ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
February 19th, 2020 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Steve Stone, called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. Christine Dawson, Historic Development Staff, called the roll as follows.
   Members Present: Abby Davis, Catarina Echols, Andre Rathle, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, Gypsie Van Antwerp, and Jim Wagoner
   Members Absent: David Barr, Robert E. Brown, Sr., Kim Harden and Joseph Rodrigues
   Staff Members Present: Bridget Daniel, Christine Dawson, John Sledge, Marion McElroy, and Flo Kessler

2. Mr. Wagoner moved to approve the minutes from the February 5th, 2020 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Van Antwerp and approved unanimously.

3. Mr. Wagoner moved to approve the Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff. The motion was seconded by Ms. Davis and approved unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. Applicant: John Switzer
   a. Property Address: 311 Marine Street
   b. Date of Approval: 01/28/2020
   c. Project: Reroof, GAF charcoal color.

2. Applicant: Clint Hill
   a. Property Address: 1121 Selma Street
   b. Date of Approval: 01/29/2020
   c. Project: Repaint house with Benjamin Moore Paint Colors: Heritage Red for door, Cabbage Patch for shutters, Dill Weed for structure and Linen White for trim. Replace front door with fiberglass half-light, historically appropriate design and paint.

3. Applicant: Gregory Gordon
   a. Property Address: 912 Palmetto Street
   b. Date of Approval: 01/31/2020
   c. Project: Reroof with asphalt shingle roof, charcoal black.

4. Applicant: Catherine Laughlin
   a. Property Address: 1224 Willie Blackman Lane
   b. Date of Approval: 01/31/2020
   c. Project: Reroof asphalt shingles, charcoal gray.

5. Applicant: Courtney Kelly
   a. Property Address: 68 N Monterey Street
   b. Date of Approval: 02/04/2020
   c. Project: Repaint house: body white; columns white; porch deck dark green; porch ceiling Palladian blue.

6. Applicant: Government Street Presbyterian
   a. Property Address: 300 Government Street
   b. Date of Approval: 02/05/2020
   c. Project: Mostly interior termite repair, may require minor exterior work, all to match original in material, profile, and dimension.

   a. Property Address: 1752 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 02/06/2020
   c. Project: Reroof with Timberline Architectural Shingles, pewter in color.
8. Applicant: All Weather Roofing & Construction LLC  
   a. Property Address: 1259 Selma Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 02/10/2020  
   c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles, 35 squares, Weatherwood color.

9. Applicant: Bryant Olson  
   a. Property Address: 1802 Old Government Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 02/11/2020  
   c. Project: Repair/replace damaged stucco to match original; reroof porch, carefully preserving original ceramic tile and replacing after finished; repair to main roof as necessary keeping original tile; repaint.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2020-06-CA: 257 N. Jackson Street  
   a. Applicant: Mr. Craig Roberts, Architect, on behalf of Ms. Mary Catherine Betz and Mr. Bob West  
   b. Project: New construction: residence  
      APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2020-07-CA: 101 S. Jackson Street / 255 Government Street  
   a. Applicant: Mr. Philip Olivier on behalf of Mr. James Huger  
   b. Project: Install one 15’x3’ double-sided blade sign  
      CONCEPTUALLY APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

   a. Applicant: Stephanie Nowell of Mitchell Signs on behalf of Garner Dental Group  
   b. Project: Install 7’-10”x4’-8 5/16” monument sign  
      DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2020-08-CA: 73 S. Lafayette Street  
   a. Applicant: Ms. Karlene Kegley  
   b. Project: New construction: two-car garage with second floor storage  
      WITHDRAWN. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

5. 2020-05-CA: 37 Blacklawn Street  
   a. Applicant: Lukas Builders on behalf of Mr. Steve Lowell  
   b. Project: Construct covered patio behind garage  
      APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

   The next ARB meeting is scheduled for March 4, 2020.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2020-06-CA: 257 N. Jackson Street
Applicant: Mr. Craig Roberts, Architect, on behalf of Ms. Mary Catherine Betz and Mr. Bob West
Received: 1/23/2020
Meeting: 2/19/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Vacant
Zoning: T-4
Project: New construction: single-family residence

BUILDING HISTORY

The property proposed for development is a vacant lot enclosed on all four sides by a masonry wall. The 1902 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows a two-story brick dwelling with front and rear double gallery porches on the property. The building footprint appears to be that of an offset wing house, commonly constructed in Mobile in the decade from 1850 to 1860. The house (with an apparent hipped roof) appears in aerial photographs in 1938 (www.alabamamap.ua.edu), 1952, 1955, 1967, and possibly 1980 (www.historicaerials.com); however, the lot became vacant by 1997.

