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:  P. M. Gardner Construction Consultants
   Property Address:  1323 Dauphin Street
   Date of Approval:  2/15/05  asc
   Work Approved:  Re-roof building with architectural shingles, sablewood in color.

2. Applicant's Name:  Jim Wagoner
   Property Address:  1805 Dauphin Street
   Date of Approval:  2/15/05  weh
   Work Approved:  Repair rotten wood on front of residence with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Re-paint front of house in existing color scheme.

3. Applicant's Name:  Langan Construction Company
   Property Address:  601 Government Street
   Date of Approval:  2/16/05  asc
   Work Approved:  Install new built up flat roof to match existing in profile and dimension.

4. Applicant's Name:  Dobson Sheet Metal
   Property Address:  1061 Elmira Street
   Date of Approval:  2/16/05  asc
   Work Installed:  Install new modified bitumen roof to match existing.

5. Applicant's Name:  Slate and Tile Roofing
   Property Address:  1008 Palmetto Street
   Date of Approval:  2/17/05  weh
   Work Approved:  Repair slate roof and turret with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and color.

6. Applicant's Name:  Baylor and Associates
   Property Address:  452 E Government Street
   Date of Approval:  2/17/04  weh
   Work Approved:  Install signage measuring 8’9” long by 2’ high. Colors to be black background, gold text, red star. Sign to be framed in Honduras mahongany frame.
7. Applicant's Name: Grace Lutheran Church  
   Property Address: 1356 Government Street  
   Date of Approval: 2/17/05  
   Work Approved: Re-roof church with synthetic slate roofing.

8. Applicant's Name: Kimberly Tew  
   Property Address: 9 Semmes Avenue  
   Date of Approval: 2/18/05  
   Work Approved: Re-roof shed with shingles to match the main house.  
                   Repair/replace rotten wood as necessary on front porch and  
                   north side of main house to include foundation sills, siding,  
                   etc. All new wood to match existing in dimension and  
                   profile. New wood to be primed in preparation for painting.

9. Applicant's Name: Patricia Finkbohner  
   Property Address: 1559 Blair Avenue  
   Date of Approval: 2/21/05  
   Work Approved: Paint exterior in the following Olympic color scheme:  
                   body-Silk Sails; trim-Turban Shell; shutters and porch deck-  
                   Royal Hunter Green; door-Apple a Day with brown added.

10. Applicant's Name: Coulson Roofing  
    Property Address: 803 Government Street  
    Date of Approval: 2/21/05  
    Work Approved: Re-roof to match existing with 3 tab fiberglass shingles,  
                    charcoal in color.

11. Applicant's Name: Graham Roofing Company  
    Property Address: 63 LeMoyne Place  
    Date of Approval: 2/21/05  
    Work Approved: Re-roof building with three tab fiberglass shingles onyx  
                    black in color.

12. Applicant's Name: Louis Felis  
    Property Address: 206 S. Broad Street  
    Date of Approval: 2/21/05  
    Work Approved: Repair roof with materials to match existing slate roof in  
                   profile and dimension. Repair water damaged wood on  
                   fascia and siding as necessary with materials to match  
                   existing in profile and dimension. Paint new materials in  
                   existing color scheme.
13. Applicant's Name: Ronald A. Suggs  
Property Address: 354 Regina Avenue  
Date of Approval: 2/22/05  
Work Approved: Replace rotten floor on upstairs rear porch with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Replace missing shingles with roofing matching existing in profile, dimension and color. Repair or replace rotten trim around cornice & fascia with materials matching existing in profile and dimension.

14. Applicant's Name: Aubrey L. Dees  
Property Address: 257 Marine Street  
Date of Approval: 2/23/05  
Work Approved: Install storage shed as per ARB stock plans. Building to be 6’ from side and rear property line. Paint to match main house.

15. Applicant's Name: Hargrove & Associates, Owners, Ben Cummings, Architect  
Property Address: 210 South Washington Avenue  
Date of Approval: 2/23/04  
Work Approved: Demolish non-contributing lumber shed at rear of building. Remove deteriorated canopy and construct new canopy as per submitted designs. Rework storefront/window openings as per submitted plans. NOTE: This work was previously approved by the ARB pending approval from the Planning Commission for rezoning. That approval was granted at the last Planning Commission meeting.

C: OLD BUSINESS

1. 019-04/05-CA  
Applicant: Jeanelle Millet Cala  
Nature of Request: Construct a circular concrete driveway in front yard as per submitted plans.

2. 025-04/05-CA  
Applicant: McDonalds Restaurants  
Nature of Request: Demolish existing restaurant and construct new restaurant as per submitted designs.

D: NEW BUSINESS

1. 029-04/05-CA  
Applicant: Title Max, Owner/ DeNyse Signs, Contractor  
Nature of Request: Install 2 signs, each measuring approximately 30 square feet, as per submitted plans.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF COMMENTS

019-04/05-CA 1553 Fearnway
Applicant: Jeanelle Millet Cala
Received: 2/09/05  Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/02/05  1) 1/24/05  2) 3/14/05  3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Construct a circular concrete driveway in front yard as per submitted plans.
History of the Project: The ARB considered this application at the January 24, 2005 meeting. A copy of the Certified Record is attached.

