AGENDA
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
June 26, 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: Ken McElhaney Jr.
   Property Address: 1220 Elmira Street
   Date of Approval: 5/30/06 jdb
   Work Approved: Paint house the following Sherwin Williams colors:
                  Body – Colonial Yellow
                  Trim - White

2. Applicant’s Name: Caldwell and Osborn Home Improvement &
   Construction Co.
   Property Address: 1009 Elmira
   Date of Approval: 5/30/06 weh
   Work Approved: Install new architectural shingles, black in color.

3. Applicant’s Name: Caldwell and Osborn Home Improvement &
   Construction Co.
   Property Address: 364 Marine Street
   Date of Approval: 5/30/06 weh
   Work Approved: Install new architectural shingles, onyx black in color.

4. Applicant’s Name: Stair Depot
   Property Address: 1059 Elmira
   Date of Approval: 5/31/06 weh
   Work Approved: Extensive repair to enclosed rear porch. Repoint brick
                  piers; install intermediate piers not to be visible from the
                  street. Repair/replace deteriorated wood siding with
                  materials to match existing in material, profile and
                  dimension. Prep for painting.

5. Applicant’s Name: Paul Brown and Art Powell
   Property Address: 918-920 Dauphin Street
   Date of Approval: 5/31/06 weh
   Work Approved: Repair brick columns and arches damaged by
                  automobile collision. Install fixed louvered blinds over
                  storefront window on right side of front elevation.

6. Applicant’s Name: Hubbard Properties
   Property Address: 1254 Old Shell Road
   Date of Approval: 6/1/06 weh
   Work Approved: Re-roof with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, charcoal in color.
7. Applicant’s Name: Jeff Medlin  
   Property Address: 1258 Texas Street  
   Date of Approval: 6/1/06  
   Work Approved: Replace deteriorated siding with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Repair or replace second floor porch columns with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Prep new materials for paint.

8. Applicant’s Name: Jason Dudley/A-1 Roofing Company  
   Property Address: 1504 Brown Street  
   Date of Approval: 6/2/06  
   Work Approved: Install new 3 tab shingles, autumn brown in color.

9. Applicant’s Name: Gulf Coast Roofing  
   Property Address: 55 South Julia Street  
   Date of Approval: 6/5/06  
   Work Approved: Install new Timberline shingles, cedar in color.

10. Applicant’s Name: AME Pentecostal Church  
    Property Address: 306 North Joachim  
    Date of Approval: 6/5/06  
    Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and materials. Repaint church body and trim – white, steps gray.

11. Applicant’s Name: AME Pentecostal Church  
    Property Address: 308 North Joachim  
    Date of Approval: 6/5/06  
    Work Approved: Replace porch handrails as per MHDC photographs and MHDC stock design number 1.

12. Applicant’s Name: Mauvilla Court Apartments  
    Property Address: 15 North Ann Street  
    Date of Approval: 6/7/06  
    Work Approved: Install new roof on laundry room with materials to match existing materials. Paint trim to match existing.

13. Applicant’s Name: Chris Bowen  
    Property Address: 1010 Dauphin Street  
    Date of Approval: 6/7/06  
    Work Approved: Replace rotten wood around windows with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.

14. Applicant’s Name: Kimberly Harpring/Bay Flowers  
    Property Address: 452A Government Street  
    Date of Approval: 6/8/06  
    Work Approved: Install metal letter signage in existing sign band of building. Letters to be 18” high by 5’ long, or 7.5 sf. Letters to be white.
15. Applicant’s Name: Alabama School for Math & Science/ TAG Architects
   Property Address: 1255 Dauphin Street
   Date of Approval: 6/9/06 asc
   Work Approved: Renovation of the existing first floor lobby, recreation area, and second floor library with an adjacent addition to provide space for an expanded lobby, recreation and library. Erect a monument sign at Caroline Street elevation. Rework existing parking lot. Undertake landscaping as per submitted landscape plan.

16. Applicant’s Name: Harold Rummel
   Property Address: 961 Selma Street
   Date of Approval: 6/9/06 asc
   Work Approved: Install new roof using charcoal asphalt shingles.

17. Applicant’s Name: Harold Rummel
   Property Address: 1005 Selma Street
   Date of Approval: 6/9/06 asc
   Work Approved: Install new roof using charcoal asphalt shingles; repair/replace wood siding as necessary with new wood siding to match existing in profile and dimension. Rework front porch – new foundation, 1x4 t&g decking, repair/replace columns as necessary. Install new railing, steps and stair rail as per MHDC designs. Paint exterior (colors to be submitted at a later date.)

C. NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS:
   No NoVs or MoTs were written during this time period.

D. OLD BUSINESS:
   1. 012-05/06-CA 110 Ryan Avenue
      Applicant: Norman E. Wood
      Nature of Request: Alter historic residence as per submitted plans.

E. NEW BUSINESS:
   1. 071-05/06-CA 1510 Government Street
      Applicant: Anchor Signs/Starbucks Coffee
      Nature of Request: Install internally lit signage as per submitted plans.

F. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS:

G. ADJOURNMENT
INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Alter existing historic residence as per submitted plans. Extend eaves 11 ½”; extend roof to cover flat built-up roof; add dormers on south elevation; construct side gable on north elevation.

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>Roofs</td>
<td>Extend eaves; enlarge roof to accommodate converting attic to living space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Introduce new window configuration in rebuilt north gable</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 majority of the proposed work does not comply with the Design Review Guidelines and will impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

Project History: This application was submitted for the November 11, 2005 ARB meeting. Due to the recommendation of denial by staff, the project was withdrawn. A revised application was submitted and the biggest impairment, the installation or an oriole window on the front elevation, was deleted. The current application deals mainly with the existing historic roof pitch, profile and height.