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 (ARB) in August 2013, when the ARB approved changes to a previously approved (June 2013) application for a new construction residence.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (Guidelines) state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Maintain the visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street.
      a. Where front yard setbacks are uniform, place a new structure in general alignment with its neighbors.
      b. Where front yard setbacks vary, place a new structure within the established range of front yard setbacks on a block.” (6.34)
   2. “Maintain the side yard spacing pattern.
      a. Locate a structure to preserve the side yard spacing pattern on the block as seen from the street.
      b. Provide sufficient side setbacks for property maintenance.
3. “Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.
   a. Choose the massing and shape of new construction to maintain a rhythm of massing along the street.
   b. Match the proportions of the front elevations of a new structure with those in the surrounding district.” (6.36)

4. “Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.
   a. Use a building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.
   b. Size foundation and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings.
   c. Match the scale of the porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings.” (6.37)

5. “Design exterior building walls to reflect traditional building patterns of nearby historic structures.
   a. Use a ratio of solid to void that is similar in proportion to those of nearby historic buildings.
   b. Reflect the rhythm of windows and doors in a similar fashion on all exterior building walls.
   c. Use steps and balusters in a similar fashion as nearby historic structures.
   d. Design building elements on exterior building walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings.” (6.38)

6. “Use exterior building materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.
   a. Use material, ornamentation, or a color scheme that blends with the historic district rather than making the building stand out.
   b. Use a material with proven durability in the Mobile climate that is similar in scale, character, and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings.” (6.39)

7. “Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.
   a. Design the roof shape, height, pitch, and overall complexity to be similar to those on nearby historic buildings.
   b. Use materials that appear similar in character, scale, texture, and color range to those on nearby historic buildings.” (6.40)

8. “Design a door and doorway on new construction to be compatible with the historic district.
   a. Place and size a door to establish a solid-to-void ration similar to that of nearby historic buildings.
   b. Place a door in a fashion that contributes to the traditional rhythm of the district as seen in nearby historic buildings.
   c. Incorporate a door casement and trim similar to those seen on nearby historic buildings.
   d. Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight, or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.
   e. Use a door material that blends well with surrounding historic buildings. Wood is preferred. Paneled doors with or without glass are generally appropriate.” (6.41)

9. “Design a porch to be compatible with the neighborhood.
   a. Include a front porch as part of new construction if it is contextual and feasible.
b. When designing a porch, consider porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, balustrades, and porches in the district.
c. Design the elements of a porch to be at a scale proportional to the main building.
d. Where a rhythm of porches exists on a street or block, design a porch that continues this historic rhythm.” (6.42)
10. “Design piers, a foundation, and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
   a. Use raised pier foundations.
   b. Do not use raw concrete block or exposed slabs.
   c. If foundation infill must be used, ensure that it is compatible with the neighborhood.
   d. If solid infill is used, recess it and screen it with landscaping.
   e. If lattice is used, hang it below the floor framing and between the piers. Finish it with trim.
   f. Do not secure lattice to the face of the building or foundation.” (6.43)
11. “Use details and ornamentation that help new construction integrate with the historic buildings in the district.
   a. Use decorative detail in a manner similar to those on nearby historic buildings. A modern interpretation of a historic detail or decoration is encouraged.
   b. Do not use a decorative detail that overpowers or negatively impacts nearby historic buildings.” (6.44)
12. “Locate and design windows to be compatible with those in the district.
   a. Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic buildings.
   b. Locate a window to create a traditional rhythm and a proportion of openings similar to that seen in nearby historic buildings.
   c. Use a traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.
   d. Place a window to match the height of the front doorway.
   e. Place a window so that there is proportionate space between the window and the floor level.
   f. Do not place a window to directly abut the fascia of a building.
   g. Use a window material that is compatible with other building materials.
   h. Do not use a reflective or tinted glass window.
   i. Use a 1/1 window instead of a window with false muntins. A double-paned window may be acceptable if the interior dividers and dimensional muntins are used on multi-light windows. A double-paned 1/1 window is acceptable.
   j. Do not use fake interior muntins except as stated above.
   k. Use a window opening with a raised surround on a wood frame building.” (6.45)
13. “Design shutters and awnings to be compatible with the building.
   a. Use a shutter that fits the reveal of a window opening precisely.” (6.46)
14. “Design shutters and awnings to be compatible with the district.
   a. Use operable blinds or shutter units hung with hinges.
   b. When using artificial materials, use a blind or shutter unit that has a thickness, weight, and design similar to wood. An artificial material shutter will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
   c. Use an operable shutter where feasible.
   d. Where a blind or shutter is fixed, hang it on a window casing in a manner to replicate an operable shutter.” (6.47)

