ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
October 17th 2018 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The acting Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
   Members Present: Harris Oswalt, Bob Allen, John Ruzic, David Barr, and Nick Holmes.
   Staff Members Present: Bridget Daniel, John Sledge, Marion McElroy and Paige Largue.

2. Mr. Ruzic moved to approve the minutes of the September 19th and October 3rd meeting. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

3. Mr. Ruzic moved to approve the MidMonths. The motion received a second and was approved with one opposed, Mr. Allen.

B. MIDMONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. Applicant: John and Kristen Rand
   a. Property Address: 163 Houston Street
   b. Date of Approval: 9/25/2018
   c. Project: Construct 6’ or below wooden dogeared privacy fence behind front plane of house and along the perimeter of lot. Install compressor behind fence on southern wall. Repair window on northern elevation to match or replace to match.

2. Applicant: Linda Tenhundfield on behalf of the Mattress Factory HOA
   a. Property Address: 412 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 9/25/2018
   c. Project: Repair/replace damaged brick; repaint woodwork to match existing; repair exterior balcony supports.

3. Applicant: Frank Allen
   a. Property Address: 1002 New St. Francis Street
   b. Date of Approval: 9/28/2018
   c. Project: Construct 6’ wooden dogeared fence that tie into the western perimeter of the lot, and run behind the front plane of the house.

4. Applicant: Central Townhomes
   a. Property Address: 1110 Government Street
   b. Date of Approval: 10/1/2018
   c. Project: Reroof to match existing.

5. Applicant: Mike Marshall
   a. Property Address: 163 S. Georgia Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 10/1/2018
   c. Project: Reroof with thirty year shingle charcoal gray.

6. Applicant: Martha Hamilton
   a. Property Address: 1407 Government Street
   b. Date of Approval: 10/1/2018
   c. Project: Reroof with thirty year Timberline, flash chimneys.

7. Applicant: Sims Mobile
   a. Property Address: 500 Marine Street
   b. Date of Approval: 10/2/2018
   c. Project: Reroof charcoal gray asphalt.
8. **Applicant**: Stacia Rogers  
   a. Property Address: 1417 Brown Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 10/2/2018  

9. **Applicant**: Irvin Grodsky  
   a. Property Address: 7 N. Hamilton Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 10/2/2018  
   c. Project: Re-deck as necessary and reroof; repair/replace rotten wood in eaves, porch ceiling, and wherever else needed per existing in profile and dimension; tuck point and repair brick as needed; repaint white.

10. **Applicant**: Kelli Johnson with Wrico Signs  
    a. Property Address: 952 Government Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 10/3/2018  
    c. Project: Install one painted wood freestanding stand. Sign will be 3’9” in height by 6’6” in width with 4x4 post and caps.

11. **Applicant**: Michael and Clarice Bettne  
    a. Property Address: 263 Dexter Avenue  
    b. Date of Approval: 10/3/2018  
    c. Project: Install pre-fabricated shed with wooden siding, no windows, and double door on the front elevation and galvalume metal roof or shingles at rear or lot behind house. Paint to match the residence.

12. **Applicant**: Eric May of One Stop Contractors on behalf of Child Day Care Association  
    a. Property Address: 209 S. Washington Avenue  
    b. Date of Approval: 10/3/2018  
    c. Project: Replace existing playhouse with wooden playhouse 10’ x 12’ in footprint.

13. **Applicant**: Amanda Kramer  
    a. Property Address: 1458 Brown Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 10/3/2018  
    c. Project: Replace damaged column to match existing front porch columns in dimension, profile and material. Repaint in light grey body, white trim, and cornflower blue door.

14. **Applicant**: May Restoration, Inc.  
    a. Property Address: 957 Savannah Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 10/4/2108  
    c. Project: Repair deteriorated wood to match in dimension, profile, and material. Repair column on front porch.

