

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
October 7, 2009 – 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 3:02.
2. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
3. **Members Present:** Gertrude Baker, Kim Hardin, Bill James, Tom Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts,
4. **Members Absent:** Carlos Gant, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson.
5. **Staff Members Present:** Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and Keri Coumanis.
6. Harris Oswalt moved to approve the minutes of the 2009 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
7. Tom Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COAs granted by Staff.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Mike Henderson/Henderson Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 119 North Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/08/09
 - c. Project: Remove existing roof. Reroof house with 3-tab shingles, GAF, charcoal in color.
2. **Applicant: James Backes, Jr.**
 - a. Property Address: 509 Eslava Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/08/09
 - c. Project: Replace 3-tab asphalt shingles.
3. **Applicant: Patrick Kingsmill**
 - a. Property Address: 68 North Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/08/09
 - c. Project: Extend existing six foot south lot line interior privacy fence 35 feet. Fence to turn north and feature a single gate. Install a six foot wood gate to north side of house at end of exiting concrete walkway. Remove concrete drive.
4. **Applicant: Nolan McLean**
 - a. Property Address: 1213 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/08/09
 - c. Project: Construct a storage shed according to MHDC stock plans approximately eight feet in from the southwest corner of the lot.
5. **Applicant: Stanley Ferguson**
 - a. Property Address: 1326 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/11/09
 - Project: Tear off old roof. Install Golden Mantel metal roof, Galvalume 26 gauge roof. Repair wood as necessary and repaint per existing. Paint to match existing color scheme.
6. **Applicant: Brent Erickson**
 - a. Property Address: 1658 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/14/09

- c. Project: Reroof house with black Timberline architectural shingles. Repair/Replace rotten wood around soffit and eaves as necessary. Work to match existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repair/Replace rotten siding as necessary. Work to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
7. **Applicant: M. K. Harless**
 - a. Property Address: 110 South Dearborn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/09/09
 - c. Project: Replace rotten wood. Repaint per existing color scheme. Run AC pvc pipes down to ground. Paint pipes to match body of house.
 8. **Applicant: Virginia Andreades**
 - a. Property Address: 506 Monroe Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/09/09
 - c. Project: Repaint per existing color scheme. Paint body of house mauve. Paint shutters green (maroon and option). Paint trim white. Repair and replace rotten wood. All work to match existing.
 9. **Applicant: Mark Keith**
 - a. Property Address: 553 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/09/09
 - c. Project: Repair and replace siding to match existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repair window sash to match existing. Paint house per submitted Mobile Paints color scheme.
 10. **Applicant: Alabama School of Math and Science**
 - a. Property Address: 1255 Dauphin Street.
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/08/09
 - c. Project: Prepare and paint iron fence around the school black to match existing.
 11. **Applicant: C. F. Littlepage, III**
 - a. Property Address: 1456 Eslava Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 08/08/09
 - c. Project: Reroof house using 30 year architectural shingles, black/brown in color. Level foundations, repointing piers. Repair and replace any rotten sills. Repair and replace rotten siding and trim as needed, matching existing in profile, dimension, and material. Paint body Fort Morgan sand. Paint trim white. Paint deck brown.
 12. **Applicant: Cecily Kaffer**
 - a. Property Address: 1559 Fearnway
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/14/09
 - c. Project: Paint house. Body is to be grey. Trim is to be white. Accent trim is to be black. Porch ceiling is to be pale blue. Repair and replace rotten wood as necessary to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
 13. **Applicant: Ormandos M. Jackson**
 - a. Property Address: 507 Saint Francis Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/15/09
 - c. Project: Complete rear porch and side entry per submitted plans.
 14. **Applicant: David Rasp**
 - a. Property Address: 1312 Chamberlain Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/16/09
 - c. Project: Repair and replace roof to match existing.
 15. **Applicant: Joseph B. Pierce, Jr.**
 - a. Property Address: 1110 Montauk Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/16/09
 - c. Project: Repaint per existing color scheme. Body will remain white and shutters will remain green.

- 16. Applicant: Scott Phillips and Patrick McCullers**
- a. Property Address: 1225 Texas Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/17/09
 - c. Project: Repair and replace windows. Work to match existing in profile, dimension, and material.
- 17. Applicant: C. C. & G. Construction**
- a. Property Address: 50 Saint Emanuel Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/18/09
 - c. Project: Repair termite damage on window sill and brick mold. Repaint to match existing color scheme.
- 18. Applicant: Trademan LLC**
- a. Property Address: 501 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/18/09
 - c. Project: Replace roof shingles, 30 year asphalt shingles, and repair roof valley.
- 19. Applicant: David Horn**
- a. Property Address: 1561 Blair Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/20/09
 - c. Project: Repaint house per existing color scheme. Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork and detailing. Work to match existing in profile, dimension, scale, and material. Install a French drain along the west side of the house. Repair existing concrete block wall.
- 20. Applicant: Chris Musgrove for Y-Paint**
- a. Property Address: 7 North Lawrence Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/21/09
 - c. Project: Install bronze gutters along the north and south elevations just below the eaves.
- 21. Applicant: Thomas R. Maddox**
- a. Property Address: 27 Macy Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/21/09
 - c. Project: Extend existing 6 foot wood privacy fence along the east lot line. Continue fence 90 feet along the south lot line. Fence will terminate at rear plane of the south projecting bay of the main house. Install six foot wooden double gate over the drive. Install a second double gate accessing the garage at southeast corner of lot.
- 22. Applicant: Roger Lavoie for the Mobile Archdiocese**
- a. Property Address: 400 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/23/09
 - c. Project: Reroof house Roofing to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
- 23. Applicant: Tim Morris**
- a. Property Address: 1307 Spring Hill Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/23/09
 - c. Project: Repaint and retouch existing sign lettering.
- 24. Applicant: Robert Wilson**
- a. Property Address: 363 Adler Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/23/09
 - c. Project: Repaint house white. Paint railing black. Paint steps dark green.
- 25. Applicant: Terry Mannion**
- a. Property Address: 11 North Dearborn
 - b. Date of Approval: 09/28/09
 - c. Project: Repair and replace windows sashes. The work is to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
- 26. Applicant: Roberts Construction**

- a. Property Address: 71 Etheridge
- b. Date of Approval: 09/21/09
- c. Project: Construct porch deck stoop with lattice underpinning to match the house and MHDC stock balustrade.

27. Applicant: C. C. & G. Construction

- a. Property Address: 71 Etheridge
- b. Date of Approval: 09/8/09
- c. Project: Repair termite damage on window sills, brick mold. Repaint to match.

28. Applicant: Wayne and Paula Thorpe

- a. Property Address: 1651 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 09/29/09
- c. Project: Install a six foot wooden interior lot privacy fence along the western lot line. Install a six foot gate between the fence and the house. Install a three foot picket fence along the drive and sidewalk..