C. Scope of Work:
   1. Construct a single-family residence.
a. The house would be set back from the North Jackson Street right-of-way (ROW) approximately 17’.
b. The house would appear to rest on a raised pier foundation but, in fact, rest on a concrete slab over compacted fill. The height of the first floor above grade would be 4’-0”. The “Old World Mould” beige brick-clad piers supporting the front and rear porches would be infilled with framed composite lattice panels painted “shutter green.” The foundation supporting the house itself would be disguised by brick pilasters infilled with recessed brick veneer. The infilled areas would be accentuated by 22 ½”x14 ½” aluminum faux vents.
c. The walls would be clad in 6” lapped HardiePlank siding.
d. The ceiling heights would be 11’-0” on the first floor and 9’-0” on the second floor.
e. The aluminum-clad windows would be multi-light, six-over-six, double-hung, aluminum clad sashes with insulated glass and applied 5/8” muntins.
f. Doors would be composed of aluminum clad, metal or wood.
g. The dominant roof would be side-gabled and clad in charcoal gray dimensional fiberglass shingles.
h. East Elevation (Façade)  
   1) The East Elevation would be dominated by the east slope of the roof and the full-width (45’-0”) porch.
   2) The porch would be five (5) bays wide and would be sheltered by an integral roof supported by six (6) boxed 9” square columns.
   3) The porch would be 10’-0” deep and would be surrounded by a plain wood balustrade.
   4) The porch would be accessed by a flight of wooden composite steps at the north and south sides.
   5) The porch would be supported by brick veneer piers infilled with framed lattice panels.
   6) Fenestration will be as follows from south to north: six-over-six window; six-over-six window; clad paneled door framed by full-height sidelights and multi-pane transom with applied muntins; six-over-six window, and six-over-six window. All windows would be flanked by working louvered shutters with hardware, painted Shutter Green.
   7) A single-car carport and storage area would be set back from the easternmost plane of the east elevation on the south end. The carport would have a side-gabled roof resting on a boxed column on a brick veneer pier. The east wall of the storage area would be clad in 6” lapped HardiePlank, and the storage area would be accessible via a pair of centered, wood, paneled doors.
i. North (right side) Elevation  
   1) The porch steps and porch opening would define the easternmost most portion of the North Elevation, and the back porch, steps, and the north elevation of the studio would define the westernmost portion of the elevation.
   2) The North Elevation’s fenestration (from east to west) would be as follows: six-over-six window; six-over-six window, and six-over-six window in the northernmost plane of the elevation on the first floor and one six-over-six window on the second floor. All windows would be flanked by working louvered shutters with hardware, painted Shutter Green.
   3) The fenestration behind (south of) the rear porch would be as follows (from east to west): six-over-six window; six-over-six window, and six-over-six window.
   4) The porch at the west end of the elevation would have an integral roof supported by a boxed column at the west end and would be supported by brick veneer piers infilled with framed lattice panels.
5) A false louvered vent of composite material would be located in the apex of the gable.

j. West (Rear) Elevation
1) The rear elevation would consist of a partial-width porch at the north end, a rear-facing gable at center, and the side-gabled storage area at the south end.
2) The porch’s integral roof would be supported by three boxed columns and surrounded by a plain balustrade. The porch would be supported by brick veneer piers infilled with framed lattice panels.
3) Fenestration on the West Elevation would be as follows, from north to south: six-over-six window flanked by louvered shutters; four-over-four window; eight-light clad door with applied muntins framed by full-height sidelights and multi-light transom with applied muntins: six-over-six window; six-over-six window; six-over-six window, and false window with inset working shutters.

k. South (side) Elevation
1) The South Elevation’s fenestration (from west to east) would be as follows on the first floor: six-over-six window; six-over-six window, and six-over-six window. There would be one six-over-six window on the second floor. All windows would be flanked by working louvered shutters with hardware, painted Shutter Green.
2) A false louvered vent of composite material would be located in the apex of the gable.
3) The gabled roof of the carport, located at center-left of the elevation, would be supported by the lapped HardiePlank-sided storage area and two boxed columns resting on brick-veneer piers.
   i) Two of the three first-floor windows and stairs leading to a side entrance (not visible behind the storage area) would be sheltered under the carport roof.
      a. A false louvered vent of composite material would be located in the apex of the carport gable.

