

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

June 16, 2010 – 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: Gertrude Baker, Bill James, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswald, Craig Roberts, Jim Wagoner, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Members Absent: Carlos Gant, Kim Hardin, and Barja Wilson.
Staff Members Present: Cart Blackwell, Keri Coumanis, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Oswald moved to approve the minutes of the June 2, 2010 meeting as amended by clarifications made to Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COAs granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Robert Smith**
 - a. Property Address: 353 South Broad Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/28/10
 - c. Project: Repair rotten woodwork to match the existing in proportion and dimension. Repaint the house. The color scheme will be submitted at a later date.
2. **Applicant: Tony Dixon**
 - a. Property Address: 73 South Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/24/10
 - c. Project: Replace rotten siding with wood siding to match existing as necessary; repaint to match existing.
3. **Applicant: Ilyas Shaikh**
 - a. Property Address: 12 Straight Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/28/10
 - c. Project: Install front yard picket fence, wood, to be painted white; repair and replace rotten eaves and soffit as necessary; repaint white.
4. **Applicant: Keith Summersell**
 - a. Property Address: 79 Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/28/10
 - c. Project: Repaint exterior of house per submitted colors: Body – Behr Spanish Galleon; Shutters – Behr Sled; Door – Burnt Tile; Trim – Cream.
5. **Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for William Cutts**
 - a. Property Address: 1005 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/1/10
 - c. Project: Repair and replace a damaged cornice. The work will match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
6. **Applicant: Low-Cost Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 254 S Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/3/10
 - c. Project: Reroof with three tab shingles, charcoal.
7. **Applicant: Susan & Cecil Gardner**
 - a. Property Address: 1665 Lamar
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/3/10

c. Project: Construct carport per the MHDC approved plans. The setbacks will be 8 feet on the rear and side. A different window will be used in the gable. It will be built with side elevation #3.

8. Applicant: Daisy Parker

- a. Property Address: 851 Elmira Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/3/10
- c. Project: Paint the house. The color scheme will be submitted at a later date.

9. Applicant: Coolson Roofing

- a. Property Address: 2256 Ashland Place Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 6/4/10
- c. Project: Reroof house per existing charcoal gray shingles.

10. Applicant: Gerald Bates for Old Shell Investments

- a. Property Address: 911 Augusta Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/7/10
- c. Project: Repair rotten woodwork and siding to match the existing. Paint the body of the house Valspar's olive green. Repaint the trim white. Replace the framed, suspended, and recessed lattice skirting between the foundation piers. Install a crushed limestone gravel in the driveway. Install a six foot interior lot privacy fence along the property line. Install a three foot picket fence across the front property line. The picket fence will tie into privacy fence. Repair and replace the windows to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2010-46-CA: 245 South Warren Street

- a. Applicant: Darrel Williams for Gail Stillwell
- b. Project: Construct an elevator shaft.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2010-47-CA: 1115 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Kojis Signs for Taco Bell
- b. Project: Sign Approval – Install a new monument sign and a new wall sign grouping.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2010-48-CA: 206 and 204 State Street

- a. Applicant: Paul C. Davis for the Waterfront Rescue Mission
- b. Project: 206 State Street - New Construction - Construct a new dormitory building; 204 State Street - Demolition – Demolish the building's rear wing.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. WITHDRAWN IN PART. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2010-49-CA: 56 South Catherine Street

- a. Applicant: Lawrence Stacy for Ping Investment LLC
- b. Project: After the Fact Approval – Retain aluminum replacement windows.

WITHDRAWN. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Guidelines
- 2. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-46-CA: 245 South Warren Street
Applicant: Darrel Williams for Gail Stillwell
Received: 6/1/10
Meeting: 6/16/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct an elevator shaft.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house was constructed in 1998.