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 100-09: 256 South Cedar Street
 - a. Applicant: Warren and Jacquelyn Carmichael
 - b. Project: Reconstruct a greenhouse.
 APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
2. 101-09: 2 Water Street
 - a. Applicant: Randy Crocker
 - b. Project: Monument Sign Approval.
 APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
3. 102-09: 11 North Reed Street
 - a. Applicant: Norman Stockman
 - b. Project: Demolish existing metal storage shed in the backyard. Place prefabricated wood shed in backyard.
 APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
4. 103-09: 251 Dauphin Street
 - a. Applicant: Corey Fogarty for Hopjacks Pizza Kitchen and Taproom
 - b. Project: Sign Approval.
 APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
5. 104-09: 505 Saint Francis Street
 - a. Applicant: Ormandos Mark Jackson
 - b. Project: Extensive Repair and Replacement. Demolition and reconstruct front porch. Reconstruct side ell.
 APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
6. 105-09: 10 and 12 South Monterey Streets
 - a. Applicant: Denise Burks
 - b. Project: Extend a concrete drive. Install a concrete drive. Install a concrete parking pad. Alter front porch columns.
 APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
7. 106-09: 5 North Claiborne Street
 - a. Applicant: Deborah Tolbert for Jordan Investments, LLC
 - b. Project: Install a continuous canvas awning over second story façade windows.
 DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
8. 107-09: 221 South Dearborn Street
 - a. Applicant: Tony M. Jones and Thomas P. Baines

- b. Project: New Construction - Construct a garage; Fence Approval - Construct a wall.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
- 9. 108-09: 1702 B Government Street
 - a. Applicant: Able Body Gulf Coast, Inc.
 - b. Project: Sign Approval – Relocate and mount a sign from an out of district location.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
- 10. 109-09: 206, 208, and 210 State Street
 - a. Applicant: Mike Redmond for the Waterfront Rescue Mission
 - b. Project: Paint three buildings, two wooden and one stuccoed, with Rhino Shield paint.
WITHDRAWN. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
- 11. 110-09: 1506 Old Shell Road and 110 Catherine Street
 - a. Applicant: McGill-Toolen High School
 - b. Project: Demolition Request - Demolish the house, convenience store, and storage building on the lots listed above. Install a parking lot. Construct a fence.
WITHDRAWN. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
- 12. 111-09: 1501 Old Shell Road (building to face Lafayette Street)
 - a. Applicant: Blich Knevel Architects for McGill-Toolen High School
 - b. Project: New Construction - Build a New Student Center on the site of the complex’s Lafayette Street parking lot. Install a circular drive. Replace existing precast concrete covered walkways on the east and west sides of Lafayette Street with new covered walkways.
WITHDRAWN. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Guidelines: Staff updated ARB; MHDC members currently reviewing first three sections of the Guidelines. MHDC has decided they would like an editor/designer.
2. South Broad Gas Station Preliminary Review: Withdrawn; will be presented at 10/21 meeting.
3. Discussion: Design Review Committee for Lawrence Street Project: Jim Wagoner, Tom Karwinski, Kim Hardin; Next Weds. A meeting for McGill Toolen will also be held at 4p.m. on 10/14/2009.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

100-09-CA: 256 Cedar Street
Applicant: Warren and Jacquelyn Carmichael
Received: 09/21/09
Meeting: 10/07/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Relocate and retain a greenhouse in the backyard.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story brick residence was built in 1999.

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 Board on September 2, 2009. The applicants sought approval to retain a greenhouse. The greenhouse is located in the backyard of the property. It is not visible from the street. The greenhouse has been on the property since 2004. The greenhouse appeared before the City Council on July 10, 2009. The Mobile City Council rendered a two part ruling. First, the applicants were required to move the greenhouse back 1’5” to meet setback requirements. Secondly, the greenhouse had to receive the approval of the Architectural Review Board. The greenhouse proposal was tabled during the September 2, 2009 meeting.
- 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. 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. **Relocate and retain existing greenhouse abutting the west (rear) elevation of the house.**
 - A. Move west side of the greenhouse back 1’ 5” to the east of the west property line to comply with the 5’ setback requirement.
 - B. The greenhouse will measure 21 feet in length by 6 feet in depth.
 - C. The greenhouse will measure 9 feet in height with a one foot downward slope.
 - D. The greenhouse will be constructed of prefabricated iron panels which are covered in corrugated clear PVC plastic.
 - E. The greenhouse will rest on a concrete slab.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The current Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts do not address greenhouses. The greenhouse is not visible from the street. While the corrugated plastic sheathing does not meet the

Guidelines' standards, but Staff recommends approval of the relocation and reconstruction of the greenhouse for the reason that the structure has been on the site for more than five years.

Staff read into following, from Assistant City Attorney John Lawler into the minutes: "Circuit Judge Smith, in the Board of Adjustment case concerning the Carmichaels' greenhouse having been built in violation of the 5-foot setback requirement contained in the City's Zoning Ordinance ordered that the Carmichaels bring the greenhouse into conformance with the setback and that they get ARB approval of the change. After the last meeting, I went to the Carmichael home and inspected the greenhouse and reviewed the plan being presented to comply with Judge Smith's Order. The plan meets the requirements of the Order and I recommend approval of the plan by the ARB."

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. and Mrs. Carmichael were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Karwinski asked whether the greenhouse functioned as a greenhouse or a storage room. Mrs. Carmichael responded that the greenhouse served as such as well as being a storage space for a generator, small tools, and other things during hurricane season.

Mr. Wagoner stated that the plan complies with the judge's order. The structure represents a material impairment, but a COA should be granted on the condition that if the greenhouse was ever removed the applicants would have to come back before the Board if they wanted to replace. He elaborated saying the materials do not meet the Guidelines, however the Board is accepting the application on the contingency that if it were to be moved again they would have to come back to the board. Mr. Bemis said that the greenhouse doesn't meet the current standards of materials but has been there for so long it would be a hardship to move it at this point.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig 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.

Mr. Karwinski has an issue with approving a material that is not in conformance with our guidelines. Mr. Roberts stated that it is not our place to determine what would happen in the future. Mrs. Baker noted that the Guidelines do not directly address greenhouses. Staff concurred. Ms. Baker stated that this should not be an issue.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The Board did not find an impairment.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/07/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

0101-09-CA: 2 Water Street
Applicant: Randy Crocker
Received: 07//09
Meeting: 08/05/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Construct a monument sign.

