

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
October 17, 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 3:02. Devereaux Bemis, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Gertrude Baker, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes III, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Craig Roberts, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Members Absent: Carlos Gant; Harris Oswalt; and Jim Wagoner
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis and John Lawler.
2. Craig Roberts moved to approve the minutes of the 2009 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Craig Roberts moved to correct item ten and approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant: Caleb Cunningham with Holmes & Cunningham**
 - a. Property Address: 354 ½ Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/26/12
 - c. Project: Install a hanging sign. The sign will be suspended from existing S-hooks located beneath the second floor gallery. The total square footage of the metal sign will amount to 18 square feet. The name of the occupying tenant will comprise the sign design. The sign will be suspended so meet height requirements protecting the passerby.
2. **Applicant: Lipford Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 1116 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/26/12
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
3. **Applicant: Wrico Signs**
 - a. Property Address: 1700 Spring Hill Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/28/12
 - c. Project: Repaint and reface the existing sign.
4. **Applicant: Barbara Evatt**
 - a. Property Address: 1706 Laurel Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/1/12
 - c. Project: Repaint house, body Home Depot Decorator Collection HDC-CT 18, Violet Vista; trim HDC AC 27 Heather Sachet.
5. **Applicant: Birdie C. Irby**
 - a. Property Address: 262 Marine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/1/12
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the submitted Glidden color scheme. The body will be Granite Gray. The trim will be white.
6. **Applicant: Mitchell Doan**
 - a. Property Address: 150-164 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/1/12
 - c. Project: Repaint per the existing color scheme.

7. **Applicant: High Mark Roofing Services**
 - a. Property Address: 501 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/2/12
 - c. Project: Remove asphalt roof. Install TPO Firestone Roof system. 1.5 poly-iso with R9 insulation and white membrane.
8. **Applicant: Coulson Roof and Sheet Metal**
 - a. Property Address: 1160 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/2/12
 - c. Project: Replacing 14 squares of roofing to match the existing in profile, dimension, materials and color.
9. **Applicant: Matt Lemond**
 - a. Property Address: 211 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/4/12
 - c. Project: Paint the body of the building per the Sherwin Williams color “Black Bean.”
10. **Applicant: Carlos Williams**
 - a. Property Address: 1058 Savannah Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/2/12
 - c. Project: Repaint house, body grey and trim an off-white.
11. **Applicant: Jones Walker**
 - a. Property Address: 251 North Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/4/12
 - c. Project: Repair the roof to match the existing.
12. **Applicant: Leroy Anerson**
 - a. Property Address: 358 South Broad Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/8/12
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork and siding to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Reinstall the porch rails. Install storm windows within the window reveals. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair fencing.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2012-60-CA: 106 Lanier Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: Lucy Barr with Lucy Barr Designs for Mr. & Mrs. James Edgar Brister
 - b. Project: Fenestration – Reconfigure a window grouping on a side elevation.

APPROVED AS AMENDED
2. **2012-61-CA: 957 Palmetto Street**
 - a. Applicant: William W. Gadd
 - b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval (Follow Up) – Retain an unapproved door in altered form.

APPROVED

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-60-CA: 106 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Lucy Barr with Lucy Barr Designs for Mr. & Mrs. James Edgar Brister
Received: 10/1/12
Meeting: 10/17/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fenestration – Reconfigure a window grouping on a side elevation

BUILDING HISTORY

This exemplary early 20th-Century period revival residence dates from 1927. Constructed for timber baron Lucian A. Cowan, the Tudor-inspired dwelling is among finest area homes of its style and period.

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 December 7, 1992. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a wall and the alteration of two ancillary buildings.
- 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 the building help establish the historic character of the building. Original openings should be retained as well as well as original sashes and glazing.”
 - 2. “The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per drawings, photographs, etc...):**
 - 1. Fenestration – Reconfigure a window grouping on a side elevation.
 - a. Remove a triplet of three fifteen light windows from the North Elevation.
 - b. Replace the aforementioned tripartite window grouping with an oriel window.
 - c. The three-faced oriel bay windows will feature beveled, leaded, and diamond-shaped panes matching those found on the façade’s stairwell window.
 - d. Wooden brackets will be located beneath and provide partial support for the window.
 - e. Roofing shingles and moldings will match those employed on the body of the property’s principle building.

