

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
January 5, 2011 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Jim Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Kim Harden, Bill James, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Jim Wagoner.

Members Absent: Gertrude Baker, Carlos Gant, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson.

Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis and Cart Blackwell.

2. Mr. Oswalt moved to approve the minutes of the December 1, 2010 and December 15, 2010 meetings. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Oswalt moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously. Mr. Karwinski questioned the issuance of midmonth # 21.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. Applicant: Sterling Perry

- a. Property Address: 1563 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/7/10
- c. Project: Repair and replace rotten fenestration moldings to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint to match the existing color scheme.

2. Applicant: Terry Trotter

- a. Property Address: 1550 Eslava Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/8/10
- c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted color scheme. The body will be green. The trim will be of white. Replace the later six paneled door with a glazed and paneled door more appropriate to the period and style of the house.

3. Applicant: Trey Littlepage

- a. Property Address: 70 Etheridge
- b. Date of Approval: 12/8/10
- c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork to match the existing. Repaint to match the existing color scheme.

4. Applicant: Scogin Construction

- a. Property Address: 1116 Palmetto Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/8/10
- c. Project: Repair and replace rotten and/or deteriorated exterior wood siding as necessary only. New siding to match existing siding in profile, dimension and material. Repair and replace rotten and/or deteriorated porch ceiling as necessary to match existing in profile, dimension and material.

5. Applicant: Lucy and David Tufts

- a. Property Address: 308 Michigan Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 12/8/10
- c. Project: Erect a four foot picket fence at rear of property.

6. Applicant: Meleah Jurasek

- a. Property Address: 61 North Monterey Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/9/10
- c. Project: Replace rotten wood to match original in profile and dimension, re-glaze windows, replace broken window panes, replace one shutter. Repaint as existing.

7. **Applicant: Vickers, Riis, Murray & Curran**
 - a. Property Address: 56 Saint Joseph Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/9/10
 - c. Project: Install a 16" by 30" Corian wall sign.
8. **Applicant: Colson Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 11 Macy Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/14/10
 - c. Project: Repair the roof and install flashing.
9. **Applicant: Williams Foundation**
 - a. Property Address: 202 South Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/15/10
 - c. Project: Repair the existing foundation piers. The work will match the existing.
10. **Applicant: Tony Moore**
 - a. Property Address: 310 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/17/10
 - c. Project: Relocate the existing neon sign (measuring 2'x10') to a location over the door.
11. **Applicant: John Klotz**
 - a. Property Address: 350 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/17/10
 - c. Project: Repaint per the existing color scheme.
12. **Applicant: John Klotz**
 - a. Property Address: 354 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/17/10
 - c. Project: Repaint per the existing color scheme.
13. **Applicant: William Graham**
 - a. Property Address: 1760 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/17/10
 - c. Project: Install a canvas awning over the rear entrance.
14. **Applicant: Advanced Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 205 Congress Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/17/10
 - c. Project: Reroof the building with asphalt shingles.
15. **Applicant: Grant Zarzour**
 - a. Property Address: 1756 New Hamilton Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/20/10
 - c. Project: Relocate an existing carport (approved 1993) to a point closer into the lot. The carport will be less visible from the public view.
16. **Applicant: Highmark Roofing Services**
 - a. Property Address: 65 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/20/10
 - c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.
17. **Applicant: MH3 Printing, Signs and Ad Specialties**
 - a. Property Address: 1325 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/20/10
 - c. Project: Replace an existing aluminum sign with a new aluminum sign of the same dimensions (under 30 square feet). The sign will feature a green ground and white lettering.
18. **Applicant: Cameron Pfeiffer**
 - a. Property Address: 204 Michigan Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/20/10

- c. Project: Replace shingles where damaged by tree to match original.
- 19. Applicant: Mike Henderson**
 - a. Property Address: 1400 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/21/10
 - c. Project: Reroof the house to match the existing.
- 20. Applicant: Tom Hassel**
 - a. Property Address: 114 Garnett Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/27/10
 - c. Project: Replace roof with 35 year architectural GAF shingle; Slate in color.
- 21. Applicant: Richard Brown**
 - a. Property Address: 56 South Hallet Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/22/10
 - c. Project: Repaint house per existing. Reintroduce porch railings found under house.

