ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA
June 20, 2018 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes from April 18, 2018 and June 6, 2018.
3. Approval of MidMonth COAs Granted by Staff

B. MIDMONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant: Jennifer Weed
   a. Property Address: 1743 Hunter Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 5/29/2018
   c. Project: Replace rear of roof to match existing asphalt singles. Repair and replace damaged wooden trim around windows and wood around gutters to match in dimension, profile and material. Repaint to match. Reflash chimney. TPO portion of roof in rear to match existing.

2. Applicant: Steven Slanke
   a. Property Address: 255 Dexter Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 5/29/2018
   c. Project: Replace balusters to match; replace lattice.

3. Applicant: Stephen and Ellen Harvey
   a. Property Address: 120 Ryan Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 5/30/2018
   c. Project: Remove wood siding in good condition to repurpose. Replace wood siding, deteriorated, to match existing in dimension, profile and material. Repair and replace wood trim to match existing. Repaint to match.

4. Applicant: Matthew and Karen McDonald
   a. Property Address: 1260 Selma Street
   b. Date of Approval: 5/30/2018
   c. Project: Reroof and reconstruct balustrade to match existing in dimension, profile and material.

5. Applicant: St. Francis Joachim, LLC
   a. Property Address: 15 N. Joachim Street
   b. Date of Approval: 5/30/2018
   c. Project: Build three foot high masonry wall in front of parking area along Jackson St. Along north property line wall will be six feet high.

6. Applicant: National Society of the Colonial Dames
   a. Property Address: 104 Theatre Street
   b. Date of Approval: 5/30/2018
   c. Project: Reroof small section to match.

7. Applicant: Gregory Benke
   a. Property Address: 158 S. Catherine Street
   b. Date of Approval: 5/31/2018
   c. Project: Reroof with GAF weatherwood shingles.

8. Applicant: John Ferguson
   a. Property Address: 59 S. Lafayette Street
   b. Date of Approval: 5/31/2018
   c. Project: Reroof with new asphalt shingles to match.
9. Applicant: Talitrum Investments  
a. Property Address: 204 Rapier Avenue  
b. Date of Approval: 6/5/2018  
c. Project: Repair/replace exterior wood to match existing, repair existing shutters, install framed lattice, repaint. Build six foot wooden privacy fence up to front plane of house.

10. Applicant: Robert Hunter  
a. Property Address: 561 Eslava Street  
b. Date of Approval: 6/5/2018  
c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles, black.

11. Applicant: Katie Bracher  
a. Property Address: 1167 Old Shell Road  
b. Date of Approval: 6/6/2018  
c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles, black.

12. Applicant: Emil Kraft  
a. Property Address: 271 Dauphin Street  
b. Date of Approval: 6/6/2018  
c. Project: Powerwash, Paint, Repair Deck and Dig 4 holes to replace rotten existing pylons.

13. Applicant: Jace Aran  
a. Property Address: 255 S. Georgia Street  
b. Date of Approval: 6/8/2018  
c. Project: Construct in-ground pool with surrounding paver deck.

14. Applicant: Sing Ming Au  
a. Property Address: 1702 Government Street  
b. Date of Approval: 6/6/2018  
c. Project: Construct fence on west and east side property behind front facade of commercial building. Fence to be wooden or metal.

15. Applicant: WG Buchanan Residual Trust  
a. Property Address: 316 Dauphin Street  
b. Date of Approval: 6/8/2018  
c. Project: Remove deteriorated canopy in rear of building.

16. Applicant: Church Religious Services  
a. Property Address: 60 N. Ann Street  
b. Date of Approval: 6/11/2018  
c. Project: Repaint building medium gray with white trim.

17. Applicant: Sign Art on behalf of Bank of the Ozarks  
a. Property Address: 7 N. Royal Street  
b. Date of Approval: 6/12/2018  
c. Project: Install one storefront sign, one wall sign, one incidental sign. Install one vinyl decal on inside of door.

18. Applicant: Jerry Jackson on Jackson Investments  
a. Property Address: 3004 Michigan Avenue  
b. Date of Approval: 6/13/2018  
c. Project: Repaint in approved color scheme: gray body with white trim. Replace windows on non-contributing with either aluminum clad or extruded aluminum. Repair and replace deteriorated wood to match in dimension, profile and material when necessary.
C. APPLICATIONS

   a. Applicant: Mr., Adam Metcalfe
   b. Project: Install metal roofing panels on a residential building.

2. 2018-19-CA: 205 Church Street
   a. Applicant: Mr. Timothy E. Howell on behalf of Briskman and Binion
   b. Project: Fenestration Related: Replace three wooden windows.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. There will be no meeting on July 4th due to it falling on a holiday.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF REPORT

Applicant:  Mr. Adam Metcalfe
Received:  5/30/2018
Meeting:  6/20/18

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:  Old Dauphin Way
Classification:  Contributing
Zoning:  R-1
Project:  Install metal roofing panels on a residential building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This residence, known as the Langlois House, was constructed in 1924 as a bungalow. It has no particular stylistic details.

