

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

March 7, 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, Nick Holmes, III, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Members Absent: Carlos Gant and Jim Wagoner.
Staff Members Present: Cart Blackwell, Keri Coumanis, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the February 15, 2012 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: George Davis**
 - a. Property Address: 16 North Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/10/12
 - c. Project: Repair and replace woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint affected areas to match the existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant: Teague Construction Systems**
 - a. Property Address: 104 Saint Francis Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/7/12
 - c. Project: Repair the canopy on the St. Francis and St. Joseph Street facades, reproofing and repairing the soffits. All repairs to match the existing in profile, dimension and materials.
3. **Applicant: Bryan Robertson**
 - a. Property Address: 153 South Jefferson Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/10/12
 - c. Project: Install a wooden privacy fence between the northeast corner of the house and the adjacent commercial building. Repair the existing fence.
4. **Applicant: City of Mobile**
 - a. Property Address: 200 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/10/12
 - c. Project: Construct a support frame around the existing air conditioning units located atop the building roofs. The framing will not be visible from the street.
5. **Applicant: Paulette Walsh**
 - a. Property Address: 715 Monroe Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/8/12
 - c. Project: Install gutters.
6. **Applicant: Mobile Masonry & Concrete**
 - a. Property Address: 963 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/2/12
 - c. Project: Repair brick work by replacing missing brick on West and East sides of building, matching the brick in color and size reusing existing bricks as available. Mortar to be Type N matching the color to the existing.

- 7. Applicant: Wayne Askew Contracting**
 - a. Property Address: 1307 Chamberlain Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/7/12
 - c. Project: Repaint per the existing color scheme, repairing any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile and dimension. Repaint per the existing color scheme. Reroof with three tab shingles, grey in color.
- 8. Applicant: Jeffrey Fick**
 - a. Property Address: 1319 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/9/12
 - c. Project: Reroof six squares to match original roofing.
- 9. Applicant: Chris Bowen**
 - a. Property Address: 1458 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/10/12
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint to match the existing color scheme.
- 10. Applicant: Calvin Nettles**
 - a. Property Address: 19 South Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/13/12
 - c. Project: Repair and/or replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint in the affected areas.
- 11. Applicant: Gina Finnegan**
 - a. Property Address: 1306 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/10/12
 - c. Project: Demolish a deteriorated, non-contributing outbuilding. Building is failing and in disrepair.
- 12. Applicant: James Wagoner**
 - a. Property Address: 1805 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/22/12
 - c. Project: Replace driveway gates using aluminum to match the existing in size, profile, and dimension. The gates will be painted black in color.
- 13. Applicant: Mark Willis**
 - a. Property Address: 1721 Conti Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/22/12
 - c. Project: Erect a six foot shadow box fence around rear of property
- 14. Applicant: John Thomas**
 - a. Property Address: 210 Roper Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/14/12
 - c. Project: Repair Palmetto Street side of the two story porch, stress relieve, with new splice and replace to match original. Repaint to match.
- 15. Applicant: Big Moore Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 314 South Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/22/12
 - c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.
- 16. Applicant: Sara Workman Kindt**
 - a. Property Address: 1119 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/24/12
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair a dormer. The roofing shingles will match the existing.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2012-14-CA: 260 North Joachim Street**
 - a. Applicant: Jennifer English for Freedom Reporting
 - b. Project: Renovation – Change the swing of the first story doors; replace railings; construct a new rear stoop; stabilize pavers; and install signage.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
2. **2012-15-CA: 50 South Lafayette Street**
 - a. Applicant: Ricky Bradford and Bruce Rockstad
 - b. Project: Renovation – Replace windows.
TABLED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
3. **2012-16-CA: 63 North Georgia Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: Rameh Dickens
 - b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Replace deteriorated woodwork, remove unauthorized siding, and remove and replace windows; Proposed Work - Install shutters.
APPROVED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
4. **2012-17-CA: 1115 Government Street**
 - a. Applicant: Lee Manske with GLMV Architecture for the Peters Trust
 - b. Project: Remodeling – Update the exterior of a commercial franchise to reflect a new brand image; Make alterations to the site plan.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion

The Board discussed possible phased approval of the Guidelines and addressed the strategies regarding windows.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-14-CA: 260 North Joachim Street
Applicant: Jennifer English for Freedom Reporting
Received: 2/9/12
Meeting: 3/7/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-B
Project: Renovation – Change the swing of the first story doors; replace railings; construct a new rear stoop; stabilize pavers; and install signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story house dates from 1904. The facade features a full-length, two-tiered piazza.