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>Drives, Walks &amp; Parking</td>
<td>Install circular drive</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:

A. The proposed construction is not in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.
   1. The main structure is a ca. 1927 Tudor Revival residence.
   2. The Design Review Guidelines state that “Circular drives and parking pads in the front yard are generally inappropriate in the historic districts.”
   3. The linear front footage of the lot is approximately 102’. Typical lots in the Fearnway sub-division are 75’-80’ wide.
   4. The site situation is unique in that the house has a Fearnway address but the driveway is off Catherine Street.
   5. On the opposite side of the entrance to Fearnway, the residences at 56 and 1552 Fearnway share a common alley off Catherine Street, providing ample safety for ingress/egress.
   6. The circular drive is proposed to provide a safe means of access to the property.
   7. Heavy landscaping is proposed to minimize the effect of the circular drive.
   8. There are no other circular drives on Fearnway.
   9. No application has been submitted to Traffic Engineering for a second curb cut.
   10. The originally proposed circular drive was 20’ in width. The revised proposal for the
circular drive has been reduced to 12’ with brick and concrete paving at the proposed entrance steps.

Staff recommends denial as submitted based on the fact that circular drives are not allowed in front yards and such a circular drive would impair the historic integrity of the property and the district.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
STAFF COMMENTS

025-04/05-CA 658 Government Street
Applicant: McDonald’s Restaurants
Received: 3/04/05  Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/16/05  1) 2/28/05  2) 3/14/05

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
History of the Project: At the February 28, 2005 Board Meeting, the ARB tabled this application pending the submission of additional information. A copy of the Certified Record is attached.

Nature of Project: Demolish existing non-historic restaurant & re-construct new restaurant as per submitted plans.

The building site is located on the north side of Government Street between Washington and South Dearborn Streets.

The existing front of the restaurant is situated within 5’ of the sidewalk with mature landscaping between the building wall and the sidewalk. The existing building is the only structure on the north side of the street between Washington and South Dearborn Streets. The remainder of the block is taken up with parking for the restaurant.

The proposed building measures approximately 45’ wide by approximately 105’ long.

The building faces south towards Government Street, and the front building line is located at a distance of 37’ from the sidewalk. The proposed building is one story brick veneer over concrete block on a slab-on-grade foundation. The ground plan is rectangular in design. The overall wall height is 17’ to the top of the parapet, with areas at the corners, the entrance, and over the drive thru windows raised to 19’-8”.

The glazing system is anodized aluminum with clear insulated glass. A flat roof will be hidden behind a parapet wall capped with pre-cast stone.

The following are proposed building materials:
   a. foundation – concrete slab-on-grade
   b. façade – brick veneer over concrete block
   c. doors – clear glass in bronze anodized frames
   d. windows – clear glass in bronze anodized frames
   e. awnings – green metal
   f. roof – flat concealed behind a pre-cast stone capped parapet

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Guidelines for New Commercial and Residential Construction in 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>Design Standards for New Construction</td>
<td>Construct new restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,I</td>
<td>Placement and Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,II</td>
<td>Massing and Scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,III</td>
<td>Façade Elements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “In the case of a proposed new building, that such building will not, in itself, or by reason of its location on the site, materially impair the architectural or historical value of the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity and that such building will not be injurious to the general visual character of the Historic District in which it is to be located.”

STAFF REPORT

3.I

I. Placement and Orientation: The guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
   A. Setbacks in the Church Street East Historic District range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with a 5’-25’ setback.
   B. The proposed building site is located on the footprint of the existing building.
   C. The existing setback is 5’.
   D. The proposed setback is approximately 37’.
   E. The extra distance is to accommodate an internal circle of traffic flow.

3.II

II. Massing and Scale:

   A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
      1. There are multiple examples of fast food restaurants in the Historic Districts.
      2. The proposed building is a 1 story brick veneer structure.

   B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
      1. There are no other historic buildings within this block.
      2. The existing restaurant has a slab-on-grade foundation.
      3. The Arby’s restaurant directly across the street has a slab-on-grade foundation.
      4. The proposed foundation is concrete slab-on-grade.

   C. The guidelines state that new construction should consider roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings.
      1. A variety of commercial roof shapes exist in the Church Street East Historic District, but the most common are flat roofs behind a parapet.

3.III

III. Façade Elements:

   A. The guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.
      1. The use of clear glass in bronze anodized frames is a common design element found in new construction throughout the Historic Districts.
      2. The use of a rusticated base with brick veneer and a header bands below the parapet add interest to the elevation.
IV. Materials and Ornamentation:
   A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
      1. There are a number of commercial brick veneer structures in the Church Street East Historic District.
   B. The guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found in the design of nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
      1. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

V. Miscellaneous:
   A. The existing brick and iron fence around the perimeter of the property will remain.
   B. The drive-thru area between the sidewalk and the building will be stamped concrete as per submitted photograph. This answers a recommendation of ARB staff by the applicant.
   C. There will only be one menu board per drive-thru lane.
   D. There will be a canopy over the menu board as per submitted photograph.
   E. The canopies over the menu boards will be painted dark green to match the awnings.
   F. Building signage includes four golden “M”s, each 16’ square for a total of 64 square feet of signage.

Staff recommends approval of Scheme A, which has an additional metal awning on the west elevation between the first and second bays.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

029-04/05-CA  1960 Government Street
Applicant:  Title Max, Owner/ DeNyse Signs, Sign Contractor
Received:  3/04/05    Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days:  4/18/05  1) 3/14/05  2)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:  Government Street Sign Corridor
Nature of Project:  Install two wall mounted signs, measuring approximately 116” x approximately 3’, as per submitted design.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES AND DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wall Signs</td>
<td>Install 2 wall mounted signs</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:

A. The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.
   1. The Guidelines state that “The total allowable square footage for the display area of building signage is 64 square feet.”
   2. The building itself is non-historic and is not under the control of the ARB.
   3. Proposed sign colors are red and white on a blue background.
   4. The proposed sign material is high density urethane.

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:
   1. That prior to the sign being installed the building colors be changed to be compatible with the sign colors.