ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA  
August 21, 2013 – 3:00 P.M.  
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street  

A. CALL TO ORDER  
1. Roll Call  
2. Approval of Minutes  
3. Approval of Mid Month COAs Granted by Staff  

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS  
1. Applicant: Mobile Fence for Jim Allen  
   a. Property Address: 15 Houston Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 7/31/13  
   c. Project: Repair a 6’ wood fence to match existing. Remove chain link fence and replace it with the matching 6’ high privacy fence.  
2. Applicant: Habitat for Humanity  
   a. Property Address: 21 South Hallett Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 7/29/13  
   c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles. Touch up the paint around the soffits.  
3. Applicant: Kenneth McKee  
   a. Property Address: 25 Lee Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 7/30/13  
   c. Project: Repair the front porch to match the existing. Repaint to match the existing color scheme.  
4. Applicant: Deborah DeGuire  
   a. Property Address: 209 Dauphin Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 8/1/13  
   c. Project: Replace rotten wood in kind and as needed. Repaint the building per the existing color scheme.  
5. Applicant: Taylor Atchison  
   a. Property Address: 1400 Dauphin Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 8/1/13  
   c. Project: Repair and/or replace to deteriorated woodwork to match up the existing in profile and dimension. Repaint the work per the existing color scheme.  
6. Applicant: David Calametti  
   a. Property Address: 1714 Dauphin Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 8/1/13  
   c. Project: Remove a roll up door on the rear elevation. Install wood and glass entrance in the location of the above.  
7. Applicant: Ross Pritchard  
   a. Property Address: 1011 Church Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 8/2/13  
   c. Project: Replace rotten wood on house, repaint to match. Clean up around shed, leave existing.  
8. Applicant: Jeff Mizell  
   a. Property Address: 26 South Julia Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 8/2/13  
   c. Project: Reroof with 30 year architectural shingles, brown color.  
9. Applicant: Tony Atchison with Atchison Home / Atchison Properties
a. Property Address: 551 Dauphin Street
b. Date of Approval: 8/5/13

10. Applicant: Coulson Roofing for David Koen
a. Property Address: 151 South Dearborn Street
b. Date of Approval: 8/5/13
c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.

11. Applicant: Barnes Fence and Home Improvement
a. Property Address: 104 South Georgia Avenue
b. Date of Approval: 8/5/13
c. Project: Install a 6’ high, interior lot wooden privacy fence.

12. Applicant: Brian Weeks with Diversified Roofing
a. Property Address: 256 Dexter Avenue
b. Date of Approval: 8/6/13
c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.

13. Applicant: Kiker Corporation
a. Property Address: 1655 McGill Avenue
b. Date of Approval: 8/6/13
c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.

14. Applicant: Glamr Ventures
a. Property Address: 1966 Government Street (signage corridor)
b. Date of Approval: 8/6/13
c. Project: Replace franchise signage. Replace the existing wall sign as per the same dimensions. The reverse channel illuminated sign will feature the name of the franchise. Replace a existing freestanding sign within the existing cage. The reverse channel illuminated sign will feature the name of the establishment.

15. Applicant: Gray Arnold
a. Property Address: 154 South Cedar Street
b. Date of Approval: 8/7/13
c. Project: Paint in the same BLP color scheme or equivalent. Repair/replace rotten wood as needed. Body: Flo Claire Crocus Yellow Trim: White Porch Decking, shutter and rail caps: Claiborne St. Red

16. Applicant: Julia Greer
a. Property Address: 113 South Georgia Avenue
b. Date of Approval: 8/7/13
c. Project: Remove expanses of infill located behind front porch’s intact posts and balustrades. Touch up the color scheme as per the existing.

17. Applicant: David L. Sanders
a. Property Address: 202 George Street
b. Date of Approval: 8/12/13
c. Project: Construct an ancillary building per submitted plans (approved 14 December 2004).
C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2013-63-CA: 1400 Dauphin Street**
   a. **Applicant:** Taylor Atchison
   b. **Project:** Painting – Paint an unpainted brick building.

2. **2013-64-CA: 128 Macy Place**
   a. **Applicant:** Patricia Lambert
   b. **Project:** Chimneys – Remove a chimney stack.

3. **2013-65-CA: 50 Le Moyne Place**
   a. **Applicant:** Jake Epker
   b. **Project:** After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain an unauthorized replacement door and sidelights.

4. **2013-66-CA: 210 Dauphin Street**
   a. **Applicant:** John Switzer with J. L. Swit, LLC
   b. **Project:** After-the-fact-Approval – Retain unapproved windows.