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 2011- 01-CA: 112 Lanier Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: Charles Weems for Richard and Barbara Janecky
 - b. Project: New Construction – Construct a rear addition.
HELDOVER. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
- 2. 2011-02-CA: 355 Government Street**
 - a. Applicant: Kim Kearley for the Carnival Museum
 - b. Project: Sign Approval - Construct a monument sign.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
- 3. 2011-03-CA: 263 South Cedar Street**
 - a. Applicant: David Thomas
 - b. Project: Install vinyl windows
TABLED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
- 4. 2011-04-CA: 309 Stocking Street**
 - a. Applicant: Jewel Davis
 - b. Project: Face a house with a brick veneer. Install interior lot fencing.
APPROVED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
- 5. 2011-05-CA: 158 Michigan Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: Quick Phones
 - b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain painted window signage.
DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Appeals

Mr. Bemis briefed the Board as to an upcoming appeal of a review board ruling. He told the Board that the 1660 Government Street Appeal would appear before the City Council on January 11, 2011.

- 2. Satellite Dish Update

Mr. Bemis briefed the Board on the Satellite dish proceedings. He told the Board of the MHDC's January 3, 2011. At the meeting the MHDC discussed three proposals for

addressing the satellite issue. A list of the three proposals was distributed to Board. A discussion ensued. Mr. Bemis told the Board that a public meeting would be held on January 13, 2010. Placement and enforcement will be discussed. Mr. Bemis told the Board that the meeting would take place at 5:30 pm.

3. Election of New Officers

Mr. Wagoner informed his fellow Board members and Staff that he would not be seeking reappointment as the chair of the Architectural Review Board. Mr. Oswalt nominated Mr. Ladd. Mr. James seconded the nomination. The nomination was Unanimously approved. Mr. Oswalt agreed to maintain his position of vice chair.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-01-CA: 112 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Charles Weems for Richard and Barbara Janecky
Received: 12/20/10
Meeting: 1/5/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story residence was constructed in 1937 according to the designs of Mobile architect C. L. Hutchisson, Jr. The house is one of several contemporary Hutchisson designs featuring complex brick combinations and colorings.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. With this application, the applicant’s representative proposes the construction of rear addition.
- B. 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, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The addition will extend between the main house and the existing garage. See C (2) for the garage.
 - b. The addition will not be visible from the public view.
 - c. The addition will be one story in height.
 - d. The walls of the addition will be faced with stucco.
 - e. The addition will feature six-over-six vinyl or aluminum clad wooden windows.
 - f. The proposed window type matches that of the main house.
 - g. The addition will be surmounted by gable roof set perpendicular to Lanier Avenue and the rear alley.
 - h. The roof will be sheathed with asphalt shingles matching those found on the

- body of the house.
 - i. The North Elevation will feature a bay window.
 - j. Four six-over-six windows will be located within the bay window.
 - k. The East Elevation will have a paneled and glazed garage door. For further alterations to the garage see C (2).
 - l. The South Elevation will feature a two bay porch accessed by two pairs of wooden French doors.
 - m. The South Elevation's porch will be defined by three wooden porch posts located atop stuccoed pedestals.
 - n. A flight of steps will descend from the porch's single eastern bay.
 - o. The porch will be surmounted by a shed roof.
 - p. An octagonal window will be located east of the porch. For the remainder of the South Elevation's fenestration see C (2).
2. Reconstruct/remodel the existing garage.
- a. The reconstructed garage will maintain the same footprint/setbacks.
 - b. The walls of the reconstructed garages will be stuccoed in the same manner as those of the addition.
 - c. The six-over-six aluminum or vinyl-clad wooden windows will match the existing.
 - d. The gable roof's pitch will be altered to be made more comparable to those of the main house and the addition.
 - e. The gable roof will feature a louvered vent like that of the main house's rear gables.
 - f. The garage's East Elevation will feature the aforementioned garage door. See C (1).
 - g. The garage's South Elevation will feature two six-over-six vinyl or aluminum clad windows.
 - h. The two-six-over-six windows will flank a glazed and paneled wooden door.
 - i. A shed roof overhang featuring curvilinear brackets will be located over the South facing door.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposed addition will not be visible from the public view. This inner lot rear addition and garage reconstruction will only be visible from the alley. The addition will in effect connect the house to the garage. The garage, which will maintain its existing footprint, will be extensively remodeled.

