AGENDA
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
January 23, 2006 – 3:00 P.M.
Mayor’s Pre-Council Chamber – Mobile Government Plaza
205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER – Chair
   1. Roll Call
   2. Approval of Minutes
   3. Approval of Mid-Month Requests Approved by Staff

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant’s Name: Parker & Poynter/Sign Pro
   Property Address: 305 North Joachim Street
   Date of Approval: 12/21/05
   Work Approved: Install wood sign with painted graphics, measuring 2’ x 3’, double sided, or 12 sf, on 50” high 4x4 post as per illustration provided.

2. Applicant’s Name: William Graham
   Property Address: 1760 Dauphin Street
   Date of Approval: 12/28/05
   Work Approved: Repair roof with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Replace rotten and/or storm-damaged wood on fascia with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint new material to match existing color scheme.

3. Applicant’s Name: Ramada Inn/Tripp Construction
   Property Address: 255 Church Street
   Date of Approval: 12/28/05
   Work Approved: Repair storm damaged brick veneer south wall with original bricks and new bricks to match original in color, profile and dimension.

4. Applicant’s Name: Terri Williams
   Property Address: 253 State Street
   Date of Approval: 12/13/05
   Work Approved: Re-roof with charcoal gray shingles.

5. Applicant’s Name: Sims Family Properties/Town Court Apartments
   Property Address: 1111 Church Street
   Date of Approval: 12/15/05
   Work Approved: Install 6’ high wood fence around dumpster.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Applicant’s Name:</th>
<th>Property Address:</th>
<th>Date of Approval:</th>
<th>Work Approved:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Steven Brown</td>
<td>202 South Catherine Street</td>
<td>1/3/05</td>
<td>Prep house for painting. Relocate secondary front door to rear of front porch. Infill door at left of porch with siding feathered to match existing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Stewart Peyton</td>
<td>115 North Ann Street</td>
<td>1/3/06</td>
<td>Replace rotten wood with materials to match existing in profile, material and dimension. Repaint building in existing color scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>David McConnell/Traditional Services</td>
<td>6 North Jackson Street</td>
<td>1/5/06</td>
<td>Repair storm damaged portion of roof with new materials to match existing in profile, materials and dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Custom Remodeling</td>
<td>128 Macy Place</td>
<td>1/5/06</td>
<td>Re-roof with 3 tab fiberglass/asphalt shingles, onyx black in color.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Willie E. Shaw</td>
<td>456 Charles Street</td>
<td>1/5/06</td>
<td>Re-roof to match existing, 3 tab fiberglass, black in color. Repair storm-damaged eave wood if necessary to match existing in profile, material and dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Joe and Carolyn Utsey</td>
<td>160 South Warren Street</td>
<td>1/6/06</td>
<td>Repair to rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile. Paint exterior in the existing colors, except body to be BLP Monticello.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Applicant’s Name: Margie Crawford/Do Right Construction  
Property Address: 104 North Julia Street  
Date of Approval: 1/6/06 asc  
Work Approved: Repair hurricane damage to roof and chimney. Repair siding on rear elevation and paint to match existing. All repairs to roof, chimney and siding to match existing in dimension and profile.

14. Applicant’s Name: Virginia Sigler  
Property Address: 500 Canal Street  
Date of Approval: 1/9/06 weh  
Work Approved: Re-roof with materials matching existing in profile and color. Repair windows damaged by storm. Repair front porch woodwork. Repaint to match existing color scheme.

15. Applicant’s Name: Bailey DuMont  
Property Address: 162 Roberts Street  
Date of Approval: 1/9/06 asc  
Work Approved: Renewal of expired CoA. Carport repair; repair/replace columns to match existing. Paint ceiling, doors and columns white. Repairs to main house: caulk and repaint steel casement windows; repaint portico and shutters to match existing. Minor repair to chimney and paint top of chimney white.

16. Applicant’s Name: George Boone  
Property Address: 306 George Street  
Date of Approval: 1/9/06 weh  
Work Approved: Change of wording of CoA from CARPORT to GARAGE. Construct Garage using MHDC stock plans, as per submitted design.

C. OLD BUSINESS:

1. 026-05/06-CA  
Applicant: David Ayers  
Nature of Request: Construct rear addition on existing rear deck; roof over existing deck, all as per submitted plans.

D. NEW BUSINESS:

1. 027-05/06-CA  
Applicant: Alabama School of Math and Science/TAG Architects  
Nature of Request: Renovation of the existing first floor lobby, recreation area, and second floor library with an adjacent addition to provide space for expanded lobby, recreation and library. An overhead walkway to the existing administration building. Erect monument sign at Caroline Street elevation.
2. **028-05/06-CA**  
Applicant: Christopher E. Peters, P.C.  
Nature of Request: Replace hurricane damaged, non-historic wood windows with Kolbe & Kolbe clad windows with snap-in muntins, as per submitted photographs.

