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: Graham Roofing
   a. Property Address: 1557 Monterey Place
   b. Date of Approval: 4/12/11
   c. Project: Remove old roofing and replace with same color and type roofing but heavier weight.

2. Applicant: Eddie Crabtree
   a. Property Address: 7 South Joachim Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/18/11
   c. Project: Install a hanging metal sign from the underside of the building’s balcony. The sign will feature the name of the establishment. The sign will measure five feet in length and 2 feet in height.

3. Applicant: Trey Littlepage
   a. Property Address: 1509 Monroe Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/18/11
   c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork to match the existing. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Replace a later side door with a more historically and stylistically appropriate wooden door. Replace window panes where necessary. Reroof the house with architectural shingles.

4. Applicant: Trey Littlepage
   a. Property Address: 1111 Old Shell Road.
   b. Date of Approval: 4/18/11
   c. Project: Replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing. Replace broken window panes where necessary. Repaint the house.

5. Applicant: Johnny Murray
   a. Property Address: 1258 Old Shell Road
   b. Date of Approval: 4/18/11
   c. Project: Repair and replace siding to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Reroof the house with 3-tab shingles.

6. Applicant: 203 South Georgia Avenue
   a. Property Address: 203 South Georgia Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 4/18/11
   c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork and roofing to match the existing.

7. Applicant: Gary Jackson for the City of Mobile
   a. Property Address: 201 (or 109) Government Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/18/11
   c. Project: Install a heavy duty metal chain between the posts demarcating the enclosure’s vehicular drive.
8. Applicant: Raphael Nichols with Alliance Contracting  
   a. Property Address: 1050 Old Shell Road  
   b. Date of Approval: 4/19/11  

9. Applicant: Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood  
   a. Property Address: 107 Saint Francis Street / 31 North Royal Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 4/19/11  
   c. Project: Install teller windows within the inner portions of the drive through. Install pavers in the vestibules matching pavers found elsewhere on the complex.

10. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Jones/Walker  
   a. Property Address: 256 State Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 4/19/11  
   c. Project: Remove and replace iron shafts. Remove, clean, repaint, and reinstall ironwork. Repair the porch floor. All work will match the existing.

11. Applicant: Joe Pomeroy with Thomas Roofing for AME Big Zion Church  
   a. Property Address: 112 South Bayou Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 4/19/11  
   c. Project: Replace roofing shingles to match the existing.

12. Applicant: Rosemary Pettus  
   a. Property Address: 4/21/11  
   b. Date of Approval: 404 Chatham Street  
   c. Project: Install a three foot picket fence. The fence will commence at the northeast corner of the lot. The fence will extend across the front of the lot. It will feature an inward opening wooden vehicular gate and a iron pedestrian gate. The fence tie into the south side of the house.

13. Applicant: Lorene Whidden  
   a. Property Address: 557 Church Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 4/20/11  
   c. Project: Repaint trim white as existing.

14. Applicant: Charles B. & Patricia Hunter  
   a. Property Address: 210 Lanier Avenue  
   b. Date of Approval: 4/25/11  
   c. Project: Remove an existing interior lot fence. Replace the existing lattice fence with a six foot high wooden privacy fence. The fence will extend along the northern, eastern, and southern lot lines. The fence will be located behind the front plane of the house. The fence will feature an alley-facing vehicular gate.

15. Applicant: George V. Davis  
   a. Property Address: 16 North Monterey Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 4/25/11  
   c. Project: Reissue a COA dating from 10/6/09 authorizing the construction of a storage shed.

16. Applicant: Sue Stewart  
   a. Property Address: 205 Michigan Avenue  
   b. Date of Approval: 4/26/11  
   c. Project: Repair and replace rotten eaves. The work will match the existing. Reroof the house with architectural shingles.

17. Applicant: Mike LaSarge  
   a. Property Address: 68 South Georgia Avenue  
   b. Date of Approval: 4/21/11
c. Project: Repaint as per existing. Repair woodwork as necessary to match existing. Add railings at steps to match 1910 photograph.

18. Applicant: Allen Johnson
   a. Property Address: 1006 Selma Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/25/11
   c. Project: Replace rotten wood to match existing in profile and dimension and repaint as existing.

19. Applicant: M. C. Roofing & Construction
   a. Property Address: 1407 Government Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/25/11
   c. Project: Reroof flat roof back porch with roll roofing and replace some decking as per existing. Replace any rotten siding necessary to match existing.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2011-28-CA: 210 Roper Street
   a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Dr. W. Christopher Patton
   b. Project: Ancillary Alteration – Enclose and extend an existing carport.

2. 2011-29-CA: 108 Conti Street
   a. Applicant: Benjamin Cummings for Kress Investments, LLC
   b. Project: Inner Lot Alterations - Construct a pedestrian bridge and stair over a private alley.

3. 2011-30-CA: 959 Savannah Street
   a. Applicant: William R. May
   b. Project: Roofing - Install a 5-V Crimp Metal roof.

