

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
November 20, 2012 – 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, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes III, Thomas Karwinski, Craig Roberts, and Jim Wagoner.
Members Absent: Gertrude Baker, Carlos Gant, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Staff Members Present: Cart Blackwell and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the November 7, 2012 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. With the exception of midmonth #10, 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: Smith Painting**
 - a. Property Address: 1206 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/1/12
 - c. Project: Repair rotten wood and fascia matching the existing in profile dimension and materials. Paint the existing color scheme: body – medium gray; trim – white; porch – Bellingrath Green.
2. **Applicant: Angela Surgenor and Cherri Pacatte with Pura Vida Ventures**
 - a. Property Address: 1008 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/1/12
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
3. **Applicant: Chris Bailey**
 - a. Property Address: 255 Adam Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/19/12
 - c. Project: Install 6 foot dog eared privacy fence, shadow boxed along rear west property line per submitted sketch.
4. **Applicant: Jill Sheffiled**
 - a. Property Address: 58 Lee Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/12/12
 - c. Project: Paint the house following Behr colors: Body: Nomad; Trim: White; Porch floor: Black; and Door: Autumn Rushes
5. **Applicant: Sarah and Chad Jones**
 - a. Property Address: 21 Hannon Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/16/12
 - c. Project: Replace fixed louvers with glazed wood windows in the side and rear wall dormers.
6. **Applicant: Zachery Cooley**
 - a. Property Address: 13 South Julia Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/1/12

- c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and composition. Work includes: siding, decking, skirting, etc... Repaint per the existing color scheme.

7. Applicant: Matt Lemond

- a. Property Address: 564 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/5/12
- c. Project: Repair and resurface existing concrete paving.

8. Applicant: Jeffrey Hall

- a. Property Address: 265 South Monterey Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/6/12
- c. Project: Repaint per the existing color scheme.

9. Applicant: Downtown Mobile Alliance for Olensky Brothers.

- a. Property Address: 28 South Royal Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/06/12
- c. Project: Install a wall sign. The sixty-four square foot (Board Zoning Adjustment approved sign) will be aluminum-faced and feature reverse channel lighting. The name, logo, and descriptive of the occupying concern will comprise the sign design.

10. Applicant: Richard Brown

- a. Property Address: 1501 Old Shell Road/1413 North Lafayette Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/8/12
- c. Project: Relocate existing 4 foot chain link fence surrounding baseball field in 3 feet in order to maintain property between fences.

11. Applicant: Meggan Haller

- a. Property Address: 1320 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/13/12
- c. Project: Remove a later concrete walkway extending between the sidewalk and the front steps and install a brick walk. Replace later stone coping with brick coping.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2012-64-CA: 106 South Catherine Street

- a. Applicant: William Pee Griffin for Katherine Whitely
- b. Project: New Construction – Construct an ancillary building.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2012-65-CA: 564 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Matt Lemond
- b. Project: Mural – Paint a mural on the West Elevation.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Fire Damaged House – Board Resolution regarding

Mr. Blackwell asked the Board to consider a resolution involving the Board's approval of staff or midmonth level approval of two fire damaged residential buildings located within the Oakleigh Historic Garden District. He introduced the two properties to the Board. Showing them pictures from the Staff files and then imagery of the damaged inflicted by the fires, Mr. Blackwell then spoke to the number of and circumstances surrounding a dozen fires that have

occurred in the southern portion of the Oakleigh Garden District. Upon reviewing the photographs of the building and listening to the explications, the Board unanimously approved the resolution allowing Staff to issue midmonth approvals authorizing the demolition of the two buildings. Further discussion ensued as to number, concentration, and nature of the fires. Mr. Holmes asked Mr. Blackwell to mark on the map all of the Oakleigh Garden District fires that have occurred in the past few years.

2. Mr. Ladd signed the revised midmonth resolution approved during the October 3, 2012 meeting. See the below:

RESOLUTION

SPONSORED BY THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF MOBILE, ALABAMA, that the following work items may be approved by the Architectural Review Board staff:

1. Repair and/or replacement of rotten or damaged wood, doors, and windows with a design matching the existing in profile, dimension and material.
2. Repainting to match existing or repainting with a new, color scheme reflecting the period of the building.
3. Re-roof with materials matching the existing provided the existing roofing conforms to the standards set by the Guidelines. Also, allow the re-roofing of asbestos roofs with approved roofing and the re-roofing of period appropriate shotguns with standing seam and 5-V crimp metal roofs.
4. Replacement of non-conforming, architectural features with those that conform to the existing historic features in material, profile and dimension.
5. Fenestration and minor alterations/additions to rear elevations not visible from the public right of way provided they meet the design guidelines.
6. Installation of shutters provided the design conforms to the standards set by the Guidelines.
7. Installation of temporary handrails & handicap ramps, and permanent handrails & handicap ramps provided that the ramps and/or rails are minimally visible from the public right-of-way. Install simple permanent pipe or aluminum railings.
8. Construction of decks in rear yards provided the deck is not visible from the public right-of-way.
9. Fencing which conforms to the Design Guidelines:
 - a. 3' high wood picket fencing.
 - b. 4' high aluminum and iron picket fencing.
 - c. 6' or 8' high interior lot, privacy fencing provided it is set behind the front wall of the principle front facade.
10. Construction of one-story permanent ancillary structures provided there are no setback issues and they meet the design guidelines.
11. Installation of non-permanent one-story prefabricated ancillary structures provided there are no setback issues and they meet the design guidelines.

12. Installation of driveways and sidewalks - both replacement of existing deteriorated materials or new materials - provided the proposed location and materials conform to the Guidelines.
13. Installation of residential canvas awnings.
14. Installation of commercial awnings where the installation does not damage the structure.
15. Installation of commercial awning graphics less than 30 square feet and not exceeding the total building signage maximum allowed by the guidelines.
16. All temporary banners and signs (30 day maximum) meeting the Design Review Guidelines.
17. Renewal of expired Certificates of Approval less than three years old and only if the proposed work is in conformance with current guidelines.
18. Installation and Replacement of mothballing measures if said interventions meet the specifications outlined in the Guidelines.
19. Approve all signs if the signage meets the Sign Design Guidelines.

Adopted 3 October 2012

Signed 20 November 2012



Edward Bradford Ladd, II
Architectural Review Board Chair

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-64-CA: 106 South Catherine Street
Applicant: William Pee Griffin for Katherine Whitely
Received: 11/5/12
Meeting: 11/21/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct an ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story residence dates from circa 1915.

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 owner/applicant proposes the construction of a carport to be located in the property’s rear lot.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):**
 - 1. Construct a carport.
 - a. The carport will measure 30’ in length and 18’ in depth.
 - b. The carport will rest atop a concrete slab foundation.
 - c. The carport will be located 6’ from the side property lines and 8’ from the rear property line.
 - d. Three vehicular bays will be located in the southern portion of the building.
 - e. Six wooden posts will support the roof structure located above the vehicular bays.
 - f. A storage room will be located in northern portion of the building.
 - g. The storage room will be faced with wooden siding matching that found on the property’s principle building.
 - h. Six paneled wooden doors located on the East Elevation will provide access to and from the storage room.

- i. The North Elevation will feature rafter tails matching those employed on the main dwelling.
- j. A shed roof will surmount the building.
- k. Metal roofing panels matching those employed on the main dwelling will be employed on the building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of an ancillary building. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that ancillary construction should complement the design and scale of the property's principle building (See B-1).

Minimally visible from the public view at present, the proposed building would be located within a rear lot fully enclosed by privacy fencing. The building, a three car carport with attached storage shed, meets both setback and lot coverage requirements. Though the building's location and square footage meet municipal requirements, the design does not adequately complement the house. Staff recommends that the applicants employ chamfered or boxed posts instead of the simple posts articulated in the plans. Staff also recommends that boxed eaves be used in place of open eaves and a hipped roof be employed instead of shed roof. Changes in the post, eave, and roofing treatments would make the design more in keeping with the property's main dwelling.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and the historical character of the building. As proposed, Staff does not recommend approval of this application. If the applicant were to employ porch posts, eaves, and a roof form more in character with the historic integrity of the building (see the above), Staff would recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Katherine Whitely and William Pee Griffin 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 proposed building would measure 38' in length as depicted in the site plan not 30' as specified in the scope of work. He told the Board and the applicant that the discrepancy was on the part of Staff.

Mr. Wagoner thanked Mr. Blackwell and welcomed the applicant and her representative. He asked Ms. Whitely and Mr. Griffin if they had any comments to make, clarifications to address, or questions to ask.

Ms. Whitely addressed the Board by saying that she had initially considered employing a hipped roof, but had reconsidered on account of the expense involved. Upon inspection of other period ancillary structures she noted that many often featured shed roofs. Ms. Whitely said that she wanted to make the building attractive. She said that by borrowing details and treatments from the main building, it would complement the design of the house. She said that she was amendable to either employing boxed or chamfered posts.