3. **029-05/06-CA**  
Applicant: Hargrove and Associates  
Nature of Request: Install 5’ metal fencing around property as per submitted site plan.

E. **OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

F. **ADJOURNMENT**
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF COMMENTS

026-05/06-CA  205 George Street
Applicant:  David Ayers
Received:  12/27/05  Meeting Date(s):
Submission Date + 45 Days:  2/10/06  1)  1/9/06  2) 1/23/06  3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:  Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification:  Contributing
Zoning:  R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project:  Construct rear addition on existing rear deck; roof over existing deck, all as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district…

STAFF REPORT

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

1. The subject structure is a ca. 1887 one story Classical Revival residence with a monolithic side gable roof and an end gabled front portico.
2. The subject lot measures 58’ x 100’.
3. Currently there is a rear addition measuring 21’ wide by 18’ long and an L-shaped deck at the rear of the property.
4. The current addition has a lower pitched roof and meets the main house below the historic roof line.
5. The applicant is requesting to construct an addition over the north side of the existing deck, and roof over the east side of the existing deck to create more living space and a porch.
6. The addition occurs at a distance of 58’ from the street.
7. The existing side north side setback is 6’-6”.
8. The proposed side north setback is maintained at 6’-6”.
9. The Historic District Overlay Ordinance allows additions to structures in historic districts to be able to maintain lines established by the historic structures.
10. The existing east side setback is approximately 15’.
11. The proposed east side setback is approximately 8’-3”.
12. The minimum required rear setback for residential construction is 8’.
13. The existing lot coverage is 31%.
14. The proposed lot coverage is 38%.
15. The Historic District Overlay Ordinance allows the site coverage to increase from 35% to 50%.
16. Foundation will be brick piers, matching that of the main house and the existing addition.
17. Windows will be wood, double hung, six-over-six, matching those in the main house and the existing addition.
18. Doors will be wood French doors.
19. The cornice will be a simplified version of that on the main house.
20. The roof is an extension of the existing roof, maintaining the existing pitch, which differentiates the addition from the main structure.
21. Deck railing will match existing, which is MHDC Stock Design number 1, and will be painted white with green handrail.
22. Column details will match that on the front porch.
23. The corner board will be left in place at the main house to differentiate between the historic structure and the addition.
24. The work is in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards numbers 9 and 10, which state:
   a. 9 - New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
   b. 10 - New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF COMMENTS

027-05/06-CA 1255 Dauphin Street

Applicant: Alabama School of Mathematics and Science/TAG Architects

Received: 1/05/06 Meeting Date(s):

Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/19/06 1) 1/23/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-1, General Business
Nature of Project: Renovation of the existing first floor lobby, recreation area, and second floor library with an adjacent addition to provide space for expanded lobby, recreation and library. Construct an overhead walkway to the existing administration building. Erect a monument sign at Caroline Street elevation. Rework existing parking lot.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts
Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district…”

STAFF REPORT

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

PROJECT SYNOPSIS: This project involves four parts – the construction of a new entry and additional interior space along Caroline Street, the construction of a walkway bridge at the interior of the property, the erection of a monument sign, and the reworking of existing parking.

The focal point of the addition is a pedimented block with a modern version of a pedimented portico. The pedimented block measures 36’-6” x 20’-6”. The ridge height of the pedimented block is 49’-8”. The pedimented portico at the entry is constructed using a combination of rock face cmu at the base of the columns, a bullnose moulding, and smooth face cmu as the shaft. The pedimented block intersects an arc created by two rows of cast in place concrete columns. To the right of the pedimented block, the inner row of columns works with a storefront system to create the exterior wall of the addition. To the left of the pedimented block, the arc becomes a colonnade maintaining the symmetry of the overall piece. The outer band of columns pierce the second floor level and become bollards with spheres, integrated into the second floor railing system. The height of the addition measures 29’-4”.
The walkway bridge is located at the interior of the school complex, and is proposed to connect the second floor of the new addition to the first floor of the existing administration building. The walkway is constructed on cylindrical columns matching those used in the addition. The 10’ wide walkway starts at the addition at 11’ and slopes down to 5’-11” to intersect a landing at the administration building. The walkway parallels the existing courtyard. The roof of the walkway is proposed to be standing seam. The walkway will not be visible from public view.

A monument sign is proposed to be placed along Caroline Street adjacent to the new parking area. The sign measures 10’-11” wide, 7’-5” high, and 2’ thick. The sign is constructed on a concrete base with brick matching that of the existing buildings. Metal letters spell the name of the complex.