In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, the proposed addition and alterations will be differentiated from yet compatible with the massing, form, and materials of the main house. The use of a stuccoed wall treatment will be complementary to, albeit distinguished from the brick walls of the main house. The roof forms and pitch will be based upon those of the main house. The roof sheathing and window type will match the existing. Staff does not believe the proposed addition will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

As per the remodeling of the garage, the existing single story wooden ancillary structure is not of the same architectural caliber and construction as the main house. The reconstructed garage will become a rear wing of the main house though it will continue to function as a garage. It will feature a stuccoed wall treatment matching that of the addition. The fenestration type will match that of the body of the house. The fenestration patterns will remain the same. While the roof pitch will be altered so to better complement the rear gables of the main house and the addition, it will maintain the overall gable with side shed form. The roof will be lower in height than that of the rear addition thereby indicating a transition in

mass and use. Given that the proposed garage reconstruction will maintain the existing building footprint, retain the existing roof form, and match the wall treatment of the addition, Staff does not believe the reconstruction 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 will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Charles Weems was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Weems if he had any clarifications to make or comments to add with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Weems answered no saying Mr. Blackwell had adequately addressed the application.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Weems about the proposed windows. Mr. Blackwell explained to the Board that the addition's windows would be the same type, meaning six-over-one format, as those of the main house. Mr. Weems told the Board that the existing windows on the main house had been replaced with clad windows. The proposed windows would match these later windows. Mr. Karwinski asked if the existing and proposed windows were double hung. Mr. Weems said that he did not know, but the directive from the architect was to match those already installed. He told the Board that he assumed the windows would be double hung. Mr. Weems reiterated that main house's windows were replacements.

Mr. Karwinski drew the Board's and Mr. Weems' attention to proposed addition's south elevation. He pointed out that the recess resulting from the garage's northeast corner setback was not indicated in the proposed plans. Mr. Weems acknowledged the discrepancy, but said that the recess was a slight one. He said the discrepancy in the drawings was the result of a missing line. Mr. Karwinski pointed out that the proposed addition's south-facing porch might require a railing due to its grade.

Returning discussion to the south elevation and the ell, Mr. Roberts said that while a line was missing, that being a simple omission, the roof forms were not rendered correctly. Mr. Roberts said that while the design concept was OK, the drawings were inaccurate.

Mr. Karwinski addressed the applicant and his fellow board members by saying that the proposed addition was not of the same par as the historic house. He said it was not as elegant design-wise. Mr. Weems said the applicants wanted to use matching brick on the addition, but the brick type was no longer manufactured. He told the Board that he recommended the use of random brick set in stucco. Mr. Roberts told Mr. Weems that the concern was not so much a matter of material, but massing. Mr. Karwinski agreed saying he believed the design posed more issues than the finish. Mr. Weems told the Board that he did not execute the design. Being the applicant's representative, he said he would pass the Board's comments on to the owners.

Mr. Roberts initiated a discussion of the addition's massing and scale. Discussion ensued. Mr. James addressed the Board and Mr. Weems. He said that he did not believe that the proposed addition's proportions were disproportionate. Mr. James said that if he had any objection to the design it would be the north-facing bay window. He told his fellow board members that the whole design need not be discarded because the proportions and scale were correct. Mr. Roberts said that the roof pitches were not

depicted correctly on the plans. Mr. James agreed, but reiterated that the proposal should not be discarded.