BUILDING HISTORY

The façade of the Daniels-Elgin Building was one of Alabama’s first full-scale cast iron elevations. Designed by J. H. Giles and fabricated by D. D. Badger & Co., the four-story building constitutes the finest of Mobile’s surviving Italianate street fronts. It is the only remaining cast iron façade in the City.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The Daniels-Elgin Building recently underwent an extensive interior renovation. The property last appeared before the Board on January 17, 2008. The Board approved the installation of slate pavers and a canopy for the Water Street entrance. The applicant returns to the Board with a sign proposal. The sign’s frame matches the supports of the Water Street canopy.
- B. The Sign Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building.”
 - 2. “The overall design of all signage including the mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property. Buildings with a recognizable style such as Greek Revival, Italianate, Victorian, Queen Anne, 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.”
 - 3. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.”
 - 4. “The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet. A multi-tenant building is also limited to a maximum of 64 square feet.”
 - 5. “The total allowable square footage for display area on a monument sign is (50) fifty square feet.”
 - 6. “Internally lit signs are prohibited. Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination.”

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

1. Construct a monument sign.
 - A. The steel sign frame measures 5' in height and 9' feet in length
 1. The sign pedestals match the pedestals of the east facing canopy of the main building.
 2. The pedestals support open work piers to either side of sign field.
 3. A continuous cornice caps the piers and the sign field.
 4. An x-shaped register lies beneath the signage between the pedestals.
 - A. The two-tiered double faced sign measures 50 square feet.
 1. Each sign face measures 25 square feet.
 2. Each sign face is divided into 4 panels.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposed sign meets the design and material set by the Guidelines. The sign does not exceed the maximum square footage allotted for monument signs. The sign frame and detailing mimics the east elevation's canopy. The design does not impair the historical or architectural character of the building or district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Clay Adams and Randy Crocker were present to discuss the application. They had no testimony.

BOARD DISCUSSION

No discussion took place.

FINDING OF FACT

Tom 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

Tom Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as determined 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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/07/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

102-09-CA: 11 North Reed Street
Applicant: Norman Stockman
Received: 09/3/09
Meeting: 10/07/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolish existing metal storage shed in the backyard. Place prefabricated wooden shed in the backyard.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house was built in 1909. The house combines Arts and Crafts informed features such as Japanese “cloud lift” brackets with neoclassical detailing such as the front door surround.

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 Board in November of 2000. The Board approved the construction of rear addition.
- 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, carports, pergolas, 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:
 - 1. Demolish existing prefabricated backyard storage shed.
 - 2. Place a cedar wood shed in backyard.
 - A. The storage shed is to measure 8’ by 9” or 8’ by 10’ in plan.
 - B. The storage shed will be constructed from preassembled panels
 - C. The storage shed will measure approximately 9’ in height (counting foundation).
 - D. The storage shed is to rest on stuccoed concrete blocks
 - E. The siding and trim is to be painted the same color as the house
 - 1. The body of the shed will be gray.
 - 2. The trim of the shed will be white.
 - F. The roof will be covered with cedar shingles.
 - G. The side elevations will feature 4-light windows.
 - H. The front elevation will feature a double door with vertical boards.
 - I. The storage shed will be located approximately a the midpoint of the southern portion of the backyard within the setback requirements.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Ancillary structures can either contribute to or detract from a property. The proposed shed will not be visible from the street. Though the shed is made of prefabricated or panelized sections, the materials meet the standards set by the Guidelines. The building will be painted to match the main house. Since the shed will not be visible from the street and since the applicant will paint the shed to match the house, Staff does not believe this application impairs the historical character of the house or the district, therefore recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Norman Stockman was present to discuss the application. Mr. Stockman stated the storage shed was a solid wood structure.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Tom Karwinski asked Mr. Stockman whether the house had asbestos shingles. Mr. Stockman answered yes. Mr. Karwinski queried the use of cedar shakes on the shed when the house had shingles. Mr. Stockman responded that he intends to use the shakes, letting them weather.

FINDING OF FACT

Tom 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

Tom Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as determined 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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/07/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

103-09-CA: 251 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Corey Fogarty for Hopjacks Pizza Kitchen and Taproom
Received: 09/18/09
Meeting: 10/07/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: B-1
Project: Replace existing neon sign.

BUILDING HISTORY

This commercial building was built in 1965. The asymmetry of the elevations, the volumetric nature of the enclosure, and the avoidance of historical ornament make this building one of Mobile's finest examples of the 1950s/1960s Modern International Style. Staff attributes the design to the building to Mobile architect Cooper Van Antwerp.

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 Board on April 15, 2009. The Board approved the installation wooden non-illuminated double-faced vinyl clad sign. The sign was to fit the original 1960s sidewalk projecting sign. The applicants return to the Board with an altered sign proposal. They would like to replace the existing neon sign with a new neon sign with their business's name, logo, and advertising.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street state, in pertinent part:
1. "The overall design of all signage including the mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principle building on the property. Buildings with a recognizable style such as Greek Revival, Italianate, Victorian, Queen Anne, Neoclassic, Craftsman, et al., should use signage of the same style. This can be done through the use of similar decorative features such as columns or brackets."
 2. For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors.
 3. "The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs. The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet. A multi-tenant building is also limited to a maximum of 64 square feet."
 4. "The size of the sign shall be determined by measuring the area within each face of a geometric shape enclosing all elements of informational or representational matter including blank masking. 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.”
4. “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.”
 5. “Internally lit signs are prohibited. 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.”
 6. “Flashing, blinking, revolving, or rotating lights are not permitted.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Remove the existing neon sign.
 2. Replace the existing sign with a new neon sign featuring the name, logo, and advertisement of the business.
 - A. The sign measures 10’ 10” in height.
 - B. The sign is 5’ 4” in wide.
 - C. The sign will be double faced.
 - D. The total square footage of the double faced sign measures 60.82 feet.
 - E. The sign will fit within the existing sign frame.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Throughout this building’s forty-four year history, signage of some type has been located within the sign frame which extends over the Dauphin Street sidewalk. In keeping with date of construction and type of use, most of the signs featured neon illumination. Neon signage is found on several other entertainment establishments within the vicinity. The proposed sign does not exceed the maximum square footage allowed for signage in the historic districts and along Government Street. Staff does not believe the sign impairs the architectural or historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Corey Fogarty and Melissa Beacham were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner reminded the applicants of their last appearance before the Board saying he thought they would return for neon signage.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts as determined 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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/07/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

0104-09-CA: 505 Saint Francis Street
Applicant: Ormandos Mark Jackson
Received: 09/15/09
Meeting: 10/07/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Demolish existing concrete front porch. Reconstruct front porch. Reconstruct demolished southwest ell. For extensive list of repair and replacement work see the Scope of Work.