4. 2011-31-CA: 65 Fearnway
   a. Applicant: David B. Breikreuz
   b. Project: Extensive Renovation and New Construction - Reconfigure/reconstruct the house’s infilled porch. Alter later fenestration. Convert an attached carport into an outdoor living area. Construct a garage.

5. 2011-32-CA: 1458 Government Street
   a. Applicant: Etheridge, LLC / Tree Investments, LLC
   b. Project: New Construction – Develop an empty lot by constructing a commercial building, installing hardscaping, and install landscaping.

6. 2011-26-CA: 58 Bradford Avenue
   a. Applicant: Bill Glover with Premier Windows of the Gulf Coast for Sam Au

7. 2011-27-CA: 1507 Dauphin Street
   a. Applicant: Wayne Gardner for the Dauphin Way United Methodist Church

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Metal Roofs
2. Guidelines
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF REPORT

2011-28-CA: 210 Roper Street
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Dr. W. Christopher Patton
Received: 4/15/11
Meeting: 5/4/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Ancillary Alteration – Enclose and extend an existing carport.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house dates from circa 1900. Transitional in style, the house’s irregular massing attests to the lingering influence of the Queen Anne aesthetic while the chaste detail represents a resurgence of classical influences.

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 May 8, 2006. At that time the Board approved the construction of wall. The applicant’s representative appears before the Board with application that calls for the enclosure and expansion of an existing carport.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):
   1. Ancillary Alteration – Enclose and extend an existing carport.
      a. The open bays of the carport will be infilled with a stud wall faced with hardiboard siding.
      b. The existing columnar posts will remain in place. The siding will be coped around the post’s capitals and bases (They will become anta-like pilasters).
      c. The South or street-facing Elevation will feature a pair of double paneled and vertical boarded doors.
      d. The East Elevation will feature a pair of paneled and vertical boarded doors.
      e. The North Elevation will not feature fenestration.
      f. A 4’ by 10’ 4” addition will be constructed off the carport’s west elevation.
      g. The addition will feature a two four light clad-wood awning windows.
h. The architrave and the cornice of the addition will match the existing.
i. The asphalt shingles will match the existing.
j. The color scheme will match that of the main house.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the alteration and expansion of an existing carport to create enclosed garage and storage spaces. The building was constructed in 1994. The applicant proposes the infill of the carport’s open bays and the construction of a side addition.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that ancillary construction should complement the design and scale of the main building. The proposed design calls for the retention of the carport’s columnar piers, a character defining feature of the building. The stud construction and siding sheathing would be coped about the post’s bases and capitals. The posts would function as pilasters demarcating the body of the building from the addition. The integrated asymmetry of the proposed addition is complementary to the main house and site location.

The addition meets the setback requirements for Mobile’s Historic Districts. The design and the materials for both the infill and the addition meet the requirements specified by the Design Review Guidelines. Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the property or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2011-29-CA: 108 Conti Street
Applicant: Benjamin Cummings for Kress Investments, LLC
Received: 4/15/11
Meeting: 5/4/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Inner Lot Alterations - Construct a pedestrian bridge and stair above a private alley.

BUILDING HISTORY

This three-story building comprised one of the four street elevations of downtown Mobile’s Kress Department Store. Other Kress buildings faced Royal, Dauphin, and Saint Emanuel Streets. The Conti Street façade dates from 1950s. The building’s flush window treatment and patterned brickwork are characteristic of the period and of the chain.

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 portion of the former Kress Complex has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicant’s propose linking this building with 20-26 Royal Street via a steel pedestrian bridge. The bridge would extend between the second stories of the two structures. A steel stair would allow access between the second and third floors of the subject building.

B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:

1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”

2. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Construct a steel pedestrian bridge/connector between 108 Conti Street (wing of the Kress Building) and 20-26 South Royal Street (Old Neisner Buidling).

a. The bridge will be setback over 81’ from the public right of way at the back of a
private alley.

b. The bridge will connect the second floor of the subject property with the second floor of the 20-26 South Royal Street.

c. A 3’ 6” high steel railing will enclose the bridge/connector

2. Construct a stairs connecting the second and third floors of the 108 Conti Street.

a. The stairs will be affixed to the east elevation of the building.

b. The stairs, which will be located at the western side of the pedestrian bridge/connector, will ascend to intermediate landing before terminating at a final landing accessing the third floor.

c. The stairs will feature the same railing as that of the bridge/connector

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a pedestrian bridge and an access stairs. Fire or access stairs were integral features of downtown buildings. The interrelated units will be located within the private alley that divides the larger building complex. While visible from the public view, the proposed bridge and stairs have been positioned within the rear third of the long alley.

The proposed stairs and bridge are sympathetic to yet differentiated from the simple industrial design of the main building. The stair and the bridge will thereby “read” as later alterations to a historic building. By virtue of their cantilevered and/or suspended construction, the plan of the alley will remain unaltered.

Based on the design and location of the bridge/stair configuration, Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical integrity of the buildings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF REPORT

2011-30-CA: 959 Savannah Street
Applicant: William R. May
Received: 4/18/11
Meeting: 5/4/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install a 5-V crimp metal roof.

BUILDING HISTORY

This shotgun dwelling dates from circa 1900. The façade features turned porch posts and a shingled gable.