15. **Applicant**: Twin Hotels, LLC  
    a. Property Address: 301 Government Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 10/4/2018  

16. **Applicant**: Keith Sherrill  
    a. Property Address: 806 Monroe Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 10/5/2018  
    c. Project: Repair existing metal roof and metal casement windows to match. Windows will be painted darker than body of building. On East elevation, replace existing door with new storefront door. Install new storefront system behind existing sliding door. Install new metal doors on West elevation in existing openings. On South elevation replace
flush door with metal door and paint in Farrow and Ball "Setting Plaster.” Repaint in Farrow and Ball" Downpipe Gray." Install car charging stations.

17. Applicant:  Michael and Michelle Rumpf
   a. Property Address:  963 Palmetto Street
   b. Date of Approval:  10/9/2018
   c. Project:  Replace siding to match in material, profile, and dimension in East elevation.

C. APPLICATIONS

   a. Applicant:  Ben Cummings of Cummings Architecture Corp. on behalf of CA Property, LLC

HELDOWNER.

D. OTHER BUSINESS
   1. Next meeting will be held on November 7, 2018.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-37-CA: 1465 Government Street
Applicant: Ben Cummings of Cummings Architecture Corp. on behalf of CA Property, LLC
Received: 10/4/2018
Meeting: 10/17/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: (Vacant Lot)
Zoning: B-2
Project: New Construction: Construct new commercial building and conduct site improvements.

BUILDING HISTORY

This property is currently a vacant lot.

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 not appeared before the Architectural Review Board according to the MHDC vertical files. The proposed scope of work includes constructing a single story commercial building and conducting site improvements such as a new parking lot.
B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. Regarding the context of new design, there are three main types: “main street,” “commercial corridor,” and “interior neighborhood.”
   2. “The second context for new commercial construction is the commercial corridor. This refers to new commercial construction built along arterials at the periphery of a predominantly residential historic district. An example is a new commercial infill project on a parcel facing Government Street or Springhill Avenue that is also located within a locally designated historic district.”
   3. “In more recent years, commercial projects have begun developing alongside historic residential buildings on this corridor. In some cases, an infill site may be on a block face already completely developed with non-historic commercial properties.”
   4. “The location of new commercial infill within the block face in this context should also be considered. Corner locations may require considerations that are not relevant at mid-block locations. For this context, new commercial construction should strongly consider front setback distances, landscaped setbacks, and the transition between the commercial project and rear-adjacent historic properties to ensure compatibility with the orientation of nearby historic residential buildings in the district.”
   5. 7.30 “Orient a new commercial building to be similar to that of nearby historic structures.”
6. “Place buildings in line with adjacent historic buildings in terms of relationship to the street. If a project is flanked by non-historic structures, refer to nearby historic structures.”
7. “Design side setbacks to be similar to those in adjacent historic buildings. If a project is flanked by non-historic structures refer to nearby historic structures.”
8. “Orient façades of new commercial buildings similarly to adjacent historic structures. In most cases, new commercial structures should be oriented to directly face the street.”
9. “Face primary building entries toward the public street.”
10. “Screen ancillary buildings or place them behind the primary building.”
11. “New commercial construction in the Commercial Corridor context should prioritize front setback distances and landscape design in front yards in order to establish compatibility with nearby historic residential structures, if any exist. New commercial construction in this context should also be sensitive to rear-adjacent historic residential structures.”
12. “Place and orient new commercial construction on commercial corridors to be compatible with that of adjacent historic residential structures and the district.”
13. “Establish front setbacks similar to those in adjacent historic residential development or historic residential development on the same block.”
14. “Orient façades to be parallel with the street or in the orientation of historic residential structures that are adjacent or on the same block. In some cases, the orientation should be north-south depending on the historic context.”
15. “For corner lots, align a sidewall with historic residential structures located to the rear of project. Offset sidewalls built close to the street edge to be in line with historic residential structures at the rear of the project.”
16. “7.34 Design a building to be compatible with massing and scale with historic structures in the district.”
17. “7.35 Design building massing and scale to maintain the visual continuity of the district.”
18. “7.36 Maintain traditional spacing patterns created by the repetition of building widths along the street.”
19. “New commercial construction in the Commercial Corridor context should exhibit massing and scale that is similar to adjacent and nearby historic residential structures in the district. The design of massing and scale of buildings should also consider relationships to rear-adjacent historic residential structures.”
20. “Break down building massing to create separate volumes that are similar to the massing of adjacent and nearby historic residential structures.”
21. “Limit the height of a building to be similar to those of adjacent and nearby historic residential structures.”
22. “Where the lot lines of a commercial structure and residential structure meet, step down the height of the commercial building to match that of the adjacent residential structure.”
23. “7.47 Where new commercial construction is located adjacent to historic residential structures, use building materials that are compatible with those materials used in nearby historic buildings.”
24. “Use a material that is reflective of nearby historic residential structures, including wood siding.”