Mr. Holmes agreed that other examples of shed-roofed ancillaries existed in the area. .

Mr. Roberts said that he did not object to the design.

Mr. Karwinski recommended plain posts as opposed chamfered posts. Ms. Whitely said she agree with Mr. Karwinski's suggestion. She said she would either employed boxed piers would prefer those found on the front of the house or plane piers. Mr. Karwinski offered suggestions as to detailing of the posts. He warned Ms. Whitely not to make them too large so as not interfere with the ingress and egress of vehicles.

Mr. Karwinski and Ms. Harden entered into a discussion of how the fascia would be treated. Mr. Holmes assisted in clarifying the matter. Mr. Griffin said it would boxed in not open in construction. He also recommended the use of fiber glass doors. Mr. Roberts said that he believed fiber glass doors would be alright so long as the design remained the same.

Mr. Wagoner asked if there was any one from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. No response ensued from the audience. Mr. Wagoner closed the period of public comment.

Mr. Wagoner asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask or comments to make. No further Board discussion ensued.

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 facts to note that the building would be 38' in length, the fascia would be boxed, and the doors could be either fiber glass or wood.

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 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: 11/20/13

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-65-CA: 564 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Matt Lemond
Received: 11/5/12
Meeting: 11/21/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install a mural.

BUILDING HISTORY

This building is one unit of row of single-story storefronts constructed during the middle third 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. A unit within this larger group of strip-like storefronts last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on February 17, 2009. At that time, the Board denied an application for exterior signage. The current applicant proposes the painting of mural on the western most unit’s West Elevation.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Guidelines state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. With regard to painting “period color schemes are encouraged.’
 - 2. “The way in which color is applied as a design element is important to the overall appearance of the building. Use colors that may be typical of the period and/or blend with adjacent buildings. For purpose of design review, colors are classified by the following categories of use: body, trim, and accent.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted renderings):**
 - 1. Paint a mural on the building’s West Elevation.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the painting of a mural. The mural would be located on the building’s West Elevation.

Neither the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts nor the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Design Guidelines specifically address murals. The Design Review Guidelines encourage the use of period color schemes (See B-1), while the Lower Dauphin Guidelines state that color is important to overall appearance of buildings (See B-2). The latter compilation goes on to break down a color scheme into body, trim, and accent colors.

In reviewing previous applications entailing the painting of murals, including proposals for 14 Saint Emanuel Street (the Old Gayfer's department store) and 271 Dauphin Street (Heroes sports bar), the Board has considered and discussed the following: subject matter/content; quality; and maintenance.

With regard to subject matter, both the appearances and the meanings thereof could be problematic. As per quality and maintenance, the Lower Dauphin Commercial District is a highly trafficked area. Color schemes are in constant need of being touched up. Repair to murals could be an issue. Additionally, unauthorized graffiti could alter the design and appearance of the design.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Matt Lemond and Hanan Toole were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner welcomed the applicants. He asked Mr. Lemond and Ms. Toole if they had any comments to make, clarifications to address, or questions to ask.

Mr. Lemond asked Ms. Toole to address the mural. Ms. Toole informed the Board of her education and career in the arts. She explained the design and sources of the mural's design.

Mr. Holmes said that other murals had been painted in the historic districts. He cited one located on the rear of the row of stores located behind Griffiths' Service Station (formerly Griffiths' Shell) on South Ann Street.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Lemond about his expansion into other buildings. He then questioned Mr. Lemond on an earlier application.

Ms. Toole was asked to address the concerns outlined in the Staff Report. Ms. Toole reiterated the historical and contemporary content portrayed in the design. She explained that she was a much better artist than the photo shopped image conveyed. Ms. Toole then said that the mural would be sealed in such a way as to resist deterioration yet allow for cleaning.

Mr. Karwinski asked Ms. Toole how the mural engage and/or adapt to the can lights that punctuate the building's North Elevation. A discussion ensued. Ms. Toole explained that the mural would extend around the lights.

Mr. Roberts and Ms. Hasser admired the mural.

Mr. Roberts mentioned to the Board that Mr. Karwinski had executed murals in times past.

Mr. Karwinski said that he did not object to murals. Given that the building in question is a noncontributing building, he said that it would not impair the architectural integrity of the property. Addressing Staff and his fellow Board members, Mr. Karwinski said that there needed to be policies regarding the painting of murals.

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

Mr. Wagoner asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask or comments to make. No further Board discussion ensued.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/20/13