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 applicant proposes the installation of a 5-V crimp metal roof.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “A roof is one of the most dominate features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”

C. Scope of Work:
   1. Install a silver colored 5-V crimp metal roof.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of a 5-V crimp metal roof. Applications for metal roofs are reviewed on a case by case basis. 5-V crimp metal roofs have been a common roofing treatment across the American South for over a century. Metal roofs of this type often sheathed shotgun dwellings.

The Guidelines state that roofing materials should be appropriate to a roof’s form, color, and pitch. This shotgun is surmounted by two gabled roofs. The roofing sheets will not have to adjust to projecting bays or wings. The color selected is the traditional metal roofing color. The pitch of the roof is typical to a two bay gable-roofed shotgun and the installation of metal roofing would not result in an inappropriateness of appearance.
Taking into account the house type, roof form, and roofing material, Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical integrity of the building.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (-1), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF REPORT

2011-31-CA: 65 Fearnway
Applicant: David Breitkreuz
Received: 3/8/11
Meeting: 4/6/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Extensive Renovations and New Construction - Reconfigure/reconstruct the house’s infilled porch. Alter later fenestration. Demolish/Convert an attached carport into an outdoor living area. Construct a garage.

BUILDING HISTORY

Fearnway was platted in 1909. This single-story Craftsman-influenced bungalow dates from 1918.

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 the reconstruction of the house’s infilled front porch, the alteration of fenestration, the conversion of a carport, and the construction of a garage.

B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:

1. “Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.”

2. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”

3. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of the building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing.”

4. “The exterior of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. The original siding should be retained and repaired.”

5. An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
C. **Scope of Work (per submitted plans):**

1. **Reconfigure/reconstruct the façade’s infilled porch and addition.**
   a. Remove the infilled porch’s eastern (façade) wall.
   b. The lower portion of the continuous brick foundation, that section which occupies the location and height of the original will remain intact.
   c. Tongue-and-groove wooden decking will be installed on the porch.
   d. Tongue-and-groove bead-board will be employed in the porch ceiling.
   e. Reconfigure the porch’s bay system to reflect the original bay divisions.
   f. Four pairs of square section wooden porch posts featuring cloud lift brackets will rest atop wooden plinths. The end plinths will feature three posts.
   g. The reconstructed/reconfigured porch will be faced with 1”x 6” wooden siding that will match the original.
   h. The surviving wooden door will be returned to its original location.
   i. A door surround featuring flanking sidelights and a surmounting transom will be installed about the original front door. The sidelights and transom will feature a diamond-paned light arrangement comparable to that found in the façade’s dormer windows.
   j. Two multi-light wooden windows with arched transoms will be installed to the south of the front door.

2. **Alter fenestration.**
   a. Remove a later paired six-over-six window unit from the façade.
   b. Install siding over the location of the aforementioned window. The siding will match the existing.
   c. Remove later aluminum windows from the façade’s recessed southern wing.
   d. Install a multi-light window with arched transom in the location of the above. The window will match that proposed for the infilled porch area.
   e. Remove three aluminum windows from the west elevation of the south wing.
   f. Install a single multi-light wooden window and arched transom.
   g. Remove a pair of four-over-four windows from the South Elevation.
   h. Install a bank of four four-over-four wooden windows in the location of the above.
   i. Remove non-conforming fenestration from the South and North Elevations of the later rear addition.
   j. Install multi-light wooden windows with transoms above locations.
   k. The South Elevation’s brick dado will be reconfigured to run uninterrupted beneath the fenestration.
   l. Remove a door from the later addition’s west elevation.
   m. Install a double paneled and glazed door to replace the above.

3. **Demolish/Convert an attached carport into an outdoor living area.**
   a. Demolish the multi-vehicular parking structure.
   b. Reconfigure the carport’s and later additions rear roof.
   c. The new roof will extend over a portion of the formerly covered parking area.
   d. A section of wooden screen wall will extend from the northwest corner of the remodeled addition. The screen wall will feature a cased opening.
   e. Construct an attached wooden pergola to be located at the end of the reconfigured outdoor living.
   f. Infill the South Elevation’s grill.
   g. For fenestration changes see C (2) g-i.

4. **Attend to miscellaneous deferred maintenance on the main house.**
   a. Reroof portions of the building. The roofing shingles will match the existing.
   b. Replace siding to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.

5. **Construct a one-and-one-half story garage in the southwest corner of the property.**
a. The garage will measure 24’ in width and 34’ in depth.
b. The walls will be faced with wooden siding matching that found on the main house
c. The double car garage East Elevation will feature paneled and glazed steel “Carriage House” doors.
d. A tripartite wooden window grouping with a diamond-shaped light configuration will be located above the garage doors.
e. A louvered vent matching that found on the main house will be located within the apex of the East Elevation’s gabled roof.
f. The South Elevation will feature two banks of three four-over-four windows.
g. The West Elevation will not feature fenestration.
h. A louvered vent matching that found on the East Elevation will be located within the apex of the West Elevation’s gable.
i. The North Elevation will feature a glazed and paneled double wooden door and a bank of three four-over-four wooden windows.
j. The garage’s gable roof will be sheathed with shingles matching those found on the main house.