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 application involves the changing the swing of doors, replacing railings, constructing a rear stoop, stabilizing pavers, and installing signage.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Often one of the most important features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms, or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building.
 - 2. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
 - 3. “Signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building.”
 - 4. “The height of free-standing signs shall be no higher than 8 feet.”
 - 5. “The overall design of all signage including mounting and framing shall related to the design of the principal building on the property.”
 - 6. “The size of the sign(s) shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.”
 - 7. “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.”
 - 8. “The structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):

1. Change the swing on the front and rear doors.
 - a. Reverse the swing of the doors from an inward to an outward swing.
 - b. Make necessary adjustments to the casings thereof.
2. Reinstall a handrail on the southern side of the existing handicap access ramp. The ramp is located off the building's South or side Elevation.
3. Remove a later rear deck-like stoop.
4. Construct a new rear stoop.
 - a. The stoop will measure 5' 4" in width and 5' in depth.
 - b. The stoop deck will be located 2' 4" above the ground.
 - c. The stoop will rest atop wooden pilings.
 - d. The stoop's 3' tall railing will employ spindles matching those found on the front porch.
 - e. A single flight of north facing steps will allow ingress and egress to and from the stoop. The stair railing will match aforementioned porch and proposed stoop railings.
5. Level/adjust the side drive's brick pavers.
6. Install signage.
 - a. Install a wall sign.
 - i. The aluminum wall sign will be located to the south (right) of the front door.
 - ii. The sign will measure 1' 3" in height and 2' in width.
 - iii. The total square footage of the sign will amount to 2.6 square feet.
 - iv. Four metal studs will secure the sign to the wall.
 - v. The name of the occupying tenant will comprise the sign design.
 - b. Install a double-faced sign board.
 - i. The sign board will be affixed to an existing monument structure.
 - ii. The wooden signage will measure 1' 5" in height and 4' in width.
 - iii. The total square footage of the sign will amount to approximately 12 square feet.
 - iv. The name and explication of the occupying tenant will comprise the sign design.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This multipart application entails changing the swing of the first floor doors, replacing a handrail, constructing a rear stoop, leveling pavers and installing pavers.

With regard to reversing the swing first story doors, The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that original doors should be maintained. (See B (1) of the Staff Report.) The proposed change from an inward to an outward swing would not only involve the removal of structural framing and historic fabric but also alter the experience of the historic building.

The proposed handrail would occupy the same location of an earlier handrail. Reinstallation of the handrail would neither adversely affect the historical integrity of the building nor jeopardize historic building fabric.

The existing rear stoop was constructed in recent decades. This building originally featured a two-tiered rear gallery. The gallery was infilled after the Second World War. The Design Review Guidelines state that particular attention should be given to a stoop or porch's proportions and detailing. (See B (2) of the Staff Report.) Both the stoop and step railings will match the front porch railings. Staff recommends the use of framed, suspended, and recessed lattice foundation skirting.

Tree roots are uprooting the side drive's pavers. The applicant has contacted Urban Forestry regarding resetting the brick pavers.

Signage applications involve the review of size, materials, lighting, and design. The proposed signs meet the standards outlined in the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval in part and denial in part.

Based on B (1), Staff believes the reversal of the door swing will impair the architectural and the historical character of the building and of the historic district. Staff does not recommend approval of that portion of the application.

Based on B (2-8) Staff does not believe the leveling of pavers, reinstallation of railing, construction of a stoop, and installation of signage will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building and the district. Pending approval from Urban Forestry regarding the leveling of the pavers, Staff recommends approval of the remainder of the application but recommends that the applicant employ framed, suspended, and recessed lattice foundation skirting.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Jennifer English and Patrick Finnegan were present to discuss the application

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that the applicants were withdrawing the portion of the application pertaining to the doors.

Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representatives. He asked them to state their names. He then asked if they had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Ms. English stated that she had nothing to add.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any comments to make or questions to ask.