D. **OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards
2. Discussion
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2013-63-CA: 1400 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Taylor Atchison
Received: 8/5/13
Meeting: 8/21/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Painting – Paint an unpainted bricks building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This gabled roof dwelling dates from 1947.

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 never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The new owner/applicant proposes painting the building.
B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
   1. “The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period.”
   2. “Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.”
C. Scope of Work (per the submitted color scheme):
   1. Paint the body of the building Benjamin Moore’s “French Canvas”.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for painting of a contributing building. While the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts do not rule out painting machine-made brick, the Guidelines state that exterior materials help define the style, quality, and period of a building (See B-1). There is considerable concern in the preservation community that painting bricks can eventually lead to moisture problems. Also as seen in Cathedral Towers, the painting of brick creates a monochromatic mass as opposed to the variation in texture, shading and color that results form the grout color and dimensionality. There is also the problem with extended maintenance on a surface that is virtually maintenance free. Though the current owners are willing to paint the structure on a regular basis, it does not necessarily follow that later owners will maintain the house as well. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that historic finishes that characterize a property should be preserved (See B-2).
STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and the historical character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2013-64-CA: 128 Macy Place
Applicant: Patricia Lambert
Received: 8/5/13
Meeting: 8/21/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Chimneys – Remove a chimney stack.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Arts and Crafts inspired “bungalow” dates from the first quarter of the 20th Century.

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 on December 11, 1991. At that time, the Board denied a request to box in the house’s exposed rafter tails. The current owner/applicant proposes the removal of a chimney stack rising above the house’s North (side) Elevation.
B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
   1. “The removal of historic materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.”
   2. “Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.”
C. Scope of Work:
   1. Remove a chimney stack (only that portion rising above the roof.
   2. Install siding over the affected area.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the removal of a chimney stack.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts do not specifically address chimneys. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards state that the removal/alteration of historic features should be avoided and that distinctive features should be preserved (See B 1-2) It has been the Board’s policy to call for the retention of prominent, particularly exterior end, chimneys visible from the right of way.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and the historical character of a building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF REPORT

2013-65-CA: 50 Le Moyne Place
Applicant: Jake Epker
Received: 8/1/13
Meeting: 8/21/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Conditionally Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain an unauthorized replacement door and sidelights.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to materials located within this property’s MHDC file, this American Foursquare type dwelling dates circa 1905.

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 never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review concerns the after-the-fact approval of an unauthorized replacement door and sidelights. The application appears before the Board as a result of a 311 call.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building.”
   2. “Doors with leaded or art glass may be appropriated when documentation exists for their use, or when they are compatible with the design and style of the structure.”

C. Scope of Work:
   1. After-fact-Approval – Retain an unauthorized replacement front door and sidelights.
STAFF ANALYSIS

This application appears before the Board as a result of a 311 call. The application involves the after-the-fact-approval of a door and sidelights. Doors were removed and replaced and transoms were installed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness or the pulling of a building permit.

According photographs located within this MHDC property file, this house featured a pair of glazed and paneled doors. A single glazed door featuring leaded cames and flanking sidelights was installed. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that original doors and openings should be retained. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building (See B-1). The unauthorized door treatment is not in keeping with the construction, configuration, proportion, and appearance of the original.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and the historical character of the building. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2013-66-CA: 210 Dauphin Street
Applicant: John Switzer with J. L. Swit, LLC
Received: 7/24/13
Meeting: 8/21/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4

BUILDING HISTORY

Bavarian born architect Rudolf Benz designed this two-story commercial building in 1882. Completed the following year, the building cost $3,000.

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 on February 6, 2013. At that time, the Board approved alterations to plans approved on March 19, 2008. The property reappears before the Board as a consequence of a 311 call. The applicant proposes the retention of upper-story fenestration that does not match what was approved.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “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 window sashes and glazing.”
   2. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”

C. Scope of Work:
   1. Retain the façade’s upper-story window units.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the retention windows. The windows currently installed on the building’s second story façade do not match the ones approved by the Board on March 19, 2008. At that time, the Board approved the installation of two-over-two wooden windows. Period appropriate windows were either lost during or after a fire. The light configuration, composition, and construction are not compatible with the historic character of the building (See B-2). It should be noted that the property also has a
preservation easement on it and the owner will need to get permission from the Mobile Historic Development Commission as well.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and the historical character of the building. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.