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 October 21, 2009. At that time, the Board granted after the fact approval for a garden shed.
- B. The Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples.”
 - 2. “Building mass is established by the arrangement and proportion of its basic geometric components – the main building, wings and porches, the roof and the foundation. Similarity of massing helps create a rhythm along a street, which is one of the appealing aspects of historic districts.”
 - 3. “New construction may consider, where appropriate, roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings.”
 - 4. “To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby buildings.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Construct a brick elevator shaft at the northwest corner of the house behind the screen wall (per submitted plans).
 - a. The two-story elevator shaft will measure 5’ by 5’ 10” in plan.
 - b. The brick will match the brick on the body of the house.
 - c. The design of the cornice and the treatment of the fascia will match those of the house.
 - d. A pre-finished metal roof painted to match the color of the parapet wall’s roof will surmount the addition’s hipped quadrant roof.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This house constitutes sympathetic periphery infill within the Church Street Historic District. The proposed elevator shaft will be setback from the street behind a screen wall. The design, scale, massing, and materials meet the standards established by the Guidelines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Darrel Williams and Gail Stillwell were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked the applicants if they had any comments to add or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Williams told the Board that if granted approval, all the addition's materials would match the existing.

Mr. Wagoner asked the Board if they had any comments or questions for the applicants. Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Williams about the west elevation's blind window. Mr. Williams clarified Mr. Roberts' question.

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

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/16/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-47-CA: 1115 Government Street
Applicant: Kojis Signs for Taco Bell
Received: 5/28/10
Meeting: 6/16/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Sign Approval – Install a new monument sign and a new wall sign grouping.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Taco Bell was constructed in 1985.

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 January 26, 2004. At that time, the Board approved the installation of interior lot fencing. The applicant’s representative appears before the Board with a request to replace the existing monument and walls signs. The applicants ordered the signs prior to consulting with the sign installers. The applicant’s representative has tried to adapt the signs to the standards established by the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The overall design of the signage including 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, Neo-classic, 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.”
 - 2. “The height of free-standing signage shall not be higher than 8 feet.”
 - 3. “For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors.”
 - 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.”
 - 5. “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.”

6. "The structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building. Wood, metal, stucco, stone or brick, is allowed. Plastic, vinyl or similar materials are prohibited. Neon, resin to give the appearance of wood, and fabric may be used as appropriate."
7. "The total allowable square footage for the display area of a monument sign is (50) fifty square feet..."
8. "Internally lit signs are prohibited."
9. "Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination. Such lighting shall not shine into or create glare at pedestrian or vehicular traffic, nor shall it shine into adjacent areas. Light fixtures mounted on the ground shall be screened by landscaping."

C. Scope of Work:

1. Remove the existing monument and wall signs.
2. Install a new monument sign on the location of the existing monument sign (per submitted plan).
 - a. The sign will be set into the ground.
 - b. The lawn has a steep grade. Consequently, the base will be higher toward the street.
 - c. The double-faced sign will measure approximately 5' in height.
 - d. The double-faced sign will measure 45" (3.75') in width.
 - e. The double-faced sign will measure 10" in depth.
 - f. The total square footage of both faces of signage will measure 37.5'.
 - g. The sign faces will be made of embossed polycarbonate.
 - h. The sign faces will feature the franchise's logo, name, and directional information.
 - i. The sign features LED lighting, but the electrical components will not be installed.
 - j. Ground level spotlights will illuminate the sign.
3. Remove the existing wall sign.
4. Install a new wall sign grouping on the location of the existing wall sign (per submitted plan).
 - a. The three part wall sign grouping will be composed of one logo and two lettered sections.
 - b. The first section of lettered signage will measure 4' 10 5/8" in length by 1' 1/2" in height.
 - c. The second section of lettered signage will measure 4' 7 7/8" in length by 1' 1/2" in height.
 - d. The total square footage of the wall signage will measure approximately 16.59 square feet.
 - e. The signage features LED lighting, but the electrical components will not be installed.
 - f. The sign faces will be made of embossed polycarbonate.
5. The total square footage of all signage will measure approximately 54.09 square feet.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. Will the sunken portions of the monument sign be faced with a material to prevent rot?

