

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
April 17, 2013 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Robert Allen, Kim Harden, Nick Holmes III, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone.
Members Absent: Carolyn Hasser, Harris Oswalt, Jim Wagoner, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and John Lawler.
2. After some discussion, Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the April 3, 2013 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: Mark Dodson**
 - a. Property Address: 165 Hannon Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/26/13
 - c. Project: Remove the existing concrete walk. Install a brick on the same location as the existing walkway. The walk will be paved in Old Mobile brick matching those comprising the house's foundation. Reconstruct the property's coping wall reusing the same bricks.
2. **Applicant: Michael Patterson**
 - a. Property Address: 962 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/26/13
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material (siding, soffit, decking, etc...). Repair, and when necessary replace, windows to match the existing. Repaint the house per the submitted Behr color scheme. The body will be Myth and the trim will be white.
3. **Applicant: Brandon Bailey**
 - a. Property Address: 1016 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/26/13
 - c. Project: Install a six foot high interior lot privacy fence. The fence will not extend beyond the front plane of the house.
4. **Applicant: Tuan Tiddlestan with Baytown Builders**
 - a. Property Address: 1013 Augusta Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/28/13
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated siding and detailing to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repair and replace decking when, and where necessary, to match the existing. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.
5. **Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Jake and Melissa Epker**
 - a. Property Address: 2306 DeLeon Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/