BUILDING HISTORY

This side hall with demolished southwest ell was constructed in 1901. Circa 1910, an addition was made to the rear of the house.

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 Board on August 5, 2009. The applicant’s proposal was denied for a lack of a complete set of measured plans. The previous history of this property is as follows. On April 23, 2009, Staff granted a midmonth which allowed the applicant to repair and stabilize the roof and the foundations of this house. The applicant went beyond the approved scope of work. A projecting side ell was demolished. The siding was removed. A stop work order was issued on May 11, 2009. Staff issued a mid month COA allowing the applicant to obtain a building permit for “interior work only with no changes to the existing exterior condition.” Subsequent work exceeded the specified scope of work. The applicant submitted elevation drawings for the north and south elevations on July 15, 2009. The proposal for the north elevation would entail the replacement of concrete porch with a pier supported porch. After the submission the plans, work proceeded and exceeded that allowed by the July 15th COA. A Stop Work Order was issued on July 20, 2009.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 1. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking posts/ columns, proportions and decorative details.”
 2. “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance.”
 3. “The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch.”
 4. “A building’s base, or foundation, gives the building a sense of strength and solidity, and serves to “tie” the structure to the ground. Traditionally residential buildings were raised on piers.”

5. "Foundation screening should be recessed from the front of the foundation piers. Lattice, if used, should be hung below the skirt board or siding, between piers and framed with trim."
6. "Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building."
7. "The type, size and dividing lights of window and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window opening should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing."
8. "Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for addition and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building."
9. "The exterior of a building helps define its style, quality, and historic period." The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material."
10. "A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color."

C. Scope of Work:

1. Entire House

- a. Roof the house with Timberline architectural shingles
- b. Suspend recessed and framed lattice skirting the between foundation piers.
- c. Replace wood siding to match existing.

2. North Elevation (Existing Façade) (for reconstructed ell see the West Elevation)

- a. Demolish existing concrete porch.
- b. Construct front porch supported by brick piers
 - i. The new porch will be elevated to the height established by the foundation piers and skirting board.
 - ii. Tongue-and-groove decking will cover porch deck
 - iii. Repair and replace the front porch posts.
 1. Posts will be adjusted to fit new porch height.
 2. Repair, replace, and replicate the front porch post brackets.
 3. Construct a balustrade between the front porch bays.
 - iv. Construct a flight of wooden steps accessing the front porch.
 1. The steps will occupy the westernmost bay of the porch.
 2. The stair railing will match the front porch balustrade.
 3. Ball finials will cap the newels.
- c. Install a four paneled wooden door.
 - i. Remove existing two-light window transom frame.
 - ii. Install a four light window transom.
- d. Install 2 six-over-six windows

3. East Elevation

- a. Install 4 six-over-six windows in the existing window bays.

4. South Elevation

- a. Reconfigure fenestration
 - i. Install a four paneled door with four light transom at location of later window.
 - ii. A shed roof canopy supported by brackets and covered by Timberline shingles will extend over the door.
 - iii. Install one six-over-six window in former back door bay.
- b. Construct a wood stoo/landing accessing the back door.

- i. The stoop/landing will measure 5 feet square.
- c. Treated wood decking will cover the stoop/landing.
- d. Wood pilings will support the stoop/landing.
- e. A wooden balustrade will enclose the side bays of the stoop/landing.
- f. A flight of wooden steps will access the stoop/landing
- g. The stair railings will match the stoop/landing balustrade.
- h. Ball finials will cap the newels posts.

5. West Elevation

- a. Install two six over six windows.
- b. Install a four paneled door with a four light transom.
- c. Reconstruct the demolished side ell.
 - i. The ell will measure 8' in width and 16' 2" in depth.
 - ii. Wood siding will sheath the walls.
 - iii. A gabled ended Timberline roof will cover the addition.
- d. North Elevation of Ell
 - i. The north elevation of the ell will feature a blind window.
 - ii. The window casing will match those of the house in profile, dimension, scale, and material.
 - iii. Construct a wood stoop/landing.
 - 1. The stoop/landing will measure 8' in width and 4' in depth.
 - 2. Wood pilings will support the stoop/landing.
 - 3. A wood balustrade will encircle the stoop/landing.
 - 4. A flight of wood steps will access the stoop/landing.
 - a. The railing will match the stoop/landing balustrade.
 - b. Ball finials will cap the newel posts.
- e. West Elevation of Ell
 - i. The west elevation of the ell will feature two blind windows.
 - ii. The window casing will match those on the house in profile, dimension, scale, and material.
- f. South Elevation of Ell
 - i. The south elevation of the ell will feature one blind window
 - ii. The window casing will match those on the house in profile, dimension, and material.

STAFF ANALYSIS

In 2006 this deteriorated house was threatened with demolition. The property continued to decline. The present owner/applicant removed much of the surviving historic building fabric without authorization. This is the first time the applicant has submitted a complete set of plans for review. Staff does not believe the proposed work impairs the architectural or historical integrity of the house or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application on the following conditions:

- 1. The three light façade transom should remain in place. The other door transoms should be three, not four light transoms as proposed.
- 2. The porch decking should be 5 quarters not proposed ¾" thickness.
- 3. Brick piers should support landings or stoops, not the proposed wood pilings.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Jackson was present to discuss the application. Mr. Wagoner questioned whether Mr. Jackson accepted the three staff conditions? Mr. Jackson agreed to all three conditions. Mr. Karwinski questioned the placement of the columns. Staff clarified that Mr. Jackson would like to add a fourth column. Mrs. Hardin questioned the placement of the fourth column. Mr. Ladd suggested he retain the existing two bay rhythm. Mr. Karwinski suggested three bays. Mr. Roberts suggested they work with staff. Mr. James questioned the size of the spindle. Staff assured the Board they were MHDC stock plans.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

FINDING OF FACT

Gertrude Baker 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 accept the above conditions (use of uniform three light transoms, uniform brick piers, and 5 quarters decking on the front porch) and alter the plans to provide for either three or four columns equally spaced

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tom 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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/07/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

105-09-CA: 10 and 12 South Monterey Streets
Applicant: Denise Burkes
Received: 09/11/09
Meeting: 10/07/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Parking Proposal (for 12 South Monterey Street) – Install a concrete strip drive.
(for 10 South Monterey Street) - Repair a concrete strip drive. Install a parking pad.
Work on 10 South Monterey Street - Encase the front porch columns. Install a balustrade on the second story of the front porch. Construct a rear interior lot fence. Construct a rear porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

12 South Monterey Street was built in 1911. This one-story house features paneled window aprons and an articulated door surround. 10 South Monterey Street was built circa 1910. This American four square features a two-tiered porch façade.