2. Conduct site improvements.
   a. Install newly fabricated iron gate at north end of existing east side wall, pattern to match existing inside walls
   b. Install bluestone patio and fountain sculpture behind house (northwest corner)
   c. Install “turfstone” grass-filled paver driveway at southeast corner of property and concrete parking pad under carport.
   d. Install bluestone walkway from gate at northeast corner of front wall to north side steps to front porch.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 257 N. Jackson Street, is located within the DeTonti Square Historic District. The application under review involves construction of a single-family residence on an inner lot. Several items are taken into account for new construction residences including placement, mass, scale, and building components.

With regard to placement, two components are taken into account – setback from the street and distance between buildings. The “Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts” state that new buildings should be responsive to and maintain the alignment of traditional façade lines (see B.1), as well as the rhythm of side and rear setbacks (see B.2). The property under review, an inner block lot, is located adjacent to/in the vicinity of contributing buildings. In accord with Design Guidelines, the setbacks reflect the historical character of the contributing aspects of the built landscape. The proposed placement negotiates the placement of the buildings located within 150’ of the
The Design Review Guidelines state that mass - the relationship of the parts of the larger whole comprising a building - for new construction should be in keeping with arrangement and proportion of surrounding historic residences (B.3). The proposed house adopts a traditional raised Gulf Coast cottage massing. A dominant gabled roof tops the building. The East (façade) elevation’s recessed porch is typical of the neighborhood and the building type. The outward massing of the building, a rectangular block with a front porch surmounted by a gabled roof, is similar to massing found in the neighborhood on buildings such as that at 303 N. Jackson Street (see B.7). The scale and massing of the proposed house recall historic porch-fronted residences (see B.3 and B.4). The height of the foundation seems to mimic traditional foundation heights (see B.4). While a raised slab in construction, the foundation would feature brick facing. The massing of the structure, the first floor being 11’ ceilings below a 9’ second story height, is compatible with the architectural context of the contributing landscape in which it is situated (see B.4).

Scale refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings. The “Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction” state that new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings (see B.4). The adjacent residence at 255 N. Jackson Street is one story in height, and the residences at 261 and 303 N. Jackson Street are one and on-half stories in height, as the proposed residence would be. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph addressing massing, the height of the ceilings and pitch of the roof combine to form a whole that would be compatible with surrounding architectural landscape.

With regard to building components, the Design Review Guidelines call for responsiveness to traditional design patterns. As mentioned in the portion of the narrative articulating massing, the typology evoked has precedent in the immediate and surrounding landscape (see B.8 and B.11). The simple paneled door employed for the front (east elevation) entrance reflects doors seen on similar residences in the district, and the use of sidelights and a transom is well preceded (see B.8). The sash window types and wall treatment are visually compatible with the surrounding architectural and historical context (see B.11-B.14, B.5 and B.6). The proposed window spacing mimics a traditional solid-to-void ratio along the East elevation (façade) (see B.12).

In accord with the “Design Guidelines for New Construction”, the building materials, while modern alternatives, blend with those employed in the past and in immediate surroundings (see B.6). Hardieboard siding and aluminum clad windows and doors are approved for new construction within Mobile’s historic districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-14) above, Staff believes the proposed new construction of a single-family residence on the property would not impair the historic character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Roberts, the owner’s representative and an ARB member, recused himself and was present to discuss the application.
BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

The Board had no questions or comments.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one speaking either in favor of or opposition to the application, Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Wagoner moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff’s report, as written.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Davis and was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Wagoner moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed new construction residence would not impair the integrity of the neighborhood and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Davis and was approved unanimously.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2020-07-CA: 101 S. Jackson Street / 255 Government Street
Applicant: Philip Olivier on behalf of James Huger
Received: 1/31/2020
Meeting: 2/19/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: T-5.2
Project: Install one 15’x3’ double-sided blade sign