MATERIAL REQUEST

1. Staff requests a sample of the proposed sign face material.

STAFF ANALYSIS

When reviewing signage requests, five criteria are taken into account: size, height, materials, lighting and design.

With regard to sign size, two measurements must be observed. The Sign Design Guidelines limit the total square footage for all signage on a property to 64 square feet. To exceed the 64 square foot allotment, a variance is required. Secondly, the maximum square footage for monument size is set at 50 square feet. The proposed wall and monument wall signs are in compliance with the size requirements.

The Guidelines state that the height of a freestanding sign should not exceed 8', but the Board ordinarily does not approve monument signs measuring over 5'. The proposed sign measures roughly 5' in height. Since the sign will be located on a sloped lawn, the base will be higher at the side closest to the street, thus exceeding 5' at that end.

The Sign Design Guidelines allow the use of composite materials. The applicant proposes the use of signs featuring embossed polycarbonate faces. Embossed polycarbonate is a composite material with a textured finish.

The Guidelines prohibit the use of LED lighting. While the sign features LED lighting, the applicant does not intend to install the electrical equipment. Ground level spotlights will illuminate the signage.

With regard to design and installation, the proposed designs are stock designs ordered by the franchise owner. The monument sign design has been adapted to meet the height and lighting standards established by the Guidelines and previous Board rulings. The design does not impair the historical integrity of the district, but the manner in which the monument sign would be installed poses design and maintenance related issues. In adjusting the height of the sign, a base has been omitted. A base provides the sense of transition and definition appropriate for monument signs in Mobile's historic districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Approval in Part and Denial in Part:

Based on B (1-9), Staff does not believe the proposed wall and monument signs will impair the architectural or the historical character of the district. Staff recommends approval of the proposed signage, on the condition that the proposed facing meets the standards established by the Guidelines.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Jon Butler with Kojis Signs was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Butler if he had any comments to add or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Butler explained to the Board that the franchise owner ordered the signs from a national sign distributor without consulting the Guidelines. When the owners contacted him to install the sign he contacted Staff in order to bring the signage into compliance.

Mr. Wagoner asked the Board if they had any questions or comments. Mr. Roberts spoke of the color of the building and the sign. He noted that the color scheme, while serving the purpose to identify the franchise, was not appropriate for the Oakleigh Garden District. Mr. Roberts informed those assembled that when constructed, the building was widely copied, ultimately becoming a prototype for Taco Bells across the country. Mrs. Baker asked Mr. Butler and Staff to clarify what type lighting would be used. Mr. Karwinski asked for clarification with regard to the height of the sign.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/16/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-48-CA: 204 and 206 State Street
Applicant: Paul C. Davis for the Waterfront Rescue Mission
Received: 5/28/10
Meeting: 6/16/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Detonti Square
Classification: 204 State Street - Contributing;
206 State Street – Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-B
Project: 204 State Street - Demolition - Demolish the building’s rear wing;
206 State Street - New Construction - Construct a new dormitory building.

BUILDING HISTORY

206 State Street and 204 State Street are part of the Waterfront Rescue Mission complex. 206 State Street is a vacant lot. The building at 204 State Street dates from the early 1920s. The two-story stuccoed building originally housed the Northside Baptist Church.

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. 206 State Street has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicant proposes constructing a new dormitory on the vacant lot. 204 State Street last appeared before the Board on December 2, 2010. At that time the Board denied the applicant’s request to construct a porch. With regard to the current proposal, the applicant proposes the demolition of a later rear wing to meet parking requirements for the proposed new dormitory.
- B. The Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts Street state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples.”
 - 2. “Designers for new construction should reference buildings near the proposed construction site – ‘nearby buildings.’ The term ‘nearby buildings’ includes those buildings located on adjacent properties, on the same street, and on streets of similar character within the historic district.”
 - 3. “Placement has two components: setback, the distance between the street and a building; and spacing, the distance between its property lines and adjacent structures. New construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings. New buildings should not be placed too far forward or behind the traditional ‘façade line,’ a visual line created by fronts of buildings along a street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the façade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape. Current setback requirements of the City of Mobile may not allow the building to be placed as close to the street as the majority