Clarification

1. Provide a photograph of the door proposed for the rear elevation.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This house was heavily remodeled during the later half of the Twentieth Century. The front porch was infilled, fenestration alterations were made, a brick veneer was added, and rear additions were made. This five part application involves the reclamation of an infilled porch, the alteration of later fenestration, the remodeling of a later rear carport/addition, the undertaking of miscellaneous repairs, and the construction of a garage.

The front porch was infilled during the 1960s or 1970s. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation state that the replacement of missing features should be based upon documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence. The plan of the porch remains intact. The restoration of the elevations is guided by contemporary photographs found in the collections of the University of South Alabama Archives. With certain exceptions (fenestration and balustrade), the applicants propose a complete restoration of the façade’s front porch. The original door survives intact. The door surround, transoms and sidelight, is based on the original. The muntin pattern of the surround mimics that found in the façade’s two dormer windows. The fenestrated bays located to the south of the relocated entrance are located in the approximate locations of the original French doors. While the proposed windows will not impair the architectural integrity of the historic district, they would affect the property’s possible elevation to contributing status and Banner & Shield eligibility. Staff recommends that the applicants consider French doors with straight transoms for the porch.

The alteration of existing fenestration concerns the replacement of later windows installed on the main house and windows found on a post 1955 rear addition. With the possible exception of one window (one not visible from the street), all the aforementioned windows are not original to the building and non-conforming in nature. With regard to window replacements, window type, size, and light configuration are design matters of key concern. Staff’s recommendation regarding the porch window treatment extends in part to the south wing’s windows in that this house featured flat not arched fenestration. The remaining window replacements of the arched type are intended for the side elevation and later rear wing. All other window replacements meet the design and material standards.
The rear carport area dates from after the Second World War. This portion of the house is not visible from the public right of way. The design and construction of this parking cover is not of the same quality as that of the main house. The reduced size of the covered space will be augmented by an abutting pergola, a historically and aesthetically appropriate element for Arts and Crafts-inspired homes of the bungalow type.

The miscellaneous repairs will match the existing.

The proposed garage will be located atop the site of an earlier demolished garage. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that ancillary construction should complement the design and scale of a property’s principal building. The wood frame construction, simple massing, and window types are appropriate to period of the main house’s design and period. Some details, such as the two louvered vents, take design cue from the main house. The historic district overlay allows for the proposed setbacks.

Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical integrity of the building, the property, or the district.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-5), Staff does not believe that this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the building, the property, or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application. However, Staff would encourage the owners to utilize horizontal transoms over the windows rather than integral arched transom units.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF REPORT

2011-32-CA:  1452 Government Street
Applicant:  Etheridge, LLC / Tree Investments, LLC
Received:  4/18/11
Meeting:  5/4/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:  Old Dauphin Way
Classification:  Non-Contributing
Zoning:  R-3, R-3, R-3, R-1
Project:  New Construction – Develop a vacant lot by constructing a single tenant commercial building, installing hardscaping, fencing, and installing landscaping.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to the 1955 Sanborn Maps, three large Government Street facing homes stood upon this block. A rear service alley was located behind the one single and two multi-story dwellings.

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…”

A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicants propose the development of three large lots facing Government Street and one small lot facing Etheridge Street. The proposal calls for the construction of a single tenant commercial building, the installation of hardscaping, and the installation of landscaping.

B. A The Mobile Historic District Guidelines for New Commercial Construction state, in pertinent part:

1. “Placement and Orientation:” Placement has two components: setback, the distance between the street and a building; and spacing, the distance between its property lines and adjacent structures. New construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings. New buildings should not be placed too far forward or behind the traditional “facade line”, a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the facade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape. Current setback requirements of the City of Mobile Zoning Ordinance may not allow the building to be placed as close to the street as the majority of existing buildings. If the traditional facade line or “average” setback is considerably less than allowed under the Zoning Ordinance, the Review Boards will support an application for a Variance from the Board of Adjustment to allow for new construction closer to the street and more in character with the surrounding historic buildings.

2. Mass: Building mass is established by the arrangement and proportion of its basic geometric components - the main building, wings and porches, the roof and the foundation. Similarity of massing helps create a rhythm along a street, which is one of
a. **FOUNDATIONS:** The foundation, the platform upon which a building rests, is a massing component of a building. Since diminished foundation proportions have a negative effect on massing and visual character, new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.

b. **MAIN BODY AND WINGS:** Although roofs and foundations reinforce massing, the main body and wings are the most significant components. A building’s form or shape can be simple (a box) or complex (a combination of many boxes or projections and indentations). The main body of a building may be one or two stories. Interior floor and ceiling heights are reflected on the exterior of a building and should be compatible with nearby historic buildings.

c. **ROOFS:** A building’s roof contributes significantly to its massing and to the character of the surrounding area. New construction may consider, where appropriate, roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings.