BUILDING HISTORY

The subject property is a five-story parking garage, constructed c. 1991. The 1904 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows a garage at the northwestern corner of this property and a two-story dwelling at the northeast corner. Three additional houses were located south of the garage, one along Church Street, and a paint store was located at the northeast corner of Jackson and Church streets. According to historic aerial photography, a rectangular building (possibly the same garage depicted on the 1904 map) was present at the northwest corner in 1952, as well as two smaller, square buildings at the south end of the parcel. This arrangement persisted until at least 1960. By the date of the next available aerial photo, 1967, the entire parcel was unimproved and appeared to be used for parking. That situation remained until the parking garage was constructed in the 1990s (www.historicaerials.com).

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. Per the MHDC vertical files, this property appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) in 1990, when the existing parking garage was approved.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (Guidelines) state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Design a new sign to be compatible with the character of a building and the district.” (11.3)
   2. “New signs are restricted to a maximum of 64 square feet.” (11.5)
   3. “Use a sign material that is compatible with the materials of the building on which it is placed and the district. New materials that achieve the effect of traditional materials and lighting solutions will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
      a. Do not use highly reflective materials for a sign. All plastic-faced box signs are not allowed.
      b. Design a sign to be subordinate to the building façade.” (11.7)
   4. “Where necessary, use a compatible, shielded light source to illuminate a sign.
      a. Consider direct lighting toward a sign from an external, shielded lamp when possible.
      b. Use a warm colored light to illuminate a sign when possible.
c. If halo lighting is used to accentuate a sign or building, locate the light source so that it is not visible.
d. If a back-lit sign is used, illuminate each individual letter or element separately.

5. Acceptable sign materials include “painted or carved wood; individual wood or cast metal letters or symbols; stone, such as slate, marble, or sandstone; painted, gilded, or sandblasted glass; metal, provided it is appropriate to the architectural character of the building.”

6. Unacceptable sign materials include “whole plastic face” and “metal inappropriate for the architectural character of the building.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted application and plans):

1. Install one 15’x3’ aluminum blade sign (double-sided) at the southeast corner of the parking garage.
2. The sign colors would be red and white, and the sign would read “Park Here” and include the “P” logo and “Premium Parking” name, as well as the location number.
3. The sign would be affixed to the structure using a flat steel T-bracket.
4. No illumination is proposed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a non-contributing structure in the Church Street East Historic District. This application proposes the installation of one 15’x3’ blade sign at the southeast corner of the garage, along Church Street. Four signs exist currently on the property, but their square footage was not provided in the application.

The proposed sign material, aluminum, would be compatible with the building to which it would be attached, as the structure is non-historic (B.1, B.3, and B.5). The sign would be subordinate to the building, as it would not compete with the massive structure (B.3). The proposed size of the sign would not be in conformance with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, as elaborated below. The sign area would be ninety (90) square feet, and the Guidelines limit the size of all signs on a property to 64 square feet. Furthermore, the square footage of the existing signage is unknown.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B.2 above, Staff believes that the sign proposed in this application would impair the historical character the surrounding district. Staff recommends denial of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Mitchell Erwin, the owner’s representative, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

For the purpose of determining whether certain existing signage counts against the square footage total for the property, Ms. Dawson inquired whether the surface parking lot to the immediate east of the subject parking garage was operating on the same business license as the garage. Mr. Erwin stated the two had separate business licenses.
Mr. Roberts inquired whether the color used on the sign would be red or brown. He stated that a brown color resembling brick would be more pleasing. Mr. Erwin stated that the intended color is red.

Mr. Stone noted that existing signage is approximately 15.67 square feet, and if that is subtracted from the proposed signage area, the application could be approved. A 3’x8’ sign would allow the applicant to conform to the size limits for signs in historic districts.

Mr. Erwin asked if the ARB could grant him a variance for the size of the proposed sign. Mr. Stone stated that the ARB does not grant variances; that is a power of the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Stone stated that the applicant can either withdraw the application and amend the application by reducing the size of the proposed sign, or have the application denied and wait six (6) months to re-apply.

Mr. Erwin inquired which four signs had been counted against the total square footage already in place. Staff stated the existing signs on the property that count against the permitted square footage are the pedestrian entry sign on the Government Street elevation, the security camera sign on the Jackson Street elevation, and the two signs at the garage entry on the Joachim Street side. Mr. Erwin asked if one or more of those signs were removed, could the acceptable square footage of the proposed sign be raised above the 48 square feet Mr. Stone had suggested. The Board stated that was a possibility.