4. "Building mass is established by the arrangement and proportion of its basic geometric components – the main building, wings and porches, the roof and the foundation. Similarity of massing helps create a rhythm along a street, which is one of the appealing aspects of historic districts. Therefore, new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings."
5. "New Buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby buildings."
6. "New construction may consider, where appropriate, roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings."
7. "To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby buildings."
8. "New construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings."
9. "The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. In order to coexist in harmony with adjacent structures in the historic districts, porches are strongly encouraged. Porches often create a visual cadence along the street. Designs for new porches should also reference historic porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, rails and ornamentation. Porches of new buildings should also be similar in height and width to porches of nearby historic buildings. Proper care should be taken with the detailing of new porches. Wood or a suitable substitute material should be used."
10. "New buildings should use windows and entrances that approximate the placement and solid-void-ratio of nearby historic buildings. Where a side elevation is clearly visible from the street, proportion and placement of their elements will have an impact upon the visual character of the neighborhood and must be addressed in the design."
11. "Historic buildings feature the use of a variety of materials for roofs, foundations, wall cladding and architectural details. In new buildings, exterior materials – both traditional and modern – should closely resemble surrounding historic examples. Modern materials which have the same textural qualities and character as materials of nearby historic buildings may be acceptable."
12. "The type, size and dividing light of windows, and their location and configuration (rhythm) help establish the character of a building and compatibility with adjacent structures. Traditionally designed window openings are generally recessed on masonry buildings. New construction should follow those methods in the historic districts as opposed to designing windows flush with the wall."
13. "Blinds and shutters and awnings can be integral parts of new construction, just as they are in historic applications. Blinds and shutters should be sized to fit the reveal of the window openings precisely. Operable blinds and shutter units, hung with appropriate hinges, are encouraged. Where blinds or shutters are fixed, they should be hung on window casings in a manner to replicate those which are operable."
14. "Doorways reflect the architectural style of a building. The design of doors and doorways can help establish the character of a building and compatibility with adjacent facades."
15. "New materials which are an evolution of historic materials, such as Hardiplank or a simulated stucco finish (instead of true stucco), should suggest the profile, dimension and finish of historic materials. True materials, such as brick, wood siding, or true stucco are encouraged. Some synthetic materials, such as fiberglass porch columns may be appropriate in individual cases as approved by the Review Board."
16. "Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property."
17. "Landscaping can assist in creating an appropriate setting. Asphalt is inappropriate for walkways. Gravel or shell are preferred paving material, however, a variance from the Board of

18. "The appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design. New materials such as grasspave or grasscrete, which provides a solid parking surface while still allowing grass to grow giving the appearance of a continuance of a front lawn, may be a feasible alternative."
19. "Proposed lighting shall be designed to avoid invading surrounding areas."

C. Scope of Work:

1. Construct a new dormitory building.
 - a. The building will measure 43' 2" in width and 90' in depth.
 - b. The three-story brick building will be elevated above a raised stucco foundation.
 - c. A mansard roof (with the third floor locate therein) will surmount the building.
 - d. Architectural shingles will sheath the roof.
 - e. The height of the building will be 35 feet.
 - f. Paint the building per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme.
 1. The bricks will be left unpainted.
 2. The trim will be Classical White.
 3. The porch deck will be Roycroft Bottle Green.
 4. The shutters and lattice will be Rockwood Shutter Green.
 - g. Façade (South Elevation)
 1. The five bay façade will feature a slightly advanced three bay pavilion.
 2. Three dormer windows featuring nine-over-nine windows will punctuate the center pavilion's mansard roof.
 3. A tetrastyle (four-columned) porch with flanking flights of steps and a half-hipped metal roof will front the center pavilion.
 4. Tuscan columns will define the porch bays.
 5. A wooden balustrade will extend between the porch bays and along the open side of the stairs.
 6. Brick foundation piers will support the porch.
 7. Framed, suspended, and recessed lattice skirting will extend between the foundation piers.
 8. Tuscan columns will define the porch bays.
 9. Nine-over-nine windows with articulated sills and lintels will comprise the fenestration.
 10. Louvered wooden shutters will flank the windows.
 11. A double door will provide ingress and egress from the porch.
 - h. West Elevation
 1. The ground level will feature one large loading and two single door entrances.
 2. The first floor will feature two blind windows and two blind windows with transom-like, three-light upper portions.
 3. A flight of north-facing steps will provide access to a stoop which will allow ingress and egress to the first floor.
 4. A double door will open off the stoop.
 5. A railing will extend around the stoop and along the open side of the stairs.
 6. All the windows will feature articulated sills and lintels.
 7. The second story will feature four nine-over-nine windows, two blind windows, and three blind windows with transom-like, three light upper sections.