3. **SCALE:** The size of a building is determined by its dimensions - height, width, and depth - which also dictate the building’s square footage. Scale refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings - large, medium, and small.

Buildings which are similar in massing may be very different in scale. To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.

4. **FAÇADE ELEMENTS:** Facade elements such as porches, entrances, and windows make up the “face” or facade of a building. New construction should reflect the use of facade elements of nearby historic buildings. The number and proportion of openings - windows and entrances - within the facade of a building creates a solid-to-void ratio (wall-to-opening). New buildings should use windows and entrances that approximate the placement and solid-to-void ratio of nearby historic buildings. In addition, designs for new construction should incorporate the traditional use of window casements and door surrounds. Where a side elevation is clearly visible from the street, proportion and placement of their elements will have an impact upon the visual character of the neighborhood and must be addressed in the design.

5. **MATERIALS AND ORNAMENTATION:** The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples. The choice of materials and ornamentation for new construction is a good way for a new building to exert its own identity. By using historic examples as a point of departure, it is possible for new construction to use new materials and ornamentation and still fit into the historic district. Historic buildings feature the use of a variety of materials for roofs, foundations, wall cladding and architectural details. In new buildings, exterior materials – both traditional and modern - should closely resemble surrounding historic examples.

**Scope of Work (per submitted plans):**

1. **Overall Site Work:**
   a. Clear and level the elevated site.
   b. Remove the u-shaped drive from the eastern western lot line.
c. Remove the coping wall located within the arms of the u-shaped drive.
d. Remove trees from the interior and the perimeter of the lot.

2. **Construct a single story, single tenant commercial building.**
a. The building will be setback 33’ from Government Street right of way at its closest point, 78.66’ to 85.12’ from the South Lafayette Street right of way, and 39.55’ from the Etheridge Street right of way.
b. **General Building Elements**
   1. The brick-veneered building will measure 130’ by 70’ in plan.
   2. The total square footage will amount to 9,100 square feet.
   3. The building will measure 22’ in height.
   4. The building will feature a canted southeast corner entrance.
   5. Bricks of three different colors will articulate the building’s elevations.
   6. The bricks will be dark, medium, or tan in color.
   7. The building’s elevations will feature paneled and capped pilasters atop bases.
   8. The pilasters will rise above an interrupted parapet/cornice.
   9. The wall bays will feature blind windows.
  10. Gooseneck lamps will be centered above the blind windows.
  11. Man made stone accents will punctuate the elevations, back the lamps, and articulate the pilasters.
  12. A parapet will extend around the South, East, and North Elevations.
  13. A standing seam metal roof will surmount the roof. The roof will be Dark Kelly Green in color.
c. **South Elevation**
   1. The South Elevation will measure 130’ in length and over 22’ in height (to apex of the parapet)
   2. The South Elevation will be comprised of a paired pilaster division, two blind windowed bays, and an entrance bay.
   3. A canted aluminum storefront unit will allow ingress to and egress from the building.
   4. A suspended standing seam metal canopy will surmount the entrance bay. The canopy will be Dark Kelly Green in color.
   5. A wall Signage (to be reviewed in a later application) will be positioned above the canopy.
   6. Three gooseneck lamps will be located above the signage.
   7. The entrance bay will feature a stepped and raked parapet.
d. **East Elevation**
   1. The East Elevation will measure 70’ in length and over 22’ in height (to the apex of the parapet).
   2. The East Elevation will be six bays in length.
   3. The northernmost bay will feature a metal service door and a blind window bay.
   4. The four inner bays will feature blind windows surmounted by gooseneck lamps.
5. The southernmost or entrance bay will be treated in the same manner as the South Elevation’s entrance bay.
6. The wall signage located within the entrance bay will be reviewed in later application.

e. **North Elevation**
   1. The North Elevation will be 70’ in length and over 15’ in height.
   2. The three bay North Elevation will step down in a westward direction.
   3. The eastern bay will feature two blind window bays with surmounting gooseneck lamps.
   4. The center bay will feature two gooseneck lamps.
   5. The western bay will feature a double metal door and three gooseneck lamps.

f. **West Elevation**
   1. The five bay West Elevation will feature a wider center bay flanked by two narrower bays located to either side.
   2. The outer bays will feature gooseneck lamps (one per bay).
   3. The larger center bay will feature two gooseneck lamps.
   4. Five HVAC units will be located off the center bay.

3. **Install Hardscaping within the lot.**
   a. Two 36’ wide curb cuts will allow vehicular ingress to and egress from the Property (dimensions reflect the inner widths of the curb cuts).
   b. A large Live Oak tree will have to be removed to accommodate the Lafayette Street curbcut.
   c. An asphalt parking lot will be located to the east and north of the building.
   d. Thirty-three parking spaces will be distributed about the parking areas.
   e. Thirteen spaces will be located off the sidewalk running along the eastern side of the building.
   f. Twelve spaces will be located to the west of the landscaped buffer separating the parking lot from the Lafayette Street sidewalk.
   g. Eight additional parking spaces will be located in the northwest corner of the property.
   h. A 79’ by 24’ (1,896 sq. ft.) concrete loading pad will be located to the rear of the building.
   i. An 8’ by 50’ (400 sq. ft.) concrete HVAC pad will be located of the west side of the building.
   j. An 18’ square dumpster pad will be located at the northern end of the West Elevation.

