Karen Duren
 - b. Project: Construct a side elevation dormer; Construct an ancillary building.
- APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Mr. Ladd was unanimously reelected as chair of the Architectural Review Board.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-01-CA: 259 South Monterey Street
Applicant: Tjaden O'Dowd for John Michael O'Dowd
Received: 12/9/11
Meeting: 1/4/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain fencing; Paint an unpainted brick building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This ranch type house is depicted in the 1955 Sanborn Maps. It is among the finer modern style residential buildings located within the Mobile's Historic Districts. The symmetrical façade, which features wrap around corner windows and well executed brickwork, masks two spacious residential apartments.

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 application calls for the after-the-fact-approval of a picket fence and the proposed painting of the property's principal building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. Fences “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
 - 2. “The exterior of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period.
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**
 - 1. Retain a picket fence that encloses the front lawn.
 - 2. Paint the unpainted brick building white.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the after-the-fact-approval of a picket fence and the proposed painting of an unpainted masonry building.

The wooden picket fence was installed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. A 311 call was made. The applicant responded to the Notice of Violation. He proposes to retain the fence and paint the property's principal building. The fence extends along the western and southern sides of the property's front yard. Set behind a diminutive coping wall, the front lawn is slightly elevated above the sidewalk. Staff does not believe the fence impairs the architectural or the historical character of the

district. Staff recommends that the fencing remain in place but suggests that it be painted white to match the house's trim.

As per the proposed painting of the house, the Board does not generally approve the painting of unpainted brick surfaces. While this building was not listed as a contributing structure when the Leinkauf Historic District was originally surveyed, if resurveyed this modern structure would be listed as a historic building. The distinctive form, finish, and texture of the building's brick tile would be altered by the application of paint. The building's wall surfaces are a defining feature of the building.

On April 16, 2008, the Board approved the painting of 351 Conti Street, the Cathedral Towers building. The Cathedral Towers Building and its bricks are not of the same caliber as the subject property. The painting of Cathedral Towers building significantly affected the architectural and the historical integrity of the Church Street East and Lower Dauphin Commercial Historic Districts. The painting of the subject building would affect the architectural and historical integrity of the Leinkauf District.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval in part and denial in part.

Based on B (1), Staff recommends approval of the unauthorized fence. Staff does not believe this feature will impair the architectural or the historical character of the historic district. Staff suggests that the fence be painted.

Based on B (2), Staff believes the painting of the unpainted brick wall surfaces would impair the architectural and the historical character of the historic district. Staff does not recommend approval of that portion of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tjaden O'Dowd 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 Ms. O'Dowd if she had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Ms. O'Dowd explained that she erected the fence without knowledge of the property's inclusion in a historic district. She stated that had she had known of the requirements she would have received approval prior to erecting the fence. With regard to painting the building, Ms. O'Dowd said that she did not believe painting would comprise the visual or material integrity of the structure. She cited examples of contemporaneous brick homes with painted wall surfaces on Dauphin Street and Hunter Avenue, all mentioned properties being located within the historic districts.

Mr. Wagoner and Mr. Roberts inquired as to what color or colors Ms. O'Dowd proposed for the building. She explained that while she initially proposed painting the building white, she would prefer to paint the building grey. Ms. O'Dowd stated that she was open to the Board suggestions. She said that she wanted to make the building better complement nearby historic structures. Mr. Roberts said that there were no rules specifically disapproving a given color or color scheme.

Ms. Harden asked Ms. O'Dowd as to the detailing surrounding the front entrance. Ms. O'Dowd replied saying that a different color of brick was employed about the entrance. Both Ms. Harden and Mr. Roberts stated noted that said treatment was characteristic of many buildings of the period.

A discussion of paint colors ensued.

Ms. Harden stated that other issues needed to be discussed besides colors. She said that the National Trust recommends against painting of unpainted brick surfaces for reason in part of moisture related concerns. Moisture can be sealed within the walls resulting in a number of related structural issues. Ms. Harden and Mr. Roberts advised Ms. O'Dowd to be selective in the type of paint that she employed in painting the building.

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.

Ms. Harden and Mr. Oswalt voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/4/13

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-02-CA: 561 Eslava Street
Applicant: Gary Porter with Home Depot for Robert T. Hunter
Received: 12/12/11
Meeting: 1/4/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story brick residence dates from the late 1990s. The house, which received a 2000 award for new construction in a historic setting, is surrounded by other examples of residential infill that comprise the southernmost portion of the Church Street East Historic District.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on April 18, 1993. At that time, the Board approved the construction of the house currently occupying the lot. The applicant proposes the replacement of the house’s wooden windows with vinyl windows.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. With regard to windows “the type, size and dividing light of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original windows openings should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing.
 - 2. “Where windows cannot be replaced, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Remove the non-contributing house’s wooden windows.
 - 2. Install vinyl replacement windows. The light configuration will remain the same.

STAFF ANALYSIS

With regard to windows, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts are directed toward historic and/or contributing structures, not new construction. The installation of vinyl windows is not allowed on historic buildings. This house constitutes historically attuned infill construction in the

Church Street East Historic District. Taking into account the house's recent date of construction (late 1990s), the Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts should be consulted.