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

1. Construct a commercial building.
   a. The building will be setback over 50’ from the Government Street right of way.
   b. The house will comprise a square composition.
   c. The building will be 66’0” in width and 48’5” in depth.
   d. The walls will be brick.
   e. The windows will be aluminum storefront.
   f. A parapet will extend around three North, East, and West elevations.
g. Downspouts will be employed on the South (rear) elevation.

h. Flat roof forms will surmount the building.

2. North (Facade/Government Street-facing) Elevation
   a. The North Elevation will be defined by five sets of equidistant storefront systems.
   b. The storefront systems will be 8’8” in height with a 2’0” in height clerestory window separated by a metal canopy.
   c. An entrance door will be located in the westernmost storefront portion.
   d. An exit door will be located in the storefront on the eastern portion of the elevation.
   e. The metal canopy will span the width of the front façade and turn at the northwest corner.
   f. The parapet will be stepped and raked.
   g. The highest point of the parapet will be 22’ in height.
   h. The brick façade will feature brick accents in linear and rectilinear designs.

i. 3. East (side) Elevation
   a. The East Elevation will feature a stepped parapet.
   b. The brick façade will feature brick accents in linear and rectilinear designs.
   c. There will be no fenestration on this elevation which faces an inner lot.

4. South (rear) Elevation
   a. The South Elevation will be feature a painted metal door centrally located on the elevation.
   b. A metal canopy will extend over the door.
   c. There will be no parapet.
   d. Four downspouts will be located equidistant on the elevation.

5. West (side) Elevation
   a. The West Elevation will be feature a metal storefront system on the northern portion of the elevation.
   b. A metal canopy will span the width of the secondary façade and turn at the northwest corner.
   c. The brick façade will feature brick accents in linear and rectilinear designs.
   d. A stepped parapet will be employed.

6. Conduct site improvements.
   a. Install hard surfacing for new parking lot.
   b. Site will have a total of 18 parking paces located in the front and western side setbacks.
   c. Install a curb cut and drive from Dexter Avenue.
   d. Install a concrete walk spanning from 6’0” to 5’0” along the North, South, and West elevation adjacent to building.
   e. Install a drive located on the south side of the building leading to a dumpster pad and enclosure.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a commercial building on a corner lot. When reviewing applications for new commercial construction, the following principle criteria are taken into account: context; placement & orientation; massing; scale; façade elements; and materials.

New commercial design should conform to one of the following main typologies: main street, commercial corridor, or interior neighborhood. The property is located along a prominent arterial at the edge of the
Leinkauf historic district (See B-2). Buildings located in the commercial corridor context are in close proximity to historic residences.