4. **Install Landscaping.**
   a. Install Live Oaks, Natchez Crepe Myrtles, Leyland Cypresses, and sod around the building (excepting the eastern side) and around the perimeter of the lot
   b. According to the planting schedule, eight existing trees (five Oaks, two Crepe Myrtles, and one Pecan) will be removed from the lot.

5. **Install fencing.**
   a. A six foot wooden fence will extend along the northern lot line.
Clarifications

1. What are the outer widths of the curbcuts?
2. Will the 6’ rear lot fence extend the whole of the lot line?
3. Will the 6’ rear fence step down as it approaches the street?
4. Will the concrete loading pad be raised?
5. Has the applicant contacted Urban Forestry?
6. Provide a current site plan of conditions and landscaping on the lot.
7. What type fencing will enclose the dumpster pad?
8. Will fencing surround the HVAC pad?
9. Provide material samples of the proposed bricks.
10. Has the issue of storm water detention been examined?
11. Where will the water detention pond be located and how will it be treated?

C. STAFF REPORT

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the construction a single-story, single-tenant commercial building. The parcel is comprised of four lots of record. Undeveloped, the lots feature heritage trees and other planting. All four lots are zoned residential; therefore, the application as proposed cannot be built until the rezoning is accomplished, regardless of the decision of this Board.

Three of the four lots face Government Street, the grandest of Mobile’s historic residential thoroughfares. Renowned for its grand public buildings, large homes, and tree canopy, Government Street constitutes a nationally significant cultural landscape.

The Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile’s Historic District address five primary areas of concern: placement; mass; scale; façade elements; and materials and ornamentation. Additional concerns include landscaping and hardscaping.

Placement involves consideration of setbacks and orientation. A building setback is the distance between a building and the street. Traditionally commercial buildings were oriented close to, if not on, the property line. Government Street west of Broad was primarily a residential artery. Large houses were setback thirty or more feet from the street amid landscaped lots. The proposed thirty-three foot setback from Government Street is compatible to the setbacks that characterize nearby historic residential structures. Building orientation concerns the relationship of the building to the street. The large parcel occupies the street frontage of a Government Street block. The property therefore embraces two side streets, Etheridge Street and Lafayette Street. Etheridge Street underwent major demolitions during the later half of the Twentieth Century. Lafayette Street is one the most intact, architecturally diverse, and best preserved residential streets in Mobile. The proposed building will be located in the southeast corner of the lot. As such, the development will have significant consequences for the Lafayette Streetscape.

Building mass is defined as the relationship of individual building parts to the larger built whole. Foundation treatment, horizontal division, bays system, and roof treatments come under review. The proposed building features a block-like massing characteristic of traditional commercial structures. Said block-like massings were rarely so large on earlier single story commercial concerns. The building would rest atop a slab foundation. The pilaster bases will provide some form of horizontal relief to the building mass. The pilasters will break the building up vertically into a regularized system of bays. The proposed heights are previously approved examples of commercial infill. A parapet will obscure the building’s metal roof on its South, East, and North Elevations. Parapets are a traditional design element employed to
obscure roof structures. The parapet will not extend around the West Elevation. Resultantly the building’s green-colored metal roof will be exposed to the public view. Colored Metal roofs have not been approved by the Board.

Scale is defined as the proportional relationship between buildings. The proposed building is proportionally inappropriate to the historic residential and historic commercial buildings that continue to line Government Street. The, the Historic District Guidelines read “To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.” The scale is inappropriate to both Etheridge and Lafayette streets which are lined with one-story residences averaging 1600-2200 square feet.

A façade is a building’s principal elevation. On account of the block long lot and the canted corner of the entry, this building features two facades, one facing Government Street and a second facing Lafayette Street. The canted southeast corner storefront entrance is the principle design element. The remaining bays of the South and East facades are treated in a similar manner, essentially a regularized system of blind window bays demarcated by pilasters. The canted storefront entrance comprises the building’s only true fenestration. No glazed fenestration is found elsewhere on the building. A parapet extends around the South, East, and North Elevations. The parapet adopts a stepped format on the North Elevation. The parapet does not extend around the West Elevation. The north elevation does not feature any fenestration, real or blind. The complete absence of glazed fenestration, excepting the storefront, is not appropriate for Mobile’s historic districts. The absence of parapet on the West Elevation results in the full view of the building’s industrial roof. The unarticulated nature of the West Elevation is not suitable for street-facing elevation. The lengthy distribution of mechanical equipment along said elevation further denigrates the streetscape.

Building materials and facing should be historically appropriate to Mobile’s historic districts. Brick is a material long employed on Mobile’s commercial buildings. Numerous commercial buildings feature facades displaying varicolored bricks. Material samples should be provided for Staff inspection and Board Review.