In an effort to bring the discussion to a conclusion, Mr. Wagoner told Mr. Weems that based on the preceding discussion the applicants had two alternatives. They could either withdraw the application and return to the Board with modified plans or the application could be denied for lack of information. Mr. Ladd suggested a Design Review Committee thereby allowing the Board to work with the applicant to bring about a better design solution. Ms. Harden agreed with Mr. Ladd. She told the Board that she had problems with only one elevation, the rear.

Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Weems if the applicants would be willing to meet to meet with a Design Review Committee. Mr. Weems said that while he could not answer definitely, he believed the applicants would be amenable. He asked the Board about what steps he should take regarding the meeting. Mr. Blackwell told Mr. Weems that he would contact him regarding the procedure and the timing of the meeting. Mr. Wagoner said there were two options, either the application could go to a Design Review Committee or it could be denied for lack of information.

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 the facts to note the setback issue.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application should be tabled for thirty days for the convention of a design review committee.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-02-CA: 355 Government Street
Applicant: Kim Kearley for the Carnival Museum
Received: 12/20/10
Meeting: 1/5/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-B
Project: Sign Approval – Install a monument sign.

BUILDING HISTORY

This 1872 Mobile side hall house with recessed wing was built in 1872 for the Bernstein family. The Italianate style house was designed by Mobile architect James H. Hutchisson.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The Carnival Museum last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on October 25, 2004. At that time, the Board approved the construction of the Museum’s entry/gift shop. With this submission, the Museum’s representative proposes the construction of a monument sign.
- B. The Sign Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 1. “The height of free standing signs shall not be higher than 8 feet.”
 2. “The overall design of all signage including the mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property. Buildings with a recognizable style such as Greek Revival, Italianate, Victorian, Queen Anne, Neoclassic, Craftsman, et al., should use signage of the same style. This can be done through the use of similar decorative features such as columns or brackets.”
 3. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.”
 4. “The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet. A multi-tenant building is also limited to a maximum of 64 square feet.”
 5. “The total allowable square footage for the display area of a monument sign is (50) square feet, for pole signs 40 square feet, and for projecting signs 40 square feet.”
 6. “The structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building. Wood, stucco, stone or brick, is allowed.”
 7. “The size of the sign shall be determined by measuring the area within each face of a geometric shape enclosing all elements of informational or representational matter including blank masking. Structural supports not bearing information shall not be

included in the computation of display area. For double faced signs, each side shall be counted toward the maximum allowable square footage.”

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

1. Construct a monument sign.
 - a. Remove the existing monument sign.
 - b. The single faced monument sign will face north toward Government Street.
 - c. The sign will be located between the property’s cast iron fence and the façade’s two-tiered portico.
 - d. Existing landscaping located to the east, south, and west sides of the sign will be retained.
 - e. The monument sign will feature two brick-veneered piers supporting a rectilinear brick sign board.
 - f. The stepped signboard will feature the Museum’s name. The actual signage will be aluminum in composition. It will be applied to and over the sign board. The signboard will feature a precast concrete coping. The height of the sign board and frame measures 6’ 5 ½”.
 - g. An aluminum Carnival figure will surmount the stepped sign board. The figure will be painted in a Carnival associated color scheme.
 - h. A scrolled iron overthrough will surmount the sign board. The Museum’s logo, executed in aluminum lettering, will be affixed to the overthrough. The overthrough will measure 3’ 6” in height.
 - i. The total square footage of the signage measures 37 square feet (plus 7’ additional feet with logo).