Mr. Stone stated that the ARB could approve the proposed application contingent on the applicant working with Staff to bring the total square footage of signage on the property into conformance with the Guidelines.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one speaking either in favor of or opposition to the application, Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Wagoner moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff’s report, as written.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Davis and was approved unanimously.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Wagoner moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the sign be granted a Certificate of Appropriateness, contingent on the applicant bringing the square footage of all signage on the property into conformance with the Guidelines. The ARB also recommended that the applicant consider a color other than red.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Davis and was approved unanimously.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-55-CA: 1754 Government Street
Applicant: Stephanie Nowell of Mitchell Signs on behalf of Garner Dental Group
Received: 1/28/2020
Meeting: 2/19/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B1
Project: Install 7'-10"x4'-8 5/16" monument sign

BUILDING HISTORY

According to the Mobile County tax assessor’s record, the building was constructed in 1965. The structure appears on the 1967 aerial photo of the area, supporting the tax assessor’s date. The one-story, brick veneered commercial building rests on a slightly raised foundation and is covered with a hipped roof. The property appears to retain its original steel windows on the north and south elevations. The windows on the east and west elevations were replaced circa 1990, and a handicapped accessibility ramp was added to the east elevation at approximately the same time.

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 appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) in December 2019, when the ARB approved the painting of the brick veneer exterior and the repainting of the trim and doors. This property last appeared before the ARB in January 2020; the application for a new monument sign was withdrawn in order for the applicant to adjust the design.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, in pertinent part, state the following.
   1. “Design a new sign to be compatible with the character of a building and the district.” (11.3)
   2. “New signs are restricted to a maximum of 64 square feet.” (11.5)
   3. “Use a sign material that is compatible with the materials of the building on which it is placed and the district. New materials that achieve the effect of traditional materials and lighting solutions will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
      a. Do not use highly reflective materials for a sign. All plastic-faced box signs are not allowed.
      b. Design a sign to be subordinate to the building façade.” (11.7)
   4. “Where necessary, use a compatible, shielded light source to illuminate a sign.
      a. Consider direct lighting toward a sign from an external, shielded lamp when possible.
      b. Use a warm colored light to illuminate a sign when possible.
c. If halo lighting is used to accentuate a sign or building, locate the light source so that it is not visible.
d. If a back-lit sign is used, illuminate each individual letter or element separately.
5. Acceptable sign materials include “painted or carved wood; individual wood or cast metal letters or symbols; stone, such as slate, marble, or sandstone; painted, gilded, or sandblasted glass; metal, provided it is appropriate to the architectural character of the building.”
6. Unacceptable sign materials include “whole plastic face” and “metal inappropriate for the architectural character of the building.”

C. Scope of Work Per submitted application and plans):
1. Remove existing monument sign.
2. Install a newly fabricated aluminum monument sign.
   a. The sign would measure 7’-10” wide by 4’-8 5/16” tall.
   b. The sign would be composed of aluminum.
   c. The sign would be mounted between two brick piers, each measuring 6’-2 ½” tall.
   d. The sign text would be “Midtown Dental Studio.”
   e. The proposed colors to be used are black and white.
   f. The sign would be externally illuminated.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the removal of the existing monument sign with an area of 48 square feet and the installation of a new monument sign with an area of 73.52 square feet. The proposed sign would be composed of aluminum.

The previously considered sign design measured 6’ tall and 6’ wide, for a total area of 72 square feet (double-faced), and the sign would have been internally lit. That design was not approved by the ARB due to its size and method of lighting.

The area of the proposed sign would not be in conformance with the Guidelines, as it would be larger by almost 10 square feet (73.52) than the area allowed under the Guidelines (64 square feet) (B.2). The proposed sign would be externally lit, which conforms to the Guidelines (B.4), but the method of lighting is not specified in the application.

As to materials, the Guidelines state that metals may be used if they are “appropriate to the architectural character of the building (B.3).” The associated building on the property was constructed in the mid-20th century, an era in which aluminum was used often. Therefore, the proposed sign material is in conformance with the Guidelines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-5) above, Staff believes the proposed monument sign would impair the historic character of the surrounding district due to its excessive size. Staff recommends denial of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor the applicant’s representative was present to discuss the application.
BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Roberts inquired about the proposed colors to be used on the sign. Ms. Dawson stated the colors would be white and black.