Ms. Harden asked Ms. English and Mr. Finnegan if the applicants had considered using brick foundation piers and lattice skirting on the rear stoop as was recommended in the Staff Report. They replied by saying that they were giving the matter further thought. Ms. Harden said that brick foundation piers offered practical and aesthetic advantages.

Mr. Ladd 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.

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 the portion of the application involving altering the swing of the doors had been withdrawn.

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: 3/7/13

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-15-CA: 50 South Lafayette Street
Applicant: Ricky Bradford and Bruce Rockstad
Received: 2/14/12
Meeting: 3/7/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Renovation – Replace Windows

BUILDING HISTORY

The footprint of this house appears in the 1925 Sanborn. While drawing inspiration from Colonial New England, the design and detailing of the dwelling are characteristic of countless homes constructed nationwide during the first half of the 20th Century.

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 March 24, 2004. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a small rear addition. The current owner/applicants propose the removal and replacement of windows.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for 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 window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
 - 2. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Renovation – Replace windows.
 - a. Remove the house’s wooden windows.
 - b. Replace the wooden windows with vinyl clad wood windows.
 - c. The clad windows will feature interior and exterior applied muntins that will replicate the light configurations of the wooden windows.
 - d. Replace deteriorated wooden sills to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application involves the replacement of windows. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that original windows should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing. If windows cannot be repaired, replacements must be compatible with the existing. (See B 1-2 of the Staff Report.) The original wooden windows remain in situ. Though vinyl clad windows are approved for new construction and the proposed windows would match the light configuration, their composition and muntin construction are not appropriate for use on a historic dwelling whose original window units remain intact.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Bruce Rockstad and Ricky Bradford were present to discuss the application

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Roberts asked for clarification regarding the contributing/non-contributing status of the building. Mr. Blackwell stated that house is listed as a non-contributing building. He added that the building should be listed as contributing. Mr. Bradford asked for clarification regarding the meaning of contributing and non-contributing. Mr. Blackwell explained the difference between the two designations.

Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicants. He asked Mr. Rockstad and Mr. Bradford if they had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Rockstad explained that the existing windows are painted and caulked shut. He said that portions of the frames are rotten and some of the panes are broken.

Ms. Harden recommended to Mr. Rockstad and Mr. Bradford that they conduct a survey assessing the possible repair of the windows.

Mr. Karwinski drew the Board's and Staff's attention to the submitted specifications. He and Ms. Harden explained what constitutes a wood clad window.

As noted in the Staff Report, Ms. Harden noted that windows featured simulated muntins.

Mr. Holmes asked the applicants if the muntin configurations would remain the same. Mr. Rockstad answered yes.

Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Rockstad if he had already purchased the windows. Mr. Rockstad answered no saying that he and Mr. Bradford were following proper procedure. He added that they wanted stable and operable windows.

Ms. Harden encouraged the applicants to investigate repairing the existing windows.

Mr. Roberts said that given that the windows are painted and caulked shut, repair might not be possible.

Ms. Whitt-Mitchell asked for clarification regarding how the Guidelines address contributing and non-contributing structures. Mr. Blackwell explained that in kind replacement applies to both contributing and non-contributing designations.

Ms. Harden reiterated and Mr. Ladd recommended that the applicants look into having the windows repaired. They told the applicants that upon investigating the pricing of repair that they could then better assess their options.

Mr. Rockstad said that he wished that they had known their options prior to meeting. He stated that the submission at hand reflected timing and economic considerations.

Ms. Harden explained to the applicants that the Staff cannot always anticipate Board discussion.

Mr. Roberts also recommended that the applicants obtain cost estimates for the repair of the existing windows. Mr. Rockstad stated that repair might be cost prohibitive. Mr. Roberts said that such might prove the case. A discussion of costs ensued.

Mr. Holmes redirected the discussion. Addressing his fellow Board members he said that they had two points to consider. They could either vote against the Guidelines thereby setting a questionable precedent or they could take into account that since the approved Guidelines were passed, the National Trust had altered its policy regarding window replacements. Mr. Holmes noted the Board is bound by both the Guidelines, as well as previous Board rulings. Noting that applications for window replacements would continue to appear before the Board, and in increasing number, he said that the Board needed to investigate recent case and newer guidelines in effort to address replacements on a local level.