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. 12 South Monterey Street last appeared before the Board on September 2, 2009. The applicant’s proposal involved the installation a concrete strip drive. The application was tabled for a Design Review Committee. The applicant has returned to the Board with revised plans for parking along with porch work, porch construction, and fence approval for 10 South Monterey Street. The revised plans represent a combined parking proposal for 12 South Monterey Street and 10 South Monterey Street. The proposed drive for 12 South Monterey Street will be extended 5 additional feet for a total of 55’ in length. The portion of the application for 10 South Monterey Street calls for the resurfacing of the existing concrete strip drive and the construction of a parking pad. The renovation plans for 10 South Monterey Street involve the replacement of porch columns, the installation of a second story balcony, the construction of a rear porch, and the construction of a fence.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.”
 - 2. “Landscaping can often 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 Zoning is required for commercial applications. Hard surface materials may

3. “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance.”
4. “The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. **Project One:** Install Driveway (12 South Monterey Street) (See Submitted Plan)
 - A. Extend the existing curbcut to measure 18’ to 20’ in width.
 - B. Remove the existing rock coping wall along the sidewalk.
 - C. Excavate the northern half of the front lawn for the driveway.
 - D. Plant grass on either side of the drive.
 - E. Install two 2’ wide concrete runners that would extend 55’ into the lot.
2. **Project Two:** Driveway Repairs and Parking Pad (10 South Monterey Street)
 - A. Repair the two existing 2’ wide concrete strips that extend into the lot.
 - B. Per submitted plan, install a 18’ x 18’ concrete parking pad at the end of drive.
3. **Project Three:** Alter Front Porch Columns (10 South Monterey Street)
 - A. Encase existing front porch columns (per submitted plan)
 1. Columns will be based on those on 16 South Monterey Street.
 2. Columns will measure 9’ 2” in height
 3. Columns will feature a base, necking, and capital.
 - B. Install a MHDC stock balustrade between the second story porch columns.
4. **Project Four:** Install Rear Fence and Gate (10 South Monterey Street)
 - B. Install a 6’ tall wooden dog-eared interior lot privacy fence with a double gate.
 1. The double gate will measure 10’ in length.
 2. Two 2’ sections of fencing will flank the gate.
 3. The fence and gate will extend from a point 5’ east of the southwest corner of the house to the property line - a total 14’.
5. **Project Five:** Construct a rear porch (per submitted plans).
 - A. The porch will be 7’ wide and 4’ deep.
 - B. A two foot foundation with brick foundation piers and a wooden skirt will support the porch decking.
 - C. Tongue-and-groove decking will cover the porch deck
 1. Decking will be installed at an incline to shed water.
 - D. Two 6’ foot square section columns will support the porch roof.
 1. The columns will measure approximately 8’7” in height.
 - E. A hipped roof will extend over the porch.
 - F. A flight of pressure treated wooden steps will access the porch from the west.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Project One:

The applicant’s initial parking proposal was tabled for lack of information. The revised proposes extends the strip drive further into the lot at 12 South Monterey. The extension moves parking behind the front plane of the house, one of the concerns of the Board. The proposed drive will necessitate the removal of a portion of the property’s sidewalk coping wall, one of the defining characteristics of the property and the streetscape. Staff recommends approval of the drive for 12 South Monterey Street on the condition that

the applicant reuse the stone from the sidewalk coping wall along the side of the proposed drive as means of maintaining visual and historical continuity along the streetscape.

Project Two:

Staff recommends approval of the resurfacing of the existing drive at 10 South Monterey Street. The grass strip separating the two drives will provide a visual break between the two pairs of concrete runners. Staff also recommends approval of the parking pad because it set in the far corner of the lot.

Project Three:

The existing front porch columns at 10 South Monterey are replacements of lost originals. 1970s photographs in Staff files show unarticulated square section columnar supports. The proposed columns are slightly more substantial versions of those documented in the 1970s photograph, but are in keeping with style of the house. Staff recommends approval of the removal of the replacement columns and the installation of the more historically accurate columns.

Project Four:

The proposed interior lot wooden fence and gate at 10 South Monterey extend and terminate previously approved rear lot fencing. The proposed fence does not exceed the maximum height limit set by the Guidelines. Staff recommends approval of the fence and gate

Project Five:

The proposed rear porch utilizes the same materials and observes the same foundation line as the house. The proposed porch will not be visible from the street. Staff recommends approval of the rear porch proposal.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Denise Burkes was present to discuss the application. Mr. Wagoner asked Ms Burke if she had the owner's approval at 12 South Monterey to proceed with proposed parking proposal. Ms. Burke explained that she was doing the work for the neighbors in order for them to vacate the easement shared by the two properties. Staff assured the Board that they would distribute two COAs, one to each property owner.

Mr. Karwinski asked to see the Power Point image of the driveway. Mrs. Burke explained that they were widening the driveway ribbons. Mr. Karwinski pointed out that there were differences between the actual dimensions and the drawn proposal. He asked about the discrepancies. Mrs. Burkes said yes, there were discrepancies. She said she was not an architect but realized they would need maneuvering space. The discrepancies would be worked out once the easement was adjusted. Mr. Karwinski said he took the criteria for the driveway and sketched it out. He questioned whether the driveway would extend past the bay window. Mr. Karwinski argued that there would not be enough space for two foot strip of grass with the dimensions provided. He said he was working from the survey provided. Mr. Karwinski said he created an alternative. Ms. Burkes said it may be a seam, rather than a grass strip. She said the existing drive for 10 South Monterey would have to be removed and reconstructed in order to get the clearance for bay window at 12 South Monterey Street. All of the existing driveway would be removed and replaced.

Mr. James said there are three strips of grass and only one of the strips will disappear. Ms. Hardin asked whether there would be two distinct sets of driveways. If not, there would be no grass at the street entrance.

Mr. Ladd stated that the drives would not be truly parallel. Mrs. Burkes said the drives would be turned up and not angled so the owners at 12 South Monterey can pull straight and the owners of 10 South Monterey will drive straight into their property.

Mr. James said the curbcut, at the street, is about twenty feet. Mrs. Burkes said the City said at least ten feet expanse per property was mandatory.

Mrs. Baker clarified under project one approval would be for 20'. She asked if under C(1)(E) if the two ribbons would be different. She then said under project two, it should be "install" instead of repair the concrete strips. Mrs. Harden explained that there will be two' concreted strips, an expansion joint and two concrete drives.

The applicant has agreed to reuse and reconstruct the coping walls along the driveway.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

FINDING OF FACT

Gertrude Baker 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 Fact C (2) A to read "install" not "repair", and removing C (1) D, and adding the reuse of the stones from the coping wall for the banking of the 12 South Monterey Street drive.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tom Karwinski said typically two story porches have smaller columns on the second story. Since the second story is smaller, the applicant stated they did have a question relating to that observance. Mr. Karwinski suggested a 2" difference. The applicant agreed to that. The application and ruling were amended to allow for 9-1/4 inch columns on the bottom and 7-1/4" columns. Mrs. Baker amended motion to add above fact for column.

