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: Smith Painting
   a. Property Address: 1206 Selma Street
   b. Date of Approval: 11/1/12
   c. Project: Repair rotten wood and fascia matching the existing in profile dimension and materials. Paint the existing color scheme: body – medium gray; trim – white; porch – Bellingrath Green.

2. Applicant: Angela Surgenor and Cherri Pacatte with Pura Vida Ventures
   a. Property Address: 1008 Old Shell Road
   b. Date of Approval: 11/1/12
   c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

3. Applicant: Chris Bailey
   a. Property Address: 255 Adam Street
   b. Date of Approval: 10/19/12
   c. Project: Install 6 foot dog eared privacy fence, shadow boxed along rear west property line per submitted sketch.

4. Applicant: Jill Sheffiled
   a. Property Address: 58 Lee Street
   b. Date of Approval: 10/12/12
   c. Project: Paint the house following Behr colors: Body: Nomad; Trim: White; Porch floor: Black; and Door: Autumn Rushes

5. Applicant: Sarah and Chad Jones
   a. Property Address: 21 Hannon Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 10/16/12
   c. Project: Replace fixed louvers with glazed wood windows in the side and rear wall dormers.

6. Applicant: Zachery Cooley
   a. Property Address: 13 South Julia Street
   b. Date of Approval: 11/1/12
   c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and composition. Work includes: siding, decking, skirting, etc… Repaint per the existing color scheme.

7. Applicant: Matt Lemond
   a. Property Address: 564 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 11/5/12
   c. Project: Repair and resurface existing concrete paving.

8. Applicant: Jeffrey Hall
   a. Property Address: 265 South Monterey Street
   b. Date of Approval: 11/6/12
c. Project: Repaint per the existing color scheme.

9. Applicant: Downtown Mobile Alliance for Olensky Brothers.
   a. Property Address: 28 South Royal Street
   b. Date of Approval:
   c. Project: Install a wall sign. The sixty-four square foot (Board Zoning Adjustment approved sign) will be aluminum-faced and feature reverse channel lighting. The name, logo, and descriptive of the occupying concern will comprise the sign design.

10. Applicant: Richard Brown
    a. Property Address: 1501 Old Shell Road/1413 North Lafayette Street
    b. Date of Approval: 11/8/12
    c. Project: Relocate existing 4 foot chain link fence surrounding baseball field in 3 feet in order to maintain property between fences.

11. Applicant: Meggan Haller
    a. Property Address: 1320 Dauphin Street
    b. Date of Approval: 11/13/12
    c. Project: Remove a later concrete walkway extending between the sidewalk and the front steps and install a brick walk. Replace later stone coping with brick coping.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2012-64-CA: 106 South Catherine Street
   a. Applicant: William Pee Griffin for Katherine Whitely

2. 2012-65-CA: 564 Dauphin Street
   a. Applicant: Matt Lemond
   b. Project: Mural – Paint a mural on the West Elevation.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. 
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2012-64-CA: 106 South Catherine Street
Applicant: William P. Griffin for Katherine Whitely
Received: 11/5/12
Meeting: 11/21/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct an ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story residence dates from circa 1915.

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. With this application, the owner/applicant proposes the construction of carport to be located in the property’s rear lot.

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, 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. Construct a carport.

   a. The carport will measure 30’ in length and 18’ in depth.
   b. The carport will rest atop a concrete slab foundation.
   c. The carport will be located 6’ from the side property lines and 8’ from the rear property line.
   d. Three vehicular bays will be located in the southern portion of the building.
   e. Six wooden posts will support the roof structure located above the vehicular bays.
   f. A storage room will be located in northern portion of the building.
   g. The storage room will be faced with wooden siding matching that found on the property’s principle building.
   h. Six paneled wooden doors located on the East Elevation will provide access to and from the storage room.
i. The North Elevation will feature rafter tails matching those employed on the main dwelling.

j. A shed roof will surmount the building.

k. Metal roofing panels matching those employed on the main dwelling will be employed on the building.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the construction of an ancillary building. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that ancillary construction should complement the design and scale of the property’s principle building (See B-1).

Minimally visible from the public view at present, the proposed building would be located within a rear lot fully enclosed by privacy fencing. The building, a three car carport with attached storage shed, meets both setback and lot coverage requirements. Though the building’s location and square footage meet municipal requirements, the design does not complement the house. Staff recommends that the applicants employ chamfered or boxed posts instead of the simple posts articulated in the plans. Staff also recommends that boxed eaves be used in place of open eaves and a hipped roof be employed instead of shed roof. Changes in the post, eave, and roofing treatments would make the design more in keeping with the property’s main dwelling.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1), Staff, Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and the historical character of the building. As proposed, Staff does not recommend approval of this application. If the applicant were to employ porch posts, eaves, and a roof form more in character with the historic integrity of the building (see the above), Staff would recommend approval of this application.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2012-65-CA: 564 Dauphin Street
 Applicant: Matt Lemond
 Received: 11/5/12
 Meeting: 11/21/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install a mural.

BUILDING HISTORY

This building is one unit of row of single-story storefronts constructed during the middle third 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. A unit within this larger group of strip-like storefronts last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on February 17, 2009. At that time, the Board denied an application for exterior signage. The current applicant proposes the painting of mural on the western most unit’s West Elevation.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Guidelines state, in pertinent part:
   1. With regard to painting “period color schemes are encouraged.’
   2. “The way in which color is applied as a design element is important to the overall appearance of the building. Use colors that may be typical of the period and/or blend with adjacent buildings. For purpose of design review, colors are classified by the following categories of use: body, trim, and accent.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted renderings):
   1. Paint a mural on the building’s West Elevation.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the painting of a mural. The mural would be located on the building’s West Elevation.
Neither the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts nor the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Design Guidelines specifically address murals. The Design Review Guidelines encourage the use of period color schemes (See B-1), while the Lower Dauphin Guidelines state that color is important to overall appearance of buildings (See B-2). The latter compilation goes on to break down a color scheme into body, trim, and accent colors.

In reviewing previous applications entailing the painting of murals, including proposals for 14 Saint Emanuel Street (the Old Gayfer’s department store) and 271 Dauphin Street (Heroes sports bar), the Board has considered and discussed the following: subject matter/content; quality; and maintenance. Additionally, this is a post WWII building and there is no evidence of a mural ever having been on the building nor were they typical of the building period.

With regard to subject matter, both the appearances and the meanings thereof could be problematic. As per quality and maintenance, the Lower Dauphin Commercial District is a highly trafficked area. Color schemes are in constant need of being touched up. Repair to murals would be an issue. Additionally, unauthorized graffiti could alter the design and appearance of the design.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2) and previous Board rulings, Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and the historical character of the district and does not reflect the building’s original character. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.