

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
September 19, 2012 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Jim Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: David Barr, Mary Cousar, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes III, Thomas Karwinski, Craig Roberts, Jim Wagoner, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Members Absent: Gertrude Baker, Carlos Gant, Kim Harden, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, Keri Coumanis, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the September 5, 2012 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Richard Armstrong with Modern Signs for Atchison Home**
 - a. Property Address: 921 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/28/12
 - c. Project: Construct a new monument sign. The aluminum double-faced signage will be affixed to a 5' tall brick sign structure (per submitted plan). The signage will rely upon ground level illumination. The total square footage of the signage will not exceed 30 square feet.
2. **Applicant: Modern Signs for LODA Bier Garten**
 - a. Property Address: 251 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/30/12
 - c. Project: Install signage within the existing armature of a wall suspended double-faced sign. The aluminum sign will feature neon graphics. This sign, one original to the building, has always featured neon signage.
3. **Applicant: Jeremy Milling**
 - a. Property Address: 9 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/6/12
 - c. Project: Install a hanging sign from the underside of the building's marquee. The total square footage of the double-faced aluminum signage will be 24 square feet. The signage will feature the names of the occupying tenants and will meet (height) passage requirements.
4. **Applicant: Mary Katherine Killam**
 - a. Property Address: 105 Houston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/7/12
 - c. Project: Install metal handrails on the front steps. This reversible intervention will be painted green to match the decking and other detailing of the house.
5. **Applicant: Douglas Hunter**
 - a. Property Address: 261 North Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/7/12
 - c. Project: Paint the shutters and the front gate white.

6. Applicant: Archdiocese of Mobile

- a. Property Address: 352 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/7/12
- c. Project: Replace existing reflective film with a bronzed film providing 78% protection.

7. Applicant: Mobile Fence

- a. Property Address: 1702 Laurel Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/7/12
- c. Project: Construct a picket fence enclosing the front lawn. Said fence will feature a gated entry. Construct a six foot interior lot privacy fence with a vehicular gate at the end to driveway enclosing the backyard.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2012-57-CA: 17 Blacklawn

- a. Applicant: Bob and Janie Windham
- b. Project: Reroofing – Reroof a house with metal roofing.

WITHDRAWN.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Window Product Discussion

Terry Lamb, Marty, Calkins, and Randy Graves spoke to the Board with regard to vinyl replacement windows. After introducing himself and his colleagues, Mr. Lamb told the Board of several earlier projects his firm has done in and around the historic districts. He spoke the quality and costs of the vinyl windows he, Mr. Calkins, and Mr. Graves were submitting for consideration and discussion. Mr. Lamb explained that they wanted to enter into a dialogue with the Board and Staff regarding the use of higher quality alternative (to wood) windows in the historic districts.

Pointing to and raising the sash of one of two examples, Mr. Lamb spoke of the adjustable brickmold and wind ratings. He added that other attributes include the options for painting the windows and their ability to fit within a reveal. Mr. Calkins differentiated between tear out windows, such as the products displayed and pocket windows, which are more commonly employed. Mr. Roberts explained that vinyl windows are not allowed in the historic districts. He then stated that he appreciated the presentation, but that the design could be improved by being made more to look to like traditional wooden windows. A discussion of muntins ensued.

Mr. Roberts spoke concerning other window manufacturers. He cited Pella, Anderson, and Marvin. He told Messrs. Lamb, Calkins, and Graves that the historic districts consisted of contributing, non-contributing, and newly constructed buildings. He said that if improved, the latter might be approvable. Mr. Roberts noted that the Historic District Guidelines would have to be changed to accommodate them though.

The discussion turned to roofing alternatives. Mr. Karwinski returned the discussion back to windows. Ms. Cousar asked what windows other cities approve. Mr. Roberts and Mr. Holmes discussed how other municipalities with historic districts address window replacements. Mr. Roberts encouraged the use of traditional windows as the basis of correct design and proportion. Mr. Karwinski stated that the windows up for discussion had one aspect in their favor; they fit and could recess into the reveal. Mr. Wagoner stated since the presentation was not for a specific

property, the windows could not receive a blanket approval even if they met the Guidelines. Mr. Roberts spoke of the ordinances and guidelines. Mr. Bemis addressed the presenters saying that municipal regulations were determined by state and national bodies. Mr. Bemis and Mr. Holmes cited differing passages from National Parks Service literature. Mr. Karwinski said that while the windows could not be employed in the historic districts, there are many older buildings outside of the historic districts with deteriorated windows that could use these type windows. Mr. Roberts reiterated that the design of the windows could be improved.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-57-CA: 17 Blacklawn
Applicant: Bob and Janie Windham
Received: 8/14/12
Meeting: 9/19/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Reroofing – Reroof a house with metal roofing.

BUILDING HISTORY

This brick bungalow dates from 1930. The Arts and Crafts informed dwelling features a large porch and an impressive roof structure.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicants propose the installation of a metal roof.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “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 the pitch and the color.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted materials):**
 - 1. Remove the existing asbestos roof.
 - 2. Install Max-Rib exposed fastener roofing panels.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of a metal roof. Metal roofing is a traditional roofing material in Mobile. As the 19th Century progressed, the variety of metal roofing alternatives and their applications increased though their use faded in the early part of the 20th Century. Both frame & masonry and residential & commercial buildings featured metal roofs. Standing seam panels and individual shingles were the most common types of metal roofing. 5-V crimp was another alternative.

Metal roofs are reviewed on a case by case basis. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that roofing materials should be appropriate to the form, pitch, and color of the roof (See B-1).

Assessing roof form or configuration involves evaluation of a roof's plan. This house is surmounted by a configuration of interlocking gable and one hipped roof structures. While not complex, the roof structure is more complicated than the fully encompassing gable or hipped roof structures that typically surmount most bungalows.

The roof pitch is not particularly steep.

The color of the roofing is historically appropriate.

This house features an asbestos shingle roof which provides a significant three dimensional aspect. The compartmentalization and the pattern created by the individual shingles serve to break the plan of the roof expanses. Higher end Arts and Crafts-influenced "bungalows" such as this brick example did not often feature metal sheet roofing. Staff recommends that the applicant consider a roofing alternative that is more in keeping with the style of the house. Said option should take into account the visual differentiation allowed by individual shingles.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that the application had been withdrawn.

No discussion ensued.

WITHDRAWN