STAFF ANALYSIS

The Carnival Museum’s existing monument sign is at best minimally visible to pedestrian traffic and barely visible to vehicular traffic. The proposed signage would be located in the same location as the existing signage, which is between the high cast iron fence and the façade’s two tiered portico. An existing u-shaped box hedge would buffer the signage. The existing signage is over seven feet in height. The height of the proposed sign is approximately 10.’ The roughly 10’ height takes into account both solid and voided space components of the sign design.

In the 1990s, the Board adopted a policy of restricting the height of monument signs to 5 feet in order to maintain a pedestrian friendly environment in the historic districts. Since that time, the few exceptions have been granted. The applicant’s representative has been addressing how to develop a sign design that advertises the Museum, while at the same time will not obscure the museum’s historic building. The height of the 5’ cast iron fence fronting the house and the setback of the sign within the lot call for a height exceeding 5’.

The proposed sign will be comprised of a pair of brick-veneered piers surmounted by a brick sign board. An iron overthrough would be located atop the sign board. The total height of the masonry portion of the sign is 6’ 5 1/2”, well under the 8’ height allotment for signage in the historic districts. The overthrough measures an additional 3’ 6”. The total proposed height of the sign, roughly 10’, will require a sign height variance. Taking into account the height of the property’s fence, the vertical composition of the building, the height of surrounding buildings, and the limited range of view, the overall height of the sign and the overthrough is not disruptive to the visual or proportional aesthetics of the streetscape. Being independent from the building, possible removal and alteration would have no adverse structural effects.

The sign design and materials meet the standards outlined in the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts. The simple form echoes the massing of the building. The bricks will be painted to match the building’s color scheme, thereby blending into the built components of property. The spotting

of Carnival associated coloring on the figural motif is in keeping with Museum's theme, as well as, existing Carnival motifs located on grounds.

Staff does not believe this application meets the requirements for monument signs in historic districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (2-7), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Given the site considerations and built components that characterize the lot, Staff recommends approval of the application upon the issuance of a sign height variance.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Kim Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Bemis if he should recuse himself on account of his father's association with the museum. Mr. Bemis answered no telling Mr. Ladd he could remain present, but should abstain himself from the discussion and the ruling.

Mr. Wagoner asked Ms. Kearley if he had any clarifications to make or comments to add with regard to the Staff Report. Ms. Kearley asked the Board about the steps involved in obtaining a sign height variance. Mr. Wagoner said the variance details could be addressed after the meeting if approval was granted. Ms. Kearley said that in developing the proposed design, visibility was a primary concern on several counts. She said that she elevated the sign to make it visible from the street, but changed the material composition to for a reduced density (via the use of iron) so to allow visibility of the street. She told the Board that vision to and from the porch was important to the museum for they wanted the building to be seen from the street and to see parades from the galleries.

Ms. Kearley asked Staff about the classification of the sign. She said that she termed the sign a freestanding, not a monument sign. Mr. Bemis said that for the Board's purposes there was no distinction between the two designations.

Mr. Wagoner asked the Board if they had any comments to make or questions to ask. Mr. Karwinski said he had several comments. He told Ms. Kearley that he liked the sign, saying it was cute but he thought the placement of the sign was problematic. Mr. Karwinski pointed out that the existing iron sign was airy and did not take away from the building. He said that the sign's height and composition of the sign in its proposed location took away from the building. He said that if the proposed sign was relocated to another location, he would not object to the design and the variance. Mr. Karwinski suggested that the sign be relocated to a space in front of the recessed side wing's bay window. He provided a drawing showing the sign in that alternate location.

Ms. Kearley agreed with Mr. Karwinski saying she also had problems with the sign's location. She said that she initially wanted to locate the sign to the east of the porch, but a light post as well as other existing features precluded that location. Ms. Kearley told the Board that existing improvements to the west of the porch, the area before the bay window, worked against that location as well. She pointed out that a portrait bust atop a heavy pedestal already occupied area. Mr. Karwinski and Mr. Roberts suggested switching the locations of the bust and the sign. Ms. Kearley said the bust and its pedestal were too heavy to be relocated. Mr. Karwinski said that the bust would be better situated before the house where it would

be framed by landscaping and be backed by the building. Ms. Kearley agreed, but said that practical concerns argued against the switching of locations.