Landscaping is a key concern. Though the proposals would leave a sizable amount of the property undeveloped and would involve the installation of a large number of plantings, the development plan does not take into account the existing landscape. Removal of trees with trunks measuring twenty-four inches or more requires approval from Urban Forestry. Heritage trees such as Live Oaks are given special consideration and removal of these Oaks is rarely approved. The insertion of the Lafayette Street curbcut would require the cutting a large forty inch Live Oak. Said tree and others are located within the right of way therefore fall under jurisdiction of that City office. It should be noted that the City’s tree ordinance was crafted in order to deter and avoid removal of these Oaks. Dense groupings of Water Oaks dot the central and rear portions of the lot. While not heritage trees, Water Oaks and the other trees that create the property’s the leafy canopy, bestow upon the lot much of its historic integrity and historic character. Any proposed tree removals must be reviewed by Urban Forestry.

In addition to landscaping, hardscaping and fencing are requisite components for new commercial developments. The Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state the parking areas should be obscured by landscaping. Proposed plantings will buffer views of the built and paved areas, but only to certain extent. Most of the parking is located off of Lafayette Street, a residential street characterized by open lawns and predominately single story residences, not expanses of asphalt. Landscaping provisions fail to adequately address the southeast corner of the lot or the rear lot line. Parking in both these areas would intrude upon the historic streetscapes and/or residential settings. With regard to southeast corner area, vehicular maneuverability would be jeopardized and landscape vistas would be sacrificed. As per northeast corner, public parking would extend well into the residential block. A proposed six foot wooden
fence would abut the side wall of and extend beyond the front plan of an adjacent private residence. The rear Etheridge Street side parking would be separated from the rest of the lot by a straight cut through made by the alignment of the two proposed curbcuts. Inner vehicular arteries of this type are not encouraged and rarely approved by Traffic and Engineering. The insertion of large curbcuts from Etheridge and Lafayette Streets would alter the character of the two side streets. To accommodate the delivery trucks that would service the proposed development, Traffic and Engineering has advised us that Etheridge Street would need to be widened reducing the planting buffer. This plan would have to be approved by this department and would affect the site plan as proposed.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Staff has met with other representatives from Zoning, Planning, Traffic Engineering, Right of Way, and Urban Development regarding this application. In addition to the above cited design and landscape issues, numerous other criteria under purvey of other City Departments need to be addressed.

Urban Development: The three front lots are zoned R3 and the Etheridge Street lot is zoned R1. UDD Staff do not believe the change of zoning to B2 for the four lots would be recommended. In addition, a new subdivision is required to create one lot of record. Again, Staff was not encouraging about the intrusion of commercial zoning into the neighborhood which may affect the subdivision.

TRAFFIC ENGINEERING/RIGHT OF WAY: Etheridge Street can not accommodate large delivery trucks. Without a formal review, Staff was unsure of the ability to get large trucks onto Lafayette Street. Staff also noted that cut throughs are generally not approved such as the one from Lafayette to Etheridge. Concern was also expressed about putting commercial traffic onto Etheridge which is too narrow to handle a significant increase in traffic. It was noted that the traffic patterns along Etheridge (turning onto Government) and Lafayette needed investigating.

URBAN FORESTRY: No representative of Urban Forestry was present available, but representatives of Urban Development and Traffic Engineering were not encouraging about the removal of at least one and possibly more trees.

Applications required:
- An application to the Board of Zoning Adjustment to rezone three lots from R-3 to B-2 and one lot from R-1 to B-2;
- An application to the City Planning Commission for resubdivision of the four lots of records;
- An application to the Mobile Tree Commission for removal of the trees;
- Assuming the zoning change is approved and the resubdivision is accepted, typical site and construction review by the Urban Development Permitting staff which include review of the proposal by Right of Way, Urban Forestry, Traffic and Engineering, Zoning and the Building Inspectors.

Any changes made throughout the above rezoning and permitting process to the proposed plan will necessitate the plan returning to this Board for approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-5), Staff, Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and the historical character of the historic district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application. Staff also notes that there are considerable regulatory obstacles that need to be addressed. These obstacles may make the project not feasible.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-26-CA: 58 Bradford Avenue
Applicant: Bill Glover with Premier Windows of the Gulf Coast for Sam Au
Received: 4/4/11; revised 4/25/11
Meeting: 5/4/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Window Replacement – Replace aluminum windows with vinyl windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-and-one-half story bungalow was constructed circa 1920. The house features a full length front porch and shingled side gables.

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 appeared before the Old Dauphin Way Review Board on April 20, 2011. At that time, the Board tabled an application calling for the removal aluminum windows and the installation of vinyl windows. The applicant and his representative return to the Board with a drawing, photographs, and model of the proposed replacement windows.

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 windows should be retained as well as original 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 additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”

C. Scope of Work:
   1. Remove the latter aluminum awning windows from the house’s north and south (side) elevations.
   2. Replace the aluminum awning windows with double hung, double-paned vinyl sash windows.
      a. The vinyl window units will be framed with wooden surrounds replicating those of the façade’s wooden windows. framing
      b. The vinyl windows will be faced with a textured aluminum facing with a grained finish.
      c. The frames and units will be white in color.
d. Screens will be placed over the windows.

e. Remove a later window installed in the South Elevation’s gable.

f. The South Elevation’s first story windows will be sized to better fit the reveals (not framed and suspended as some of the existing).

g. Install wooden shingles matching the existing over the location of the aforementioned window.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the replacement of latter aluminum awning windows with double hung vinyl windows.