Project Synopsis: The applicants are requesting to extend the existing eaves of the structure to allow water to shed off the roof without affecting the wood siding. Currently the house has no overhang. In addition, the applicants are requesting to remove and reconstruct the existing gable on the north elevation, and at that time increase the height and change the profile of the existing gable approximately 4’-5” to accommodate additional living space in the attic. By increasing the pitch this will allow a flat roof section to become pitched. The additional attic space will require a new gable window on the north elevation and the addition of two dormers on the south elevation.
A. **Eave Extension** - The Guidelines state that “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained.”

1. 110 Ryan Avenue, the Smith House, ca. 1928, is a one story frame residence constructed in the English Period Revival style.
2. Currently there is no overhang, which has resulted in continued maintenance problems of the wood siding.
3. The proposed eave extension would increase the size of the overhang by 11 ½ “.
4. This change would not be noticeable as a majority of the houses in the area have overhanging eaves.
5. While this change will affect the historic appearance of the eaves of the structure, the change is necessary for the long-term preservation of the entire structure.

B. **Enlarging Pitch and Adding Dormers to Accommodate Attic Expansion** - The Guidelines state that “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained.”

1. A proposed attic addition would increase the existing ridge height by approximately 4.5’.
2. The additional 4.5’ would alter the current appearance of the front and side elevations, therefore affecting the architectural and historic character of the structure.
3. The proposed design increases the height of the existing gable 4.5’ and the existing roof profile or rake is not repeated, therefore eliminating a character-defining feature of the structure.
4. Dormers are a traditional way of creating added space in attics.
5. The simple design of the proposed dormers relates to other simplistic design element on the existing structure.
6. While the proposed changes are on secondary elevations, they change the overall character of the front elevation in height and design elements.

C. **Addition of a Pair of Fixed Casement Windows with Fanlight Transom on North Elevation** - The Guidelines state that “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing.”

1. The existing single window configuration on the north elevation is original to the 1928 structure.
2. The proposed window configuration does not relate to any other design element on the existing historic structure.
3. The addition of the proposed window configuration would impair the architectural integrity of the historic façade and create a false sense of history.

Staff recommends **Approval** of the following:
- A. Eave overhang extension

Staff recommends **Denial** of the following:
- B. Enlarging pitch and adding dormers for attic expansion.
- C. Addition of new window design on the north elevation.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF COMMENTS

071-05/06-CA 1510 Government Street
Applicant: Anchor Sign/Starbucks Coffee
Received: 6/09 /06 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 7/24/06 1) 6/26/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Non Contributing (new construction)
Zoning: LB-2, Limited Business
Nature of Project: Install reverse channel backlit signage as per submitted plans. Install height clearance pole and sign. Install single leaf pre-menu board and triple leaf menu board. Install directional signage.

STAFF REPORT

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 ANALYSIS

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work does not comply with the Design Review Guidelines and the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and will impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

I. The Starbucks project was Approved with Conditions by the Architectural Review Board March 13, 2006.

A. Building Signage
   1. One of the conditions was the submission of a complete sign package.
   2. The applicants are requesting to install two letter signs, measuring 9’-8” long x 4.4’ high.
   3. Sign A is located on the front or south façade of the building above the front entrance.
   4. Sign B is located on the east façade of the building above the side entrance.
   5. Each sign measures 22.6 sf, for a total of approximately 45 square feet.
   6. Proposed signage will be mounted to building face with ¼” lag bolts.
   7. Proposed signage is aluminum reverse channel letters.
   8. Aluminum faces to be in Starbucks Green color.
   9. Proposed signage lighting is backlit neon.

   (NOTE: the application stated that the signage would be aluminum channel lettering with lexan faces, internally lit with neon. Staff checked with the applicants to confirm the type of signage and was informed that the application was in error. The applicants intended to install reverse-channel backlit letters.)
B. Height Clearance Pole and Sign
   1. Proposed pole is to be located in the drive thru lane to avert damage to the canopies over the drive thru windows.
   2. Proposed pole measures 12’-6” high.
   3. Proposed pole is 4” in diameter, painted green to match the previously-approved awning.
   4. Clearance sign measures 12” x 5’-6”.
   5. Proposed clearance sign to be white with red vinyl letters.
   6. Directional/height clearance signs do not count when figuring site signage.

C. Pre-menu and Menu Boards
   1. The proposed pre-menu board measures approximately 4’ tall by approximately 3’ wide, supported by a 2 1/8” base, making the overall height approximately 6’.
   2. The menu board measures approximately 7’-11.5” wide by approximately 4’ tall, supported by a 2’ 1/8” base, making the overall height approximately 6’.
   3. The proposed boards are to be painted dark brown and light brown.
   4. Menu boards are to be internally lit.
   5. No information was provided on the text of the menu boards (font, color, size).

D. Directional Signage
   1. Three types of directional signs are proposed: 1) for the drive thru, 2) “exit only”, and 3) “thank you”.
   2. The proposed directional signs measure 2’-6” in height, mounted on a 3’ high base, for an overall height of 5’-6”.
   3. Signs to be painted grey, white and black.
   4. Sign text to be on clear polycarbonate face.
   5. Signs will not be lit.

Staff recommends approval of the request to install reverse channel backlit signage.

Staff recommends approval of the request to install the Height Clearance Pole

Staff recommends that the Board consider the appropriateness for internally-lit menu boards.

Staff recommends approval of the request to install directional signs.