8. Five dormers featuring with nine-over-nine windows will be centered on the third floors mansard roof.
 - i. East Elevation
 1. The second floor will feature nine blind windows with articulated sills and lintels.
 - j. North (Rear) Elevation
 1. The second floor will feature five blind windows with articulated sills and lintels.
2. Demolish the rear wing of 204 State Street
3. Install a driveway and dumpster pad between 206 and 204 State Street and a parking lot behind 204 State Street (per submitted plan).
4. Landscape the areas flanking the driveway.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. What is the height of the neighboring building?
2. What type of windows will be used (i.e. material)?
3. What type of porch decking or material will be used?
4. What type metal roof will cover the porch?
5. What is the color of the proposed metal roof?
6. Will the shutters be wooden and/or operable?
7. What is the design of the front door?
8. What are the type, design, and material treatments of the west elevation's doors?
9. What type railing will be used on the west elevation's stairs and stoop?
10. What is the proposed paving treatment for the driveway and parking lot?
11. Will a fenced enclosure surround the dumpster?
12. What type of landscaping will be planted (i.e. trees, grass, and/or shrubbery)?

DETAIL REQUESTS

1. The front porch
2. The side stoop

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves new construction, partial demolition, parking, and landscaping on two lots located within the Waterfront Rescue Mission complex.

206 State Street –New Construction

With regard to the proposed new construction at 204 State Street, the Design Guidelines for New Commercial and Residential Construction state that new construction or architectural infill should take into account the historic character of the surrounding historic district and the design features of nearby historic buildings. Placement & orientation, massing & scale, façade elements, and materials & ornamentation constitute the principle subjects for review.

The placement and orientation of the proposed dormitory at 206 State Street take into account the rhythm of the streetscape, one that features buildings set close to or immediately off of the sidewalk. Both the Board of Zoning and Adjustment and the office of Traffic and Engineering have approved the plan.

With regard to massing and scale, the design for the new dormitory utilizes a foundation treatment similar to that 204 State Street. The two story body of design also reflects the massing and scale of the adjacent structure, as well as other buildings on the streetscape. The use of a mansard roof, while not unprecedented for infill construction, would increase the height of the structure slightly beyond that of neighboring two story structures. Also the design of the roof is not consistent with the style of the building or the surrounding neighborhood. The difference in scale is among the aforementioned clarifications.

With regard to façade elements and details, Staff requests the submission of the above mentioned clarifications. These and the landscaping features should be provided prior to the meeting. At present, staff recommends the use of a uniform roofing material for the entire structure and the use of concrete for the driveway.

204 State Street

The wing rear wing of 204 State Street is comprised of a single story service area which has been obscured by subsequent access related additions. The rear wing and additions are minimally visible from the street and not integral to the architectural character of the building. The proposed demolition would not impair the architectural integrity of the building or the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff believes the roof of the structure is out of character with the building and the surrounding structures. With the character of the structure, staff recommends an alternative design and that the owners look either at the Price Williams House on St. Anthony or the demolished Scattergood Gray house as models. Staff recommends that the applicants withdraw the application until a new roof configuration can be developed and submitted to the Board.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Paul Davis and Kathleen Webb were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Davis if he had any clarifications to make or comments to add with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Davis told the Board that while he had read the Staff Report and understood certain points of concern, he still wanted to submit the application as proposed to the Board. He told the Board that alternative plans developed during the design process utilized different roof types. Mr. Davis said that the proposed roof type and overall height were not out of proportion with the streetscape.