Mr. Roberts said that if a given replacement window possesses substantial appearance that approximates the appearance of traditional windows; he was not adverse to their use as replacements for deteriorated windows.

Mr. Rockstad told the Board that the windows he and Mr. Bradford would like use are of a better design than replacement windows installed down the street. Ms. Coumanis told the Board and the applicants that the aforementioned windows were installed without approval. She reminded the Board that they had denied that applicant's request to retain the unauthorized windows and that the owner was under a court order to replace the vinyl windows with wooden windows.

Mr. Rockstad said that he and Mr. Bradford wanted operable and attractive windows.

Mr. Ladd said that the Board was trying to work with them not against them. Mr. Ladd reiterated to the applicants that they would be well served by investigating other options.

Mr. Holmes referenced the Staff Report and the Guidelines.

Ms. Harden told the applicants that most contractors give free quotes regarding repairs.

Ms. Coumanis provided the applicants with a list of local craftsmen and contractors specializing in window repair and replacement.

Mr. Oswalt moved to table the application.

TABLED.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-16-CA: 63 North Georgia Avenue
Applicant: Rameh Dickens
Received: 2/17/12
Meeting: 3/7/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Replace deteriorated woodwork, remove unauthorized siding, and remove & replace windows; Proposed Work - Install operational shutters on all windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story building was constructed between 1915 and 1920. The structure functioned as a corner grocery.

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 June 12, 2004. At that time, the Board approved fencing. This application involves the After-the-Fact-Review of painting, siding replacement, and window replacement. Proposed shutter installation is also up for review.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The exterior material 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 original in profile, dimension and material.”
 - 2. “The type, size and dividing lights 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.”
 - 3. “Blinds and shutters were integral functional components of historical buildings. Blinds and shutters should be sized to fit the reveal of the window opening precisely.”
 - 4. “Operable units, hung with appropriate hinges are encouraged.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. After-the-Fact-Approval of window replacement, siding replacement, and painting.
 - a. Remove unauthorized masonite siding.
 - b. Replace the aforementioned siding with wooden siding that matches the profile, and dimension of the original siding.

- c. Remove windows.
 - d. Install one-over-one aluminum windows.
 - e. Paint the body of the building grey. Paint the trim white.
2. Install operational wooden shutters. The shutters will be Bermuda in type.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the review of works executed without the issuance of a building permit or a Certificate of Appropriateness. The unauthorized work includes: the replacement of non-conforming siding; the replacement of windows; and the painting the building. The application also calls for the installation of shutters.

The unauthorized work can be divided into two categories that which is accord with the Design Review Guidelines and that which does not.

The replacement of the masonite siding and deteriorated wooden siding falls into the former category. As required by the Guidelines, the replacement wooden siding matches the original siding with regard to profile, dimension, and material. (See B (1) of the Staff Report.)

The color scheme is in keeping with the character of the historic district.

The replacement windows are not in accord with Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. The Guidelines state that when windows can no longer be repaired their replacements should match the existing with regard to material composition and light configuration (See B (2) of the Staff Report.). The original windows were nine-over-one wooden windows while the replacement windows are one-over-one vinyl windows.

As per the installation of shutters, the Design Review Guidelines allow shutters so long as the installations are operable in nature and wooden in composition (See B (3-4) of the Staff Report.). The proposed shutters meet the aforementioned criteria, but are Bermuda in type. Bermuda shutters were rarely employed in Mobile

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval in part and denial in part.

Based on B (1), Staff recommends approval of the replacement of the replacement siding and the painting of the building. Staff does not believe those portions of the application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district.

Based on B (3-4), Staff does not recommend approval of the replacement windows and the installation of shutters. Staff believes those portions of the application will impair the architectural and the historical character of the building or the district.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Rameh Dickens was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Dickens if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address. First addressing the shutters, Mr. Dickens told the Board that he wanted to install them for reason of security. He stated that, unlike the fixed downstairs shutters, the proposed shutters would be operable.

Ms. Harden asked if the shutters would be single leaf in form and outward folding in operation. Mr. Dickens answered yes adding that they would be closed most of the time.

Mr. Ladd told Mr. Dickens that if he had pulled a building permit prior to commencing the work, he would have been notified that he had to receive a Certificate of Appropriateness before doing any work on the building. Mr. Dickens explained that while he had previously lived in the historic districts, he was only renting at that time. As a first time homeowner, he did not know the steps involved procedure involved in doing work in the historic districts.