Mr. James addressed his fellow Board members. He said that he thought the sign's location as proposed was appropriate. He pointed out the porch's Carnival figures saying that the proposed sign would harmonize with them. He said that neither the design nor its location impaired the integrity of the building or the district. Mr. Karwinski disagreed. Mr. James said the sign would not only be more affective, but also more appropriate in the proposed location. Mr. James said he liked the design describing it as having a larger than life feel that was appropriate to the museum, yet in keeping with sight and building. Mr. Roberts said he understood Mr. James' reasoning. Mr. James pointed out that the masonry base provided support for the sign and blended with building. The transition from mass of the base to the openness of the overthrough was well considered.

Ms. Harden asked about the grade of the porch in relation to the masonry portions of the sign. Pointing to the drawing and enumerating the heights (an approximate 4' from grade for the porch), Ms. Kearley explained that she restricted the masonry components to the lower portion of the sign. Mr. Roberts told Ms. Harden that the sign design negotiated the top of the fence more than the height of the porch.

Mr. Oswalt suggested that the period of discussion should come to a close. Mr. Wagoner agreed. He asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application, upon hearing no response, he closed the period of public comment.

Mr. Karwinski said that the Carnival figures on the porch should be considered and counted as signage. Mr. Wagoner said that the figures were neither coming before the Board as part of this application nor were they a matter of concern.

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. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/5/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-03-CA: 263 South Cedar Street
Applicant: David Thomas
Received: 11/22/09
Meeting: 1/5/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install vinyl windows

BUILDING HISTORY

This 2000 house constitutes recent infill construction in 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 May 5, 2010. At that time, the Board approved the replacement of the façade’s wooden columns with fiberglass substitutions of the same design. With this submission, the applicant proposes replacing the façade’s four first story wooden windows with vinyl windows. The application was scheduled to be held on December 15, 2010. At the request of the applicant, the submission was heldover for the current meeting.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The type, size and dividing light of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window 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 and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Replace the façade’s four first story wooden windows with vinyl windows.
 - a. The windows will feature the same one-over-one configuration as the existing.
 - b. The windows will not feature applied muntins.
 - c. The windows will have a white finish.

STAFF ANALYSIS

With regards 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 traditional infill construction in the Church Street East Historic District. Taking into account the house's recent date of construction (2000), the Guidelines for New Residential Construction Mobile's Historic Districts must be consulted.

The Guidelines for New 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. As proposed and installed, those windows utilized stool extensions. The extensions and framing of the windows provide the sense of depth and stability afforded by traditional true-divided-light wooden windows. Staff deems the results successful.

Generally, the Board is looking for a certain dimensionality to the windows. Since this is a brick house and Blair Avenue is a wood house, that dimensionality must come from the window itself. No window sample was submitted and the common vinyl window would not be deemed appropriate in a historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

As submitted, Staff cannot recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. David Thomas was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Thomas if he had any clarifications to make or comments to add with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Thomas distributed descriptions and specifications regarding the proposed windows treatment to the Board.

Mr. Roberts asked if the proposed windows would feature the same configuration as the existing. Mr. Thomas answered yes. He said that the existing wooden windows would remain. The windows units would only be faced with vinyl. He told the Board that the current windows were installed in 1995. The façade's first floor windows were already beginning to decay. Mr. Thomas added that the façade's second story windows, like the rest of the windows on the house, were in good condition. He told the Board that as stated in the distributed specifications the window profiles would remain the same. A clad covering would be applied to the wooden components.