Mr. Wagoner asked the Board if they had any comments to make with regard to the application or questions which to ask the applicant. Mr. Roberts told Mr. Davis that the Guidelines state that new construction should blend with the historical fabric of the surrounding district. Mr. Wagoner said that the height difference was not great, but the form of the roof seemed to be an issue. Mr. Davis said he had investigated the use of parapet walls in the preliminary design phase.

Mr. Karwinski told the applicant that the mass and the volume of the building would overpower the rest of the streetscape. Mr. Davis informed the Board that interior space, volume, was the objective. He said

that he could break down the mass by altering features such as the porch, making it two-tiered, as means of addressing concerns for mass and scale.

Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Davis if he had considered sinking the basement. Mr. Davis told the Board that since the building is located in a flood plain, construction codes will not allow a sunken basement.

Mr. Karwinski reiterated his concerns pertaining to the overall mass of the proposed dormitory.

Mr. Roberts recommended to Mr. Davis that he withdraw the application and request a design review committee. He explained to Mr. Davis that by way of a design review committee board members address the particulars of large scale and/or challenging proposals.

Mr. Karwinski told Mr. Davis that he might be fighting a losing battle for while the Rescue Mission logically wanted to fit as much as possible into the given space, the resulting mass would not be appropriate for the historic district. Mr. James said there existed a number of ways which Mr. Davis could reduce the proposed building's massing. Mr. Davis concurred.

Mr. Karwinski suggested to Mr. Davis that he take into account the site plan. He suggested demolishing the chapel building and constructing a larger building that merged the needs of both existing and proposed buildings on an enlarged site. Mr. Wagoner and Mr. Blackwell reminded Mr. Karwinski that the chapel building is a contributing building.

Mr. Wagoner reminded the Board that they must address an application as submitted. He asked Mr. Davis if he would consider withdrawing the portion of the application pertaining to new construction. Mr. Davis answered yes. Mr. Wagoner asked Staff if the portion of the application addressing the demolition of the 204 State Street's later rear wing could be approved if the new construction was withdrawn. Staff answered yes, saying the application could be withdrawn in part and approved in part. Mr. Davis officially withdrew the portion of the application pertaining to new construction.

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 the application to allow the demolition of the rear wing of 204 State Street and reconsideration of the withdrawn portion for proposed new construction following the meeting of a design review committee.

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 for the demolition of the rear wing of 204 State Street.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/16/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-49-CA: 56 South Catherine Street
Applicant: Lawrence Stacy for Ping Investments
Received: 6/2/10
Meeting: 6/16/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning:
Project: After the Fact Approval – Retain aluminum replacement windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a multi-family home features Craftsman-inspired details.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. Staff received a 311 pertaining to the replacement of a pair of original wooden windows with aluminum windows. The windows are located on the West (Rear) Elevation of the building. The original wooden true-divided-light windows featured three vertical lights over a single solid light. The unauthorized replacement windows are one-over-one aluminum windows. A Notice of Violation was issued on May 10, 2010. The applicant contacted Staff shortly thereafter. The applicant appears before the Board with a request to retain the replacement windows.
- B. The Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on a building help establish the historic character of a building. Original windows should be retained as well as original windows sashes and glazing.”
 - 2. “Where windows cannot be repaired, 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. After the Fact Approval – Retain the replacement aluminum windows on the West (Rear) Elevation.
 - a. The two one-over-one aluminum windows replaced three-over-one wooden true-divided light wooden windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The Guidelines state that when windows cannot be repaired they should be replaced with windows which are compatible to the type, size, and material of the existing windows. The Guidelines further state aluminum windows as an inappropriate for use in the historic districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and the historical character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

WITHDRAWN