Mr. Roberts stated that this application involved two areas of concern. Firstly, the shutters are recommended against and secondly the windows were installed without approval and are in violation of the Guidelines.

Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Dickens if he had replaced all the windows. Mr. Dickens said that he had replaced all the windows which were visible on the exterior.

Mr. Roberts recommended that the applicant employ traditional shutters.

Ms. Harden asked how many of the original windows remain. Mr. Dickens said two windows are still located behind fixed shutters.

Ms. Coumanis reminded the Board that on the opposite side of Old Shell Road stand two recently restored homes feature repaired wooden windows. She said the houses were rehabilitation effort done by the Restore Mobile and Oakleigh Venture. Both properties, 1204 and 1250 Old Shell Road, were restored using federal funding and exacting standards. Ms. Coumanis noted that the work on 1204 Old Shell Road is still ongoing. She stated that these projects constituted a significant investment by the City for the community.

Fire codes were discussed in relation to the shutters.

Mr. Holmes stated that the Board needs to investigate window replacements. He said that the current Guidelines and precedent do not allow approval of the application.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that the windows are vinyl not aluminum.

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, that the portions of the application involving window replacement and shutter installation do impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued for said work.

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, that the portions of the application involving wood repair/replacement and painting do 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: 3/7/13

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-17-CA: 1115 Government Street
Applicant: Lee Manske with GLMV Architecture for the Peters Trust
Received: 2/17/12
Meeting: 3/7/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Remodeling – Update the exterior of a commercial franchise to reflect a new brand image.

BUILDING HISTORY

This building dates from 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 June 10, 2010. At that time, the Board approved a replacement monument sign. The franchise’s representatives propose remodeling the building and instigating sight improvements that would reflect the company’s new imaging concept.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The exterior material building helps define its style, quality, and historic period.”
 - 2. “Signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features and openings of a building.”
 - 3. “The overall design of all signage including mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property.”
 - 4. “The size of the sign shall be proportionate to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.”
 - 5. “The total maximum allowable sign area is one and one half square foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet.”
 - 6. “Menu Boards for drive-through windows at restaurants need to be reviewed for size, material, etc. They are not counted toward the maximum square footage allowed for on-site signs. Menu boards are limited to a maximum of 25 square feet and shall not have information and signage on the reverse side.”
 - 7. “Internally lit signs are prohibited.”

8. “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.”
9. “Flashing, blinking, revolving, or rotating lights are not permitted.”
10. “Proposed lighting should be designed to avoid invading surrounding area.”
11. “Ordinances relating to parking and landscaping will be enforced by the City of Mobile Urban Development in reviewing inappropriate requests for parking lots.”
12. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic district. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Remodel the building.
 - a. Add stone facings to the lower portions of the building’s East, North, and South pavilions.
 - b. Alter the shape of the aforementioned pavilions.
 - c. Install canister lights on the pavilions.
 - d. Install aluminum canopies over the East and West entrances.
 - e. Heighten the parapet.
 - f. Repair and when necessary replace roofing tiles to match the existing.
 - g. Touch up the paint of the painted entablature zone.
 - h. Install an expression panel on the East Elevation. The design and color scheme of the expression panel will match that of the painted frieze.
 - i. Paint and/or repaint the building per the submitted color scheme
 - i. The upper portions of the wall will be “Camelback.”
 - ii. Accents will be “Umber.”
 - iii. The pavilion faces will be “Amber Wave.”
 - iv. The pavilion arches will be “Alabaster.”
 - v. The parapet cap will be “Iron Ore.”
 - vi. The entablature zone will be repainted per the existing color scheme.
2. Replace signage.
 - a. Install a wall signage.
 - i. A logo sign and lettered sign will be installed within the apex of the façade’s central pavilion.
 - ii. Both signs will be made of formed polycarbonate.
 - iii. Both signs will feature reverse channel illumination.
 - iv. The logo sign will measure approximately 9 square feet. The height amounts to 35.64” and the width amounts to 38.23”.
 - v. The lettered sign will measure 6.81 square feet.
 - b. Install a menu sign.
 - i. A 10’ tall steel tube with a horizontal clearance bar will precede the menu sign.
 - ii. The menu sign will measure 7’ 3” in height and 7’ 8” in width.
 - iii. The menu sign will reverse channel illumination.
3. Make alterations to the site alterations.
 - a. Repair and replace existing hardscape curbing and surfaces.
 - b. Remove the existing east-west cut through accessing the drive through
 - c. Remove an existing island located just north of the aforementioned cut through.
 - d. Restripe parking.
 - e. Provide updated means of handicap access to the west of the building.
 - f. Enlarge an existing dumpster enclosure. The collapsed rear portion of the enclosure will be removed. The stuccoed block addition extension will match the existing with