The house dates from circa 1920. The house is a non-contributing dwelling on account of alterations made to its historic fabric, the absence of original/historic windows being the most obvious. The original windows were removed sometime after the Second World War. The present aluminum windows were in place when the residence was first surveyed in 1984. The current non historic replacement windows are inoperable. The existing windows are not historically or aesthetically appropriate to the style and period of the residence.

The applicant proposes replacing the aluminum awning windows on the side elevations with vinyl, double-hung, sash windows. The application was tabled at the April 20, 2011 meeting of the Board for submission of sample installation photographs, section drawings, and additional explication. In addition to material composition, window installation and dimensionality were areas of Board concern. Based on its examination of the windows installation and drawings, Staff believes the revised application address the Board’s and Staff’s concerns.

Staff believes and the Guidelines state that vinyl windows should not be utilized in the historic districts. However, the question before the Board is whether the replacement of later, inoperable aluminum windows with fitted vinyl windows will impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. In this case, Staff believes that the ideal replacement window would be wooden windows. It is the Board’s duty to determine impairment. Staff believes that the removal of later inappropriate windows and their replacement with less inappropriate and stylistically correct window cannot be considered impairment. Therefore Staff recommends approval of this application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the district. Staff recommends approval of this application. It should be noted that this exception is based on several criteria, among them being: the non-contributing status of the building; the inappropriateness of the existing replacement windows; the location of the proposed windows (side elevations only); the efforts made by the applicant to develop an appropriate windows surround (dimensionality); and the quality of the window design. Of the Board agrees with Staff, it should be noted that this is not the Board breaking its own rules or making an exception. Rather this is an instance wherein the Board utilizes its discretion as required by the ordinance.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-27-CA: 1507 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Wayne Gardner for the Dauphin Way United Methodist Church
Received: 4/4/11; revised 4/26/11
Meeting: 5/4/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: 
Project: Window Replacement – Replace wooden windows with double-paned wooden windows featuring a Low-E Glass coating.

BUILDING HISTORY

Old Dauphin Way United Methodist Church is one of the most monumental Protestant churches of the post Second World War period. The vast complex focuses about a 1957 sanctuary, an accomplished essay in the High Georgian Revival.

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 April 20, 2011. At that time, the Board tabled an application involving the replacement of original single-paned windows with double-paned Low-E glass windows. As per the Board’s request, the applicant’s representative returns before the Board with drawings of the original and the proposed windows.

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 windows should be retained as well as original 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 additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”

C. Scope of Work:
   1. Remove fourteen multi-paned arched wooden windows from the main sanctuary.
   2. Replace the single-paned windows with double-paned wooden windows of the same design.
   3. The panes of the replacement windows will feature a Low-E coating.
STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the replacement of wooden windows with wooden windows. The existing windows make up over one-fourth of the building’s historic fabric. The proposed replacement would be double as opposed to single-pane in construction and the glazing would feature a Low-E glass coating.

The removal and replacement of historic windows is a topic of major discussion in both the preservation and construction literature. With the rising energy costs and increasing “green” incentives, there exists much information and misinformation on the subject. The National Trust for Historic Preservation has devoted a section of its website to the subject (www.preservationnation.org/issues).

A 2010 issue of the Alabama Trust for Historic Preservation’s newsletter addressed the situation. The basic conclusion of the web site and publication is that existing windows should be preserved. In analyzing retention as opposed to replacement, economic, and energy factors are cited in favor of keeping the historic windows. Additional argument is made for their importance to the historic integrity of the building. The use of storm windows is recommended as energy saving solution that simultaneously preserves historic fabric, character, and resources. When windows must be replaced the replacement composition (material) and construction (single or double-paned) are matters of key concern. The window literature further addresses the types and dates of wooden window construction.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that historic windows should be retained (B.1 above). When windows must be replaced the Guidelines state that those replacements should be compatible with the general character of the building. The construction method, double instead of single pane, would change. The Guidelines do not authorize the replacement of single-paned windows with double-paned windows.

At the April 20, 2011 meeting, Board members were divided on the issue of window replacement. The applicants were requested to provide drawings of existing and proposed windows. The original drawings show that the Church was intended to have double-paned windows. For reason or reasons unspecified, single-paned windows were installed. The existing windows will be located within a deeper frame and will feature a deeper muntin system, but the detailing of the window surround and divisions will remain the same. While Staff is cognizant of and open to energy saving measures, the Guidelines, professional literature, and previous Board rulings, all speak against the installation of double-paned window replacements. Staff does not recommend approval of the removal of the original single-paned windows and their replacement with double-paned windows. In the event, the Board moves to allow the replacement of the windows Staff recommends that the lightest Low-E coating be employed on the new windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and the historical character of the building and the district. Staff recommends against the replacement of the historic windows.