Mr. Stone noted that the lighting of the sign had been changed to an external source from an internal one, but that the size was still not in conformance with the Guidelines.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one speaking either in favor of or opposition to the application, Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff’s report, as written.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Wagoner and was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed sign would materially impair the integrity of the historic district and a Certificate of Appropriateness not be granted.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Wagoner and was approved unanimously.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD

2020-08-CA: 73 S. Lafayette Street  
Applicant: Karlene Kegley  
Received: 2/3/2020  
Meeting: 2/19/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: New construction: two-car garage with second floor storage

BUILDING HISTORY

The hip-roofed, frame bungalow type house on this property was constructed c. 1900.

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. According to the MHDC vertical files, this property has not appeared previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part, state the following.
   1. “A new accessory structure should be compatible with those in the district.”
   2. “Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.” (9.1)
   3. “Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district...traditionally located at the rear of a lot.” (9.2)
   4. “Materials that are compatible with the historic district in scale and character are acceptable. These often include wood frame, masonry, cement-based fiber siding [and] installations (pre-made, store-bought sheds, provided they are minimally visible from public areas).” (9.2)
   5. “Materials that are not compatible with the historic district in scale and character are unacceptable. These often include metal (except for a greenhouse), plastic (except for a greenhouse), [and] fiberglass (except for a greenhouse).” (9.2)

C. Scope of Work (per submitted application and plans):
   1. Construct a front-gabled two-car garage with upstairs storage loft at the southeast corner (far corner) of the property.
   2. The main building footprint would be 25’ wide by 35’-7” wide and measure 25’ in height.
3. The walls would be clad in 1x8” HardiePlank cementitious siding, and the roofing would be fiberglass architectural shingles. The color is not specified in the application.
4. The windows would be wood or aluminum clad with insulated glass.
5. The doors, including the garage door, would be made of wood.
6. The ceiling height would be 9’ on the first and second floors, and the division of the floors would be elaborated by a 12” trimboard circling all four sides of the building.
7. The siding would be painted Sherwin Williams Dover White, and the trim would be painted Tricon Black.
8. West Elevation (façade)
   a. The west elevation would be composed of a set of exterior stairs at the north end and the single two-car-wide garage door on the first floor. The second floor would consist of a stair landing at the north end and a full-width porch.
   b. The gabled roof over the porch would be supported by four (4) plain 8x8” posts and enclosed by plain 2x2” balusters with 2x4” upper and lower rails.
9. West Elevation (façade)
   a. The west elevation would be composed of a set of exterior stairs at the north end and the single two-car-wide garage door on the first floor. The second floor would consist of a stair landing at the north end and a full-width porch.
   b. The gabled roof over the porch would be supported by four (4) plain 8x8” posts and enclosed by plain 2x2” balusters with 2x4” upper and lower rails.
9. The fenestration on the second level would be as follows: one-over-one window; one-over-one window; one-over-one window; one-over-one window, and single-light glass door.
   a. The first floor would be clad in brick veneer.
9. South Elevation (right side)
   a. There would be no fenestration on the south elevation.
   b. The second-floor porch and outdoor stairs (on the north elevation) would be visible at the west end of the elevation.
10. East Elevation
    a. A single one-over-one window would be present on the first and second floors of the east (rear) elevation.
    b. The outdoor stair leading to the second-floor porch would be visible at the north end of the elevation.
11. North Elevation
    a. Fenestration on the first floor of the north elevation would consist of two wood paneled doors, one toward the east end and one at the west end. There would be a set of paired one-over-one windows toward the east end of the second floor.
    b. The set of steps leading to the second-floor porch and the north end of the second-floor porch would be located at the west end of the elevation.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

The subject property, 73 S. Lafayette Street, is a contributing property on an inner lot within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review involves construction of a new, freestanding, two-story, two-car garage. The second floor would include an integral porch on the west (front) elevation.

The proposed garage clearly would be subordinate to the existing house, as it would have a smaller footprint and be placed behind the house in such a way that it likely would not be obvious from the street (B.2-3). The proposed garage would be compatible with the architecture in the neighborhood, as its architectural elements, including a front-gabled roof and lapped cladding would echo those of the existing house on the property (B.1). Further, the proposed materials are in conformance with those outlined in the Guidelines (B.4).