The Guidelines for New Residential Construction allow the use of vinyl clad windows, but do not specifically forbid the use of vinyl windows. Mill finished metal windows, along with windows featuring snap-in muntins are deemed inappropriate. Vinyl windows have been discouraged. On September 2, 2009, the Board approved, on a test case basis, the installation of vinyl windows for a new house located at 1562 Blair Avenue. On May 4, 2011, the Board approved the replacement of aluminum jalousie windows with a traditionally designed vinyl sash windows for a house located at 58 Bradford Avenue. In both of the aforementioned instances, the Board considered the following: the window's fit within the reveal and the use of muntins.

With regard to this submission, the existing windows are rapidly deteriorating. The proposed replacement windows would be of the same design and light configuration as the existing, but instead of being wooden, the windows would be vinyl in composition. As outlined above, the Board has approved vinyl windows on infill construction. The proposed windows would be recessed within the window openings. A projection would occur, but the recess is not great. The Design Guidelines for New Construction for New Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts deem snap-in interior muntins as inappropriate for use in Mobile's historic districts. If applied muntins are to be employed, said windows should be applied to the exterior. A simpler solution would be the absence of applied muntins.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (2), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the historic district. Staff recommends approval of this application on the condition that either exterior muntins are employed or no muntins are employed.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Gary Porter 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. Porter if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Porter showed the Board a sample of the proposed window. Mr. Roberts inquired as to any possible muntin treatment. Mr. Porter explained that while the application called for muntins, the applicant is amenable to not using muntins.

Mr. Roberts lead a discussion of muntin usage and window manufacturing.

Ms. Harden asked Mr. Porter what was deteriorated and was being replaced. Mr. Porter explained that only the windows would be replaced. A discussion of timber density ensued. The quality of many types of newer wooden windows was lamented.

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 one-over-one windows would be employed.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/4/13

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-03-CA: H. Todd & Karen Van Duren
Applicant: 9 Macy Place
Received: 12/16/11
Meeting: 1/4/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a side elevation dormer; Construct an ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This single story Arts & Crafts “bungalow” dates from the first quarter of the 20th Century. The house’s façade is distinguished by spacious porch-cum-porte-cochere.

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/applicants propose the construction of a side elevation dormer and a rear lot ancillary structure.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic forms, as well as the original roof pitch of the roof, should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color. “
 - 2. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
 - 3. “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.”
 - 4. “An ancillary structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure shall complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Construct a shed-roofed dormer off the house’s West (side).
 - a. The dormer will measure approximately 28’ in length.
 - b. The distance from grade to the top of the dormer’s wall will measure 19’.

- c. The dormer's walls will be faced with wooden siding matching that employed on the body of the house.
 - d. The dormer's roof will be sheathed with asphalt shingles. The existing roof will be sheathed in matching shingles.
 - e. The dormer's South Elevation five wooden windows match those employed on the body of the house.
 - f. The dormer will be painted to match the existing color scheme.
2. Construct an ancillary structure on an existing concrete slab located in the property's rear lot.
- a. The ancillary structure will measure 14' in width and 16' in depth.
 - b. The building will feature an enclosed southern section and an open northern section.
 - c. The western section will feature a brick watertable. The watertable will measure approximately the same height as house's foundation.
 - d. A grouping of square-section posts with raked brackets matching those found on the body of the main house will support the structure's northern section. Said supports will rest atop pedestal-like supports of the same height as the southern section's brick watertable.
 - e. The building will be faced with wooden siding, brackets, and gable ventilators matching those found on the main house.
 - f. The roof will be sheathed with asphalt shingles matching those proposed for the main house and dormer.
 - g. The North Elevation will feature a pair of double wood paneled doors.
 - h. The building will be painted to match the main building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a side elevation dormer and rear lot ancillary structure.

With regard to the proposed dormer, said alteration will be located on the house's South (side) Elevation. Located behind the gable roof of a projecting porte-cochere, the shed dormer would be minimally visible from the public right of way. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic District state that historic roof forms should be maintained. Both the house's main, façade-facing gable and all secondary gables would remain intact. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that new additions and alterations should be differentiated from yet compatible with existing historic fabric. The proposed dormer's traditional shed roof form would differentiate it from the house's secondary gabled projections. The use of matching siding and windows would allow for both visual and material continuity between the old and new. Staff believes two gabled dormers would be more appropriate, but on account of the location and treatment, Staff does not believe the design would impair the historic integrity of the building or the historic district.

As per the proposed ancillary structure, the building will be set atop an existing slab situated within the rear lot. Said slab is located slightly over a foot from the property line. An ancillary construction of the same distance from the lot line is located on the adjacent property to the south thereby according to the Historic District Overlay allowing a setback variance from Urban Development. In accord with Design Review, with both proportional relationships and design details derived from the main residence, the shed is in keeping with the ancillary construction requirements outlined in the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. The design of the proposed ancillary structure bases its proportions and borrows details from the main building. Neither the design nor the materials impair the architectural integrity of the property or the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Karen and Todd Duren were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicants. He asked Mr. and Mrs. Duren if they had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Ms. Duren answered yes saying that she did have something to add. She pointed that nature of architectural rendering made the construction of the proposed dormer more pronounced than they would be in reality. Ms. Duren said that the actual visual experience of the dormer would be minimal from the street.

Mr. Roberts complimented the design. He then addressed an absent Board member's query regarding possible Code-related concerns pertaining to the dormer. A discussion ensued. Mr. and Mrs. Duren told the Board that if any adjustments should be required they would submit a revised application.

Mr. Ladd complimented the design and drawings.

Ms. Baker inquired as to setback requirements. Mr. Blackwell addressed Ms. Baker's concerns.

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 fact

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/4/13