Harris Oswald 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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/07/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

106-09-CA: 5 North Claiborne Street
Applicant: Deborah Tolbert for Jordan Investments, LLC
Received: 08/31/09
Meeting: 10/07/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install canvas awning over second story façade windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

This modified side hall house was constructed in 1901. The cast iron fence abutting the sidewalk, the close proximity of the house to the street, and the decorative use of cast iron tie the turn-of-century house to downtown Mobile's 19th-century urban architectural tradition.

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 17, 2005. The Board approved the reopening of a previously enclosed rear porch.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 1. "Blinds and shutters were integral functional components of historic buildings. Blinds and shutters should be sized to fit the reveal of the window opening precisely."
 2. "Awnings will be reviewed on a case by case basis."
- C. Scope of Work:
 1. Mount a 27' 5" black Sunbrella fabric awning over the three second story façade windows (per submitted plans).
 - A. The awning is to follow the plane of the body of the main house. The northernmost bay steps back 1' from the front plane of the house.
 - B. The awning is to extend 27' 5" across the facade.
 - C. The awning is to project 5' beyond the southernmost façade windows and 6' feet beyond the recessed northernmost window
 - D. A 6' "Gothic" scalloped valance is to extend from the awning's projection and front bars.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. How will the awning be mounted to the façade?

STAFF ANALYSIS

A November 10, 2003 Resolution by the Architectural Review Board allows Staff to issue midmonth approval on residential and commercial awnings. Midmonth approval of commercial awnings must be less than 25% of the building's front or façade. While the proposed awning covers less than 25% of the building's façade, the awning would obscure receding northernmost bay of the house's main block, as well as the white painted window lintels. The advance and recess of the building's bays & planes and the white-painted lintels are distinctive features of the house's design. Staff believes that the proposed awning impairs the architectural and historical integrity of the building therefore does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to discuss this application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Ms. Hardin explained mounting an awning would damage the brick.

FINDING OF FACT

Tom 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

Tom Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued. Harris Oswald and Craig Roberts voted in opposition.

DENIED.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

107-09-CA: 221 South Dearborn Street
Applicant: Tony M. Jones and Thomas P. Baines
Received: 09/21/09
Meeting: 10/07/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction - Construct a garage.
Fence Approval - Construct a wall.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-and-one-half story brick 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 Board on August 22, 2005. The Board approved the construction of a 8’ stuccoed-finished wall that encloses all but the southeast corner of the lot. The applicants return to the Board with a proposal for garage that take design cues from the main house and a fencing proposal that would continue the previously approved fence design around the whole of the property.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. Fencing “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship the Historic District.”
 - 2. “The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.”
 - 3. “All variances required by the Board of Zoning Adjustment must be obtained prior to issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.”
 - 4. “An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, shed 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:
 - 1. Construct a Garage (per submitted plans)
 - A. The garage will be located off Canal Street service road.
 - B. A concrete motor court and curbcut will access the garage.

- C. The bricks and roofing will match the existing on the house.
- D. The garage will feature a 25' 10" square two story western block and a recessed 13' by 20' 5" one story eastern section.
- E. A gable roof with stepped and raked parapet will cover the two story western block.
- F. A shed roof obscured by a parapet to the south will cover the one story eastern section of the garage.
- G. South Elevation (Canal Street Façade)
 - 1. Two garage doors will occupy the first floor of the two story western block.
 - 2. Two gabled wall dormers with two-over-two windows will be centered over the garage doors.
 - 3. A third garage door will open onto the one story recessed eastern portion of the garage.
- H. West Elevation
 - 1. A fixed louvered door will be centered on the first floor.
 - 2. A blind window bay with a herringbone brick pattern will be centered on the second story.
 - 3. A louvered window will be centered at the attic level.
- I. North Elevation
 - 1. A single floor length window will be located at the western end of the first story of the main block
 - 2. Four skylights will punctuate the roof.
 - 3. An exposed open gable end will extend over the one story eastern section of the garage.
- J. East Elevation
 - 1. A two bay open parking area (effectively the one story eastern section of the of the garage) will front three floor length windows.
 - 2. Extend the existing 8' wall stuccoed faced concrete block wall 22'.
 - A. A single iron gate will angle from wall to the proposed garage

Clarification

- 1. What is the design of the gate between the garage and the wall?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This property does not have off street parking. The proposed garage borrows the forms and details of the main house. The design meets the material and design standards set by the Guidelines. It does not impair the architectural or historical character of the district. Staff recommends approval of the proposed garage. The proposed wall extension is based on the design and treatment of the existing wall. The faux stucco treatment of the existing wall does not meet the standards set by the Guidelines. Staff recommends approval of the wall proposal on the condition that the wall be faced with a smooth stucco finish and crowned with a cap as indicated in the original Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff withholds recommendation of the gate pending submission of the design.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tony Jones and Thomas Baines were present to discuss the application. Mr. Wagoner questioned whether they were in agreement with the conditions. The applicants answered yes, they were growing fig vine on the wall anyway. Mr. Bemis explained that the original application called for a smooth stucco finish on the existing concrete wall. Mr. Bemis explained that they needed to follow the original

application and that this would be different from what they have on the existing wall. It proved to expensive and Mr. Bemis suggested they go back and fix this wall. Mr. Bemis suggested they would not have gotten a Certificate of Occupancy with the wall. Mr. Karwinski questioned whether any section of the existing wall is taller than 8'. The applicants responded that the back was 8'-3" and it slopes down. They got around that by building up the flower beds so it does not look like 8'.

Mr. Karwinski questioned the setback shown on the site plan. Mr. Bemis explained that the requirement was zero or five and survey shows a 5' setback line. Mr. Bemis explained that he was certain it was five. The applicants know they have to put a gutter or downspout on that side.

Mr. Wagoner explained that it meets the requirements of the setback but they would still need a gutter or downspouts. The wall is the building. How are they going to put the gutter? The gutter will go five inches short of the property line. Mr. Roberts said the water runoff needs to be addressed, but it is the applicant's responsibility to do so. Mr. Wagoner asked whether the applicants needed to redesign the roof slope therefore come back before the Board. Mr. Bemis stated if there is an alteration that does not change the street elevation, then they need not come back before the Board.

Mr. Roberts stated they must agree to the conditions. Amending the fact to do a true stucco wall and a 2" cap on the wall, both new and existing.