The existing rectangular parking lot is being reconfigured into an arc-shaped to reflect the design of the building addition. Ample planting areas are proposed around the parking area, however, no plants are specified.

I. ADDITION –
   Foundation – slab on grade
   Exterior materials – Brick veneer matching existing buildings
      Rock faced cmu
      Smooth face cmu
      Cast in place concrete, painted limestone in color
   Windows – impact resistant storefront with insulating glass
      finish – Heirloom white to match brick
      glazing – solar green
   Doors – metal storefront doors
   Roof – Built-up flat roof
      Standing seam metal roof
   Ornamental Ironwork – patina green in color

II. WALKWAY BRIDGE –
   Columns – cast in place concrete lower
      Tubular steel upper
   Railing – tubular steel
   Roof – standing seam metal

III. MONUMENT SIGN -
   A. Mounting and Placement:
      1. The sign is located so as not to obscure the architectural features of the buildings.
      2. The sign is not located in the right-of-way.
      3. The sign is not an off-premise sign.
      4. The height of the sign exceeds 5’.
   B. Design:
      1. The overall design of the signage relates to the design of the buildings on the property.
      2. The sign utilizes the same materials and colors of the buildings on the property.
   C. Size:
      1. The total allowable square footage for the display area of a monument sign is (50) fifty square feet.
      2. The total proposed signage square footage for the display area is approximately 18.25 square feet.
      3. Typically, the Board limits the height of monument signs to 5’.
      4. The height of the proposed sign is 7’-6”.
5. Given the massing and scale of the buildings in the complex, a 7’-6” sign would not be out of character.
6. However, the massing and scale is out of character with the neighborhood and the residential character.

IV. PARKING –
   A. The Guidelines state that the appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design.
      1. Planting areas are proposed around the parking area.
      2. Specific plants are not listed.
      3. In order to screen parking, plants should be 36” in height.

Staff recommends approval of the application for building issues as submitted. Staff further recommends that the sign be modified to be no taller than 5’ in height, after total signage on site is measured. The Board should consider requesting a landscape plan to ensure adequate parking lot screening.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF COMMENTS

028-05/06-CA
401 Church Street

Applicant: Christopher E. Peters, P.C.
Received: 1/05/06
Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/19/06

Meeting Date(s):
1) 1/23/06
2) 3) 

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-B, Residential Business
Nature of Project: Repair bottom sash of third floor window with wood matching existing in material, profile and dimension. Replace hurricane damaged, non-historic wood windows with Kolbe & Kolbe clad windows with snap-in muntins, as per submitted photographs.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district…

STAFF REPORT

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the request to repair existing sash complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district. The request to change windows from wood double hung with true divided lite to clad windows with artificial muntins does not comply with the Design Review Guidelines and will impair the historic integrity of the district.

1. The Ravesies House, ca. 1860, is a two story Greek Revival town house.
2. Windows in the existing historic structure are wood, double hung, true divided lite.
3. The applicant is requesting to repair a damaged bottom sash with a new material matching the original sash in material, profile and dimension.
4. A ca. 1960 addition is located at the rear of the structure.
5. Existing windows in the 1960 wing are wood, single pane, true divided lite.
6. The southeast elevations of the building sustained damage during Hurricane Katrina.
7. The applicant is requesting to remove damaged and deteriorated wood windows and replace them with clad windows with artificial muntins.
8. Snap in muntins are not allowed for any type of construction in the districts.

Staff recommends approval of the request to replace damaged wood sash with new wood sash. Staff recommends denial of the request to install clad windows with artificial muntins. Staff further recommends that the windows be replaced with windows matching the original in profile, material and dimension.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF COMMENTS

029-05/06-CA  210 South Washington Street
Applicant:  Hargrove & Associates
Received:  12/09/05  Meeting Date(s):
Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/19/06  1)  1/23/06  2)  3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:  Church Street East Historic District
Classification:  Non - Contributing
Zoning:  B-1, General Business
Nature of Project:  Install 5’ high metal fence as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fences, Walls &amp; Gates</td>
<td>Install 5’ fence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district…

STAFF REPORT

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

A. The Guidelines state that “These should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”

1. The subject structure is a 1 one story commercial building with brick veneer and metal paneled exterior.
2. The subject structure is located on the northwest corner of Canal and South Washington Streets.
3. The subject structure is a non-contributing structure within the district.
4. The proposed fence is 5’ high, painted black.
5. There are two sets of gates, one set at each parking area. One gate is automatic (sliding) and one gate is manual (hinged).
6. The proposed fence matches the fence installed around the South Alabama Regional Planning Commission Office at the corner of Church and South Washington Streets.
7. The proposed fence will not impair the integrity of the structure or the district.

Staff recommends approval of the request as submitted.