Mr. Karwinski said that he thought the treatment sounded like a sash replacement kit. Mr. James told Mr. Thomas that while the description was clear, the lack of drawings made it impossible to know the profiles. Mr. Thomas said that the windows would in effect become vinyl clad windows. Ms. Harden told Mr. Thomas and her fellow Board members that in her experience, adding a wrap often resulted in additional moldings. She told Mr. Thomas that while his proposal sounded appropriate, the Board would still need to see visual representations of what he wanted to do to the windows. She told him that she understood the wrap would "fit," but the question was how it would conform to the existing components.

Mr. Thomas said that most of the houses on his block feature vinyl windows. He said that he was proposing what he thought to be an improvement over those windows. Mr. Roberts agreed, but reiterated that the Board would need to see drawings.

Mr. Bemis interjected saying that the application could be held over for submission of drawings, namely sectional details and jamb profiles. Mr. Karwinski said that the drawings should take into account the house's brick veneer construction.

Mr. Thomas said his only other alternative would be to install vinyl windows because he was not going to install new wooden windows. Mr. James told Mr. Thomas that the Board was working with him saying they only needed drawings because conceptually the project sounded appropriate. The descriptions needed only to be backed by visuals. Ms. Harden and Mr. Roberts agreed. Mr. Karwinski moved to table the application for submission of product details. The motion passed unanimously.

HELD OVER.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-04-CA: 309 Stocking Street
Applicant: Jewel Davis
Received: 12/20/10
Meeting: 1/5/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Face a house with a brick veneer. Install interior lot fencing.

BUILDING HISTORY

This single story Craftsman-influenced house was constructed in 1925.

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 construction of a rear addition. The owner/applicant returns to the Board with a proposal entailing the installation of a brick veneer around the body of the main house and the addition, as well as, submittal for interior lot fencing.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. The exterior of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the existing in profile, dimension and material.”
 - 2. Fencing “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.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Face the walls of the main house and the approved addition with a red brick veneer.
 - 2. Install interior lot fencing.
 - a. The proposed aluminum fencing will be six feet in height.
 - b. The fencing will commence at the front plan of the body of the house, from hence it will encircle the rear of the property. The fence will feature an inward opening gate of the same design.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The two part application calls for the facing of a single story wooden “bungalow” with a brick veneer and installation of an interior lot fencing.

As per the brick veneer, the proposed wall treatment would extend around the house, as well as, the recently approved (and soon to be commenced) rear addition. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that original siding should be retained and replaced. Replacements should match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. The wooden siding survives intact. The facing of the wooden siding with a brick veneer would alter the architectural and historical character of the building.

The proposed fencing meets the material and design standards for Mobile’s historic districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff believes the portion of the application pertaining to the installation of a brick veneer to the main house and the addition would impair the architectural and the historical character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of that portion of the application.

Based on B (2), Staff does not believe the portion of the application pertaining to the installation of an interior lot fence would impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this portion of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Jewel Davis was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Ms. Davis if she had any clarifications to make or comments to add with regard to the Staff Report. Ms. Davis told the Board that when she submitted her application for the addition she wanted both the main house and the addition to be faced with brick. She said that she was told that she could not do this treatment.. In the process of pulling her building permit, she said that she was told she could use brick. When she consulted Staff, she was told she would have to appear before the Board.

Mr. Wagoner explained the Guidelines to Ms. Davis. He said that the Guidelines stated that existing features should be maintained and replaced to match the existing. He told Ms. Davis that the Guidelines and the Board were established to protect the historical integrity of the districts of which her home was a contributing component.

Mr. Roberts asked Staff how Ms. Davis was informed that she could not use brick. Mr. Blackwell explained that Staff could not say no without first receiving an application. Mr. Bemis said that if the initial design as received and approved had called for a brick veneer it would not have received a recommendation from Staff because it would have violated the Guidelines. Ms. Davis said that the Guidelines did not rule out the use of brick. The Guidelines were consulted. Mr. Roberts pointed out that the appropriate materials list for new construction was different from the actual Guideline on existing material finishes. The Guidelines, which call for maintenance and matching replacement of existing wall treatments, were cited.