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 Old Dauphin Way Architectural Review Board on January 29, 1982 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time approval was granted for the repainting of the house. The proposed scope of work includes removing existing shingle roof and replacing it with a metal roof.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:

1. “Preserve the original form of a historic roof.”
2. “Preserve the original eave depth of a roof.”
3. “Use new roof materials that convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally.”
4. “If installing a new metal roof, apply and detail it in a manner that is compatible with the historic character of the roof, period and style.”
5. “Use standing seam metal, metal shingles or five v-crimp.”
6. “Use metal with a matte, non-reflective finish.”
7. “Install the roof to have low profile seams.”
8. “Finish roof edges in a similar fashion to those seen traditionally.”

“Materials that do not appear similar to the original in texture, pattern, finish and color range to the original are unacceptable. These often include: Corrugated fiberglass; Asphalt roll roofing (unless obscured by parapet walls); Built-up membrane roof on steep sloping roofs (greater than 3:12); Panel and batten; Brightly colored metal”
C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**

1. Install new roof.  
   a. Remove existing shingles.  
   b. Install metal roof panels.  
   c. Metal roof will be corrugated, 26 gauge galvalume, with a non-reflective finish.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application concerns the re-roofing of a dwelling currently features shingles with metal panels. With exceptions of certain house types (such as shotguns), constructions (such as cast iron galleries), and building typologies (such as industrial/commercial), individual applications for metal roofs are reviewed on a case by case basis. Metal roofing is a traditional roofing material in Mobile. As the 19th-century progressed, metal roofs were employed more frequently. Both frame & brick and residential & commercial buildings featured metal roofs. Standing seam panels and individual shingles were the most common metal roofing types. 5-V crimp metal roofing was another alternative. In reviewing previous applications the Board has discussed the number and spacing of ridges. Standing Seam and 5-V crimp have been approved on account of the fewer number and lower height of dividing seams.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that a roof is one of the most dominant features of a building and that original materials should be maintained (See B-1). The forms of the existing roof and gable will remain. The Design Guidelines go on to outline that if installing a metal roof, said roofing panels should be reflective of the historic character of the roof, period and style (See B-4). The proposed metal roof will be 26 gauge. Said metal roofing panels are not listed among the approved metal roofing options (See B-5), however it is not listed as an unapproved roofing material (See B-9). A version of a 5-V Crimp metal roof was approved for 25 Blacklawn on December 2, 2015, and a version of a standing seam metal roof was approved for 30 Hannon Avenue on May 16, 2016.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-9), Staff believes a metal roof will not impair either the architectural or the historical character of the properties or district. The type and construction of said roofing material and its impact on the style of the building has to be considered as well. Staff recommends the consideration of metal panels that have a lower profile such as a 5V crimp or standing seam.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2018-09-CA: 205 Church Street
Applicant: Mr. Timothy E. Howell on behalf of Briskman and Binion
Received: 6/5/2018
Meeting: 6/20/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION
Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.2
Project: Fenestration Related: Replace three wooden windows on a primary façade.

BUILDING HISTORY
This Federal building was constructed between 1844-1845. Its cast iron balcony was added later in the 19th century. A residence turned boarding house, the property was rehabilitated by its current owners in the early 1980’s according to the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

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 15, 1989. On the aforementioned date, the Board approved an application to replace repair and replace windows and doors as necessary to match the existing. The application up for review calls for the replacement of three wooden windows on the front façade.

B. Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
1. “Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.”
2. “A double-paned or clad wood window may be considered as a replacement alternative only if the replacement matches the configuration, dimensions, and profiles of original windows.”
3. “Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture, profile and finish to the original are acceptable. These often include: wood sash and aluminum clad.”
4. “Historically accurate light patterns shall be employed. Use photographic, physical, and/or documentary evidence for the design.”
5. “Use any salvageable window components on a primary elevation.”
C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**

1. Remove three (3) existing wooden six-over-six windows on second story of the North (façade) Elevation.
2. Install three aluminum clad windows to match lite configuration and profile in aforementioned openings.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application calls for the alteration of fenestration. With regard to the windows, specific replacements will match the existing components as per location, dimensions and light configuration. (See B-1). Details such as profile will match as close as possible. The proposed material is an extruded aluminum exterior with wooden interior window.

The property underwent a massive rehabilitation in the early 1980’s and it was noted that windows were repaired according to the Secretary of Interior’s Standards. (The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts are based on the Secretary of Interior’s Standards.) The Design Review Guidelines state where historic windows are intact they should be repaired, rather than replaced (See B-1). Where windows are not in repairable condition replacements may be employed to match in dimension, profile, and material. Aluminum clad or double paned wood can be considered if it appears similar to the original in texture, profile, dimension, finish and configuration. In keeping with the Guidelines the proposed materials of extruded aluminum clad and wood in a six-over-nine light pattern is similar to what is in place (see B-3). Based on photographic evidence and previous Certificate of Appropriateness issued, the amounts of historic windows intact are unknown (See B-2 and B-3). A Certificate of Appropriateness issued December 19th, 2014 approved the repair and replacement of windows to match “existing in all respects” where “necessary”. The primary façade of a building is the most important to keep intact (See B-5). While it is not confirmed the three upper story windows are original to the house, the windows were previously repaired to match the existing or replaced to match the existing per dimension, profile and material.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-5) Staff does believe this application impairs the landscape, and historic integrity of the property. Staff recommends denial of the application, unless further evidence is presented to show the windows are not original.