**CLARIFICATIONS**

1. What is the proposed color of the roofing?
STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B.1-B.5 above, Staff does not believe the proposed garage would impair the architectural or historical character of the existing house on the property or the surrounding district. Upon clarification of the two questions above, Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Karlene Kegley, the property owner, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Ms. Van Antwerp noted that the first floor of the façade would be clad in brick, and she asked whether there was any precedent for the use of brick in the house. Ms. Kegley stated that brick is used on the front of the house, to either side of the front steps.

Ms. Kegley clarified that the roof material and color would match that existing on the house, and the existing outbuildings would be removed. One would be disposed of, and the other would be placed elsewhere on the property.

Mr. Wagoner asked whether, although it is outside the purview of the ARB, the applicant intended to use the second-floor space marked “Storage” as a living area. He felt he should advise Ms. Kegley that questions will arise regarding the use of the second-floor space. Ms. Kegley stated that the space would be used as overflow living space when she had a large number of guests. Mr. Wagoner did not believe the existing zoning of the property would allow for that.

Mr. Stone noted that the applicant had provided photos of nearby accessory structures that are one and one-half stories in height, not the full two stories the applicant is requesting. The house on the property is a bungalow, not two stories in height. Mr. Stone further noted that the letter received by the Board from a neighbor pointed out that the proposed garage would have windows on all sides and would allow views into neighbors’ backyards. Mr. Stone recommended that the garage height be shortened to one and one-half stories.

Mr. Roberts inquired whether there was a way to get the same square footage without going up (to a second floor). He mentioned the option of going to a Design Review Committee for ideas.

Ms. Davis stated her opinion, in response to the applicant stating she wanted the building to be attractive, that the structure would look better if scaled down.

Mr. Stone commented that going to the Design Review Committee will not insure approval. He recommended withdrawing the application and coming back.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one other than the property owner speaking either in favor of or opposition to the application, Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.
FINDING OF FACT

No motion was made on the facts.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

The application was withdrawn.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2020-09-CA: 37 Blacklawn Street
Applicant: Mike Lukas of Lukas Builders for Steve Lowell
Received: 2/3/2020
Meeting: 2/19/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct covered patio behind garage

BUILDING HISTORY

Prior to the construction of the existing house on the property in 2016, the two lots upon which it is located had been vacant since at least 1952.

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. According to the MHDC files, this property appeared previously appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) in 2016, when plans for the existing house were approved.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (Guidelines) state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Design a porch to be compatible with the neighborhood.
      b. When designing a porch, consider porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, balustrades, and porches in the district.
      b. Design the elements of a porch to be at a scale proportional to the main building.
      c. Design a rear porch that is visible from the public right-of-way to be subordinate in character to the front porch.” (6.42)

C. Scope of Work (per submitted application and plans):
   1. Construct a covered patio directly behind the garage.
   2. The footprint of the patio would be 22’ wide by 16’ deep.
   3. The concrete patio would be covered by a rear-gabled roof supported by three (3) 8”x8” boxed columns resting on stone-veneered piers.
   4. The roof will be covered in shingles to match the existing house.
   5. North Elevation
      a. The elevation would consist of the open patio and a single support at the northwest corner.
b. An outdoor fireplace, clad in stone veneer to match the roof supports, would be visible at the far side of the patio.

5. West Elevation
   a. The elevation would consist of the gable end of the roof supported by three boxed columns on masonry piers. The gabled end would be clad in HardiePlank to match the existing house.
   b. The west side of the outdoor fireplace would be visible at the south end of the elevation.

6. South Elevation
   a. The south elevation would consist of one porch roof support at the west end and the back of the outdoor fireplace.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the construction of a covered patio behind the garage of a new-construction residence in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The covered patio would be clearly subordinate to the existing house and garage, as the roofline would sit below that of the existing building, and its footprint would be smaller than the existing garage, which measures 22x22'. Furthermore, the proposed materials and paint colors for the covered patio match those of the existing, previously approved house (B.1).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B.1 above, Staff believes the proposed patio would not impair the historic character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Steve Lowell, the property owner was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Ms. Davis asked if the covered patio would be visible from the street. Ms. Dawson stated it would not.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one speaking either in favor of or opposition to the application, Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff’s report, as written.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Wagoner and was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed covered patio would not impair the historic or architectural integrity of the neighborhood and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.
The motion was seconded by Mr. Wagoner and was approved unanimously.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for March 4, 2020.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:51 p.m.