regard to treatment and color scheme. A door bay will be inserted in the existing portion of the enclosure. The treatment and material of this pedestrian doorway will match that of the wooden, double gate vehicular door.

- g. Install two light poles at the rear of the parking lot. The height and design of the existing light poles will match the existing.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. Provide a material sample of the proposed signage.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the remodeling of a commercial franchise and the instigation of site alterations.

The proposed changes to the non-contributing building include the installation of a stone veneer, alteration of the shape & heights of the pavilions, alteration of the parapets, and repainting of the building. Based on B (1) of the Staff Report, Staff does not believe the proposed alterations will adversely impact the architectural or the historical integrity of the surrounding historic districts.

Proposed site improvements include the installation of additional light posts, the extension of an existing dumpster pad, the repair of paving, and the redirection of the drive thru approach. The proposed light posts will be set back from the street. So long as the lighting does not invade adjacent properties, Staff does not believe the lighting will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the historic district (See B (10) of the Staff Report.) The proposed expansion of the dumpster enclosure will match existing with regard to design and treatment. As per the repair of hardscaping and redirection of vehicular traffic, Staff does not believe these changes will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the district. (See B (11-12) of the Staff Report.) Staff does recommend that the eastern section of stripping be replaced with landscaping.

Wall and drive thru signs are proposed. Lettered and logo signs would be installed within the façade's central pavilion. The proposed wall signage meets the size and lighting requirements. (See B (4, 5, & 8) of the Staff Report.) The proposed logo sign would feature a clapper within the franchise's signature bell. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street do not allow flashing signage. (See B (9) of the Staff Report.) Pending review of the signage material and removal of the moving clapper, Staff does not believe the wall signage will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district. The proposed drive thru menu would be preceded by a pass thru. The pass thru would not adversely affect the historic district, but the franchise logo should be removed. If not, the pass thru would count as signage. Menu signs are not counted toward the maximum 64 square foot signage allotment. The Sign Design Guidelines do require that menu signage not exceed 25 square feet. (See B (6) of the Staff Report.) The menu sign exceeds 25' square feet. Staff does not recommend approval of the menu sign.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval in part and denial in part.

Staff recommends approval of the alterations to building. Pending clarification of the signage material, removal of the flashing clapper, and removal of the logo from the pass through, Staff recommends approval of those signage components. Pending the installation of landscaping in lieu of stripping along the eastern lot line, Staff recommends approval of site alterations. If these recommendations are agreed

upon, Staff recommends approval of the aforementioned portions of the application. Staff does not believe that they would impair the architectural or the historical character of the district.

Staff does not recommend approval of the menu sign. The sign is not in accord with the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street. Staff believes the menu sign will impair the architectural and the historical character of the district.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Lee Manske was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell informed the Board of changes made to the application. He told the Board that logo wall sign would not feature a clapper and that the applicants were amendable to installing the recommended section of landscaping

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Manske if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address.

Mr. Roberts told the applicant about the history of the building. He explained that when initially constructed the building served as model for other Taco Bell buildings.

Mr. Manske explained to the Board that in meeting with Staff and reviewing the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, he had altered the franchise's initial intentions to better reflect the historic surroundings.

Mr. Roberts mentioned again the impact of the building had upon its completion.

Mr. Holmes moved the review process forward.

Mr. Karwinski asked for clarification regarding the location of several components. He asked the applicant's representative to explain several detail treatments. Mr. Manske addressed Mr. Karwinski's queries.

Discussion turned to the menu sign. Mr. Manske provided the Board with a revised streamlined design.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note the conversion of a section of hardscaping to landscape, the absence of clapper on the logo wall sign, and the use of a streamlined menu sign.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/7/13