Clarifications/Requests

- 1. Please provide a detail of the bracket design.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the reconfiguration of fenestration located on the residence's side elevation.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic District state that original window openings should be maintained and that alterations should be compatible with general character of the building (See B 1-2). Located behind dense vegetation and a high brick wall, the location of the proposed work location is not visible from the public. The design calls for the removal of a tripartite grouping of multi light sash windows and their replacement with a diamond paned three bay oriel window. Roofing shingles would match those found on the main dwelling. The diamond-shaped beveled panes would match those employed on the façade's large stairwell window.

Staff recommends that the window bay employ a modern bracket design that would serve to differentiate this alteration from the existing historic fabric as a means of differentiating the old and the new work.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (2), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application provided a suitable bracket design is submitted.

STAFF INTRODUCTION

Staff introduced the application with two additional items added to the request. The applicants proposed to slightly extend and glass in a section of the rear wall of the kitchen per the submitted plans. A request was also made to enclose two windows on the second floor of the garage. Staff pointed out in the introduction that the butt jointed glass would be a modern interpretation and would not impair the integrity of the house. Staff also suggested that the garage window be permanently shuttered rather than boarded over.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Lucy Barr was present to discuss the application. She agreed to the staff suggestion of shuttering the windows as well as the recommendation of a modern steel support to the oriel.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Tom Karwinski pointed out that the original windows should be maintained.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board amend the facts in the Staff report as follows: 1)the double window on the second floor garage would be permanently shuttered; Fact d would be steel supports instead of wood; and a portion of the rear wall would be extended and the entire wall glassed in per the submitted plan. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig 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 passed with one dissenting vote.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: October 17, 2013

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-61-CA: 957 Palmetto Street
Applicant: William W. Gadd
Received: 10/1/12
Meeting: 10/17/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval (Follow Up) – Retain an unapproved door in altered form.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to documentation found in the MHDC property file, the core of this house dates from circa 1890. The house was extensively altered and enlarged circa 1909. The façade of this classically detailed dwelling features a full-length gallery with a bay window.

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 September 5, 2012. At that time, the applicant applied for an After-the-Fact-Approval of an unauthorized front door. The application was denied. The applicant was requested to submit a new application taking into the Board discussion and recommendations within a thirty day period of the meeting. This application, one involving the removal of the leaded glass upper panel and its replacement with a piece of beveled glass, was one of the suggested alternatives
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Often one of the most important decorative 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 reflect the age and style of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. After-the-Fact-Approval (Follow Up) – Retain an unapproved door in altered form.
 - a. Remove the leaded glass from the upper portion of the door.
 - b. Install a pane of beveled in the upper portion of the door.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the After-the-Fact-Approval of an unauthorized front door. The application first appeared before the Board at the September 5, 2012 Meeting. The application was denied. The shape of the upper panel and the type of glazing were issues of concern. The applicants were given thirty days from the date of the aforementioned meeting which to submit a revised application.

During the September 5, 2012 meeting, several alternatives were discussed. Among the possible solutions were the following: the removal of the door and its replacement with a period door; the removal of the leaded treatment from the upper portion of the door and its replacement with a solid beveled glass pane; and the removal of the upper door field (glazing and inner framing) and its replacement with a square piece of glazing that would be appropriately framed and fitted. The applicants propose the middle treatment, the substitution of single pane of beveled glass in place of the leaded comes.

The original door this house had been removed at an earlier date. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that replacement doors should be appropriate to the age and style of the house (See B-1). While Staff believes that a squared upper portion would be the best alternative, Staff recommends approval of this application as proposed as an experimental solution to determine the efficacy of replacing the decorative window with a simplified one. It should be noted that staff believes this alteration will be insufficient for the house to be awarded a historic marker.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussed that the applicant had been given two options and selected the one presented.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion received a second and was approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Roberts moved that based upon the facts found 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 approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: October 17, 2013.