The applicant stated they could use either the gate as is or just the frame. Mr. Bemis stated that the frame would be preferable. The pickets match the ones that are on the balcony now.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris 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 fact Fact C (2) to specify a smooth-faced stucco finish and crowning cap.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Robert moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the historic district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned on the verification of the setback and runoff.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/07/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

108-09-CA: 1702 B Government Street
Applicant: Able Body Gulf Coast, Inc
Received: 09/07/09
Meeting: 10/07/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Sign Approval – Relocate and mount a sign from an out of district location. Affix vinyl graphics to the door and windows of the building unit.

BUILDING HISTORY

This property is one of several late 20th-Century commercial strip developments located on Government Street.

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 Board. The applicants propose relocating a wall sign from an out of district location. They also propose applying vinyl graphics to the store front windows.
- A. The Sign Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street state in pertinent part:
 - A. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs. The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet. A multi-tenant building is also limited to a maximum of 64 square feet.
 - B. “The total allowable square footage for the display area of a monument sign is (50) fifty square feet, for pole signs 40 square feet, and for projecting 40 square feet.
 - C. “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 or signage on the reverse side.
 - D. 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.
 - E. 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.

Internally lit signs are prohibited. 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.

B. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):

1. Relocate an existing out of district sign to the above Government Street location.
 - A. The sign is single faced.
 - B. The sign is made of plastic
 - C. The sign measures 3' in height and 10' 2" in length.
 - D. The total square footage of the sign is slightly over 30 feet.
 - E. The sign will be non-illuminated.
 - F. The sign will be mounted in the entablature-like space fronting the strip development.
2. Affix vinyl graphics to the unit's windows and doors.

Clarifications

1. What is the total square footage of the proposed wall graphics?

STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposed sign is made of plastic, a material deemed inappropriate by the Guidelines. Staff does not recommend approval of the relocation and remounting of the sign. The proposed sign would impair the architectural and historical integrity of the district. Staff recommends approval of the window graphics on the condition that their total square footage does not exceed the maximum square footage allowed to this multitenant building.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Casey Parker was present to discuss the application. Ms. Parker stated that they may have another sign that is flat metal. Same size and design as the plastic sign that she applied for. In conversation with staff, the Board determined they could amend the application to allow for a metal sign, approximately 30 square feet. Ms. Parker agreed to allow the rest of the application to be tabled.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig 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 fact to allow for a metal sign if it meets Staff approval.

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 and that the application pertaining to the vinyl window graphics be tabled.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/07/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

WITHDRAWN

109-09-CA: 204, 208, and 210 State Street

Applicant: Mike Redmond

Received: 09/18/09

Meeting: 10/07/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Detonti Square

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: R-B

Project: Paint three buildings, two wooden and one stuccoed, with Rhino Shield paint.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Water Street Rescue Mission occupies four lots on State Street. The easternmost lot is undeveloped. 204 State is two-story stucco-faced building that originally housed the Northside Baptist Church. The house at 208 State Street was completed in 1895. With its irregular massing, asymmetrical elevations, and complex roofline, the house is one of the largest late Victorian Period houses in the Detonti Square Historic District. 210 State Street was built in 1892. The house represents a typological and stylistic marriage of vernacular building traditions with modish architectural fashion. The elevated foundations and jalousied porch (west elevation) were climate informed design solutions used throughout the 19th Century. The increased complexity of detail, as seen in the bracket spandrels and the turreted bay window, show how contemporary architectural fads were used along side traditional design forms and solutions.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The Waterfront Rescue Mission complex last appeared before the Board on January 13, 2003. The Board denied the Mission’s request for a large paved parking lot. Basic repair and replacement submissions have been approved on Staff level since that date. The Mission appears before with a painting proposal involving t Rhino Shield Paint. Ceramic based paints have never previously been approved by the Board.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Paint three buildings, two wooden and one stuccoed, with Rhino Shield paint.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Rhino-Shield paint and other ceramic based exterior finishes are still experimental in nature. The proposed durability and subsequent material affects of Rhino-Shield have neither been tested by time nor Mobile's climate. The use of Rhino-Shield on three contributing buildings is thus ill advised for material reasons. Additionally, the application of Rhino-Shield would create a coating that would obscure the detailing and transitions of the three building's facades. Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and historical integrity of the building and the district.

WITHDRAWN

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

WITHDRAWN

110-09-CA: 1506 Old Shell Road, 100 North Catherine Street, and 106 North Catherine Street
Applicant: Clark, Geer, Latham, and Associates
Received: 09/18/09
Meeting: 10/07/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: 1506 Old Shell Road, Non-Contributing; 100 North Catherine Street, Non-Contributing; and 106 North Catherine Street, Non-contributing
Zoning:
Project: Demolish or relocate the house at 1506 Old Shell Road. Demolish the convenience store at 100 North Catherine Street. Demolish or relocate the storage building at 106 North Catherine Street. Install a parking lot. Landscape the parking lot.

BUILDING HISTORY

The house at 1506 Old Shell Road was built circa 1930. The front porch has been enclosed. A convenience occupies the lot of 100 North Catherine Street at the intersection of Old Shell Road. A metal storage building occupies the lot at 106 North Catherine Street.

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. 1506 Old Shell Road has never appeared before the Board. 100 North Catherine Street last appeared before the Board in 2004. The Board approved the construction of a double sided monument sign. 106 North Catherine Street has never appeared before the Board.
- B. In regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the board shall consider:
 - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structures;
These buildings are non-contributing structures within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.

- ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. Though over fifty years old, the house at 1506 Old Shell Road is not significant building in the Old Dauphin Way District because it is not representative of the architectural and historical context of the district. The buildings at 100 and 106 North Catherine Street are non-contributing and unsympathetic infill with the historic district.
 - iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 - 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced.
 - iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 - 1. The house at 1506 Old Shell Road is representative of many surviving one-story houses with a slight Craftsman influence found nation wide. The convenience store at 100 North Catherine Street and Storage Shed at 106 North Catherine Street are similarly ubiquitous structures
 - v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 - 1. The applicants propose the construction of a parking lot with landscaping.
2. *Content of applications.* All applications to demolish or remove a structure in a historic district shall contain the following minimum information:
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. The applicants acquired 1506 Old Shell Road in 2006 for \$66,500. The applicants have a contract to purchase 100 North Catherine Street for \$400,000. The applicants acquired 106 North Catherine Street in 1998 for \$35,000. The buildings were all in state of comparable condition to the present when they were purchased by the Archdiocese.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. The applicants propose leaving the property an open green space. They do not propose any form of paving, but the site would be utilized for parking when the Church's parking lots reach full capacity.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. Not applicable.
 - ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 - 1. Not applicable.
 - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. \$10,000.
 - xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and
 - 1. Cash submitted.

- xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
- 3. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):

- G. Demolish or relocate the house at **1506 Old Shell Road.**
- H. Demolish the convenience Store at **100 North Catherine Street.**
- I. Demolish or relocate the storage building at **106 North Catherine Street.**
- J. Cut down four Live Oak trees
- K. Install a parking lot, per submitted plan:
 - A. Parking spaces with occupy four sides of the property, as well as two aisles in the lot.
 - B. A stormwater detention median will occupy the center of the lot.
 - C. Two curbcuts will provide ingress and egress to the lot.
- L. Landscape the property with trees and additional plantings.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Demolition requests are reviewed on a case by case basis. The significance of the building and the nature of the proposed redevelopment of the site are two key concerns. The structures occupying contiguous lots slated for demolition are non-contributing buildings.

The house at **1506 Old Shell Road** is over fifty years old. However, the house is a small and somewhat unimpressive Craftsman influenced house with a drastically altered façade. The house is set back from the street. Based on its lack architectural significance and setback from the street, Staff does not believe the demolition of the house will impair the architectural or historical character of the district.

The convenience store at **100 North Catherine Street** and the storage building at **106 North Catherine Street** are ubiquitous late 20th-Century designs. The loss of these two buildings would not impair the architectural or historical character of the district. The redevelopment plan takes cues from and develops further the successful characteristics of the parking lot at the northwest corner of Old Shell Road and Catherine Street, particularly the landscaped stormwater median. Trees would be removed, but more trees would be planted in their place.

Staff recommends approval of the application.

WITHDRAWN

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

WITHDRAWN

111-09-CA: 1501 Old Shell Road (building to face Lafayette Street)
Applicant: Blitch Knevel Architects for McGill-Toolen High School
Received: 09/18/09
Meeting: 10/07/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: New Construction
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction - Build a New Student Center on the site of the complex's Lafayette Street parking lot. Install a circular drive. Replace the existing precast concrete covered walkways on the east and west sides of Lafayette Street with new covered walkways.

BUILDING HISTORY

A number of buildings comprise the McGill-Toolen Campus. The Toolen building on Lafayette Street is Spanish Colonial Revival in style. The Administration Building at the corner Old Shell Road and Catherine Street, which its large setback and expansive façade, adopts the so-called “institutional Versailles” approach to planning that was popular in the 1950s through the 1970s.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. The McGill-Toolen School complex last appeared before the Board on September 24, 2007 with the first phase of their master campus improvement plan. The Board approved the plans of a new Science Building. The stuccoed walls and tiled roof of the new science are contemporary translations of existing Spanish Colonial Revival buildings found on the campus and in the vicinity (St. Mary's Church for instance). The School returns to the Board with the second phase of their master improvement plan, a new Student Center. The design of the proposed Student Center and the covered walkways on Lafayette Street borrows the details and finishes of the recently completed Science Center.

B. The Design Guidelines for New Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts, state, in pertinent part:

1. “Churches schools, and other civic buildings represent a unique aspect of community life and frequently have special requirements that relate to their distinct use. For these reasons, these buildings are usually free standing and their massing, scale and architectural arrangements may be of a different nature than their residential and historic neighbors. However, their materials should blend with the character of the district and their site features, such as parking lots, should not overwhelm or intrude on adjacent historic residential areas.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. **Project One: Demolish the existing covered walkway extending north from the Toolen Building.**
2. **Project Two: Construct a one-story, 26,700 square foot building abutting the east side of the McGill-Toolen Administration Building on the site of the existing Lafayette Street parking lot (Per Submitted Plan).**
 - A. Demolish existing covered walkway.
 - B. The walls will be stuccoed.
 - C. Prefinished metal “Spanish” roof tiles will cover the roof.
 - D. Decorative brackets will extend from the eaves.
 - E. A glazed clerestory with a pyramidal hipped roof will surmount an east/west facing gable gable roof.
 - F. **East Elevation (Façade)**
 1. A gabled porte-cochere with four stuccoed piers and four columns will front a 13 bay covered walkway with a hipped roof (The southernmost bay of the walkway extends east to Lafayette Street and west to the Science building).
 - A. A U-shaped drive will access the porte-cochere.
 2. Nine window and three door bays will open onto the covered walkway.
 3. A dormer projects from the main gabled-ended roof.
 4. A five bay projecting gable wing will extend from the northern end of the façade.
 5. A wall featuring stuccoed piers interspersed with aluminum picket panels will front an outdoor dining courtyard
 - G. **North Elevation**
 1. A gabled ell with a large louvered window vent will project from the wall plane.
 2. A four bay exterior gallery will stand to the east of the projecting ell.
 3. The fence of the dining gallery will extend around and front the exterior gallery.
 - A. The fence will be a solid fence stuccoed wall articulated with Pilasters on this elevation.
 4. Two doors will provide access to the recessed western portion of the elevation abutting the Administration building.
 - H. **South Elevation and Western Portion of the Covered Walkway**
 1. A rose window with tracery will occupy the gable tympanum.
 2. A nine bay shed roofed covered walkway will project from the wall plane
 3. The covered walkway extends five bays east of the building toward Lafayette Street.
 - A. A gable will terminate the walkway.
3. **Project Three: Construct an L-shaped covered walkway from the Toolen Building (see site plan).**
 - A. Stuccoed piers will frame the walkway.
 - B. Towers will surmount two end bays of the eastern section of the covered walkway.
 - C. A gable will terminate the western termination of the covered walkway at Lafayette Street.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Project One Staff recommends approval.

Staff recommends approval of the demolition of the covered walkways.

Project Two: Staff recommends this project be tabled and sent to a Design Review Committee.

The proposed Student Center will eliminate an asphalt parking lot. The proposed design takes into account the building materials and finishes of the Spanish Colonial Revival and contemporary building located on and around the campus. The **Student Center** reflects the design of new Science Building rather than the rest of the campus. The Science building is located at the rear of the campus, set back from Ann Catherine.

With regard to scale and detail, certain aspects of this infill design do not relate to the historical context of the area:

- The roof overpowers the wall planes on the east elevation.
- The fenestration on the south elevation is disproportionate to the vast expanses of unarticulated wall.
- The brackets seem out of scale with relation to the building's overall mass.

Staff recommends this project be tabled and sent to a Design Review Committee.

Project Three: Staff recommends this project be tabled and sent to a Design Review Committee to reflect the changes noted below.

The covered walkway from the Toolen Building to the New Student to Lafayette Street has two towers. These towers relate to an overall campus master plan which needs clarification. The discussed in this application are setback from the street at the building's northern and southern ends. Staff recommends that towers terminate the walkways at either end of Lafayette Street.

WITHDRAWN