Ms. Davis reiterated that she wanted to use brick on her home. She said that if she could not use brick on the whole of the existing and the expanded house, she would like to use brick on the addition and half way up on the existing. She said that such a treatment would not impair her house. She said that several of the houses on the other side of the street featured the same wall treatment. Ms. Davis stated that recent construction in the area featured brick veneered walls.

Ms. Davis alluded to a derelict house located to the north of her home. She asked why that house was being allowed to fall apart and why was she, someone wanting to work their property, being told she could not do work. Mr. Wagoner told Ms. Davis that each application was taken on a case by case basis. He said that the wall treatment survived intact on her house therefore it would have to be maintained. Mr. Oswalt suggested that Ms. Davis consider hardiplank. Mr. Blackwell said that the application of the approved addition specified Hardiplank.

Ms. Davis addressed the Board. She said that she understood some of their concerns and was trying to understand others, but that the Board was not taking into account the homeowner. Ms. Davis said that she understands and abides by rules. She told the Board that the property in question was her house. She said that she had difficulty being told what she can and cannot do to it, especially when the guidelines give you no leeway.

Mr. Wagoner said that he, like most of his fellow Board members, lives in the historic districts. He said that all their properties were bound by the same rules and regulations as hers. Mr. Wagoner said that the rules were in place to protect their homes and their surroundings. Ms. Harden reiterated the same concerns.

Mr. Bemis explained to Ms. Davis that the Guidelines were based on federal regulations. He told Mrs. Davis that a 77% majority of her neighborhood voted to become part of the historic districts. Ms. Davis said that she was out of town when the vote occurred. She told the Board that she agreed with guidelines in concept, but they were too strict. She alluded to the deteriorated property next door. Again she asked why was she, who wanted to work on her property, being held back when others who were letting their properties fall apart did not receive a reprimand. Mr. Roberts told Ms. Davis that the Board reviews applications for proposed work. Since the neighboring property owner had not submitted an application, the property had therefore not appeared before the Board.

Mr. Wagoner asked Ms. Davis about the proposed fencing. No design was provided. Mr. Blackwell explained that the fencing would consist of a standard six foot interior lot aluminum fence which would extend to front plane of the house and would enclose the rear of the property. A discussion of the whether the fence could be approved as a midmonth ensued. The midmonth approval list was consulted.

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. Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the portion of the application pertaining to the interior lot fencing does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued by Staff upon review of the design.

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the portion of the application pertaining to the installation of the brick veneer does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/5/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-05-CA: 158 Michigan Avenue
Applicant: Quick Phones
Received: 12/3/10
Meeting: 1/5/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain painted window signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

The brick veneered multi-unit commercial building was constructed in the 1970s.

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 seeks After-the-Fact-Approval of painted window signage.
- B. The Sign Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building.”
 - 2. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.”
 - 3. “The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet.
 - 4. “The size of the sign shall be determined by measuring the area within each face of a geometric shape enclosing all elements of informational or representational matter including blank masking.”
 - 5. “Signs painted directly on window glass or hung in windows are permitted. Such signs will be counted toward the maximum size requirement, and are limited to 20% of the window area.”
- C. **Scope of Work:**
 - 1. After-the-Fact-Approval: Retain painted window signage.
 - a. The wrap-around painted commercial graphics occupy three east-facing storefront windows as well as two north-facing windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This multi-tenant commercial strip was constructed in the 1970s. The franchise holder installed painted window graphics without the issue of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The signage is located in all three of the east-facing plate glass windows and one of the two north-facing plate glass windows. While the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts allow signage graphics painted on windows, the amount of said signage is limited to 20% of the window area. .

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-5), Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and the historical character of the district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Karwinski asked if the unit's street-facing wall sign would be considered as part of the application. Mr. Bemis answered no because there was no one present to amend the application to include the wall signage. Mr. Oswald asked how the application reached the Board. Mr. Bemis told the Board that the application was a result of a 311 call

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Oswald moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.