Placement of commercial buildings in a commercial corridor context involves consideration setbacks and orientation (see B-4). Setbacks from the street and between buildings are taken into account. As to orientation, the building faces Government Street, the principle vehicular artery, but its entrance engages Dexter Avenue. The way the proposed building is oriented mimics other residential and commercial buildings along Government Street including Hollywood Beauty Supply (1501 Government Street) (See B-5). As the property is a corner lot, responsiveness to the setbacks of two street streets, Dexter Avenue in addition to Government Street, is warranted. With regard to the front setback, the building is setbacks over 50’0” from the Government Street right of way, and setback roughly 90’0’ from the Dexter Avenue right of way. When reviewing setbacks, front setbacks and landscaping is considered. The site plan shows a buffer between the right of way and parking lots adjacent to Government Street and Dexter Avenue. The site plan also illustrates a dumpster pad and enclosure located at the southeast corner of the property.

Plans do not depict much detail on the landscape plan and dumpster enclosure. Front setback within a 150’0” of the property include about 29’0” at 1501 Government Street (Child Care South); about 17’0” at 1503 Government Street; and about 36’0” at 1505 Government Street (residence) (See B-11). Side setbacks in a commercial corridor context should respond to adjacent commercial structures (See B-15). The business (157 Dexter Avenue, VIC Printing and Supply) south adjacent to the property is setback about 19’0” from the Dexter Avenue right of way. The setbacks of the building do not respond to historic setbacks seen on Government Street and Dexter Avenue.

Massing refers to the relationship between the component parts comprising a building. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that massing and scale of new commercial construction in a commercial corridor context should appear to be similar to that of historic buildings in the districts (See B-16). Scale is related to massing. Traditionally, most historic commercial buildings were situated close to the right of way. The building proposed is based on a commercial building seen in a corridor context in the Old Dauphin Way historic district located at 1714 Dauphin Street (Chaleur Method Brew and Espresso). The particular is also responsive to other historic commercial buildings in the distinct such as 1455 Monroe Street (former La Pizzeria) Both of these commercial buildings are rectangular in massing, and feature flat roof forms with parapet. In terms of height, the single story responds to historic buildings in the district (See B-20).

As to materials, the drawings of the proposed building depict a brick veneer treatment. Many 19th Century and early 20th century commercial buildings were faced with brick (See B-23). Historic storefront facades were often composed of bulkhead, window, and transom or clerestory window above. The proposed storefront system includes partitioned window and clerestory window above. The materials and design then complement the character of the neighborhood.

**CLARIFICATIONS**

1. Further articulate the design of the site including dumpster enclosure design/ materials and site improvements/ landscape plan.

**SUGGESTIONS**

1. Consider redesigning storefront to have smaller pane of glass repositioned to the lower portion to mimic bulkhead.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-11), Staff believes this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. While the design of the building fits the neighborhood and district, the site plan is not consistent with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts. Staff recommends the applicant return with a revised site plan.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Ben Cummings of Cummings Architecture Corp., architect, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Allen recused himself from the discussion. Due to a lack of quorum, it was announced that the application will be heard at the November 7th meeting. Mr. Cummings requested the Board provide any feedback regarding the project as submitted.

Ms. Largue asked Mr. Cummings what color is the brick specified. Mr. Cummings replied it would be two-toned similar to the Mobile Popcorn building.

Mr. Cummings stated he did not object to the proposed site plan seen in the PowerPoint presentation, but that he would have to submit the information to his clients for review. He noted the rear elevation does not have a parapet. Mr. Holmes stated he would like to see a better site plan and was not concerned about the rear elevation being exposed to a drive.

Mr. Holmes asked what business would be in the space. Mr. Cummings replied he did not know.

Mr. Holmes suggested having a brick bulkhead on the front and side elevation, similar to those seen on historic structures.

Mr. Cummings clarified the awning would be constructed out of contemporary materials such as metal, not mixed metal and wood.

Mrs. Bolton of the Government Street Collaborative stated her support for the design of the building, and expressed the site plan should reflect the building mass being close to the primary and secondary streets.

Ms. Largue stated she would send the proposed site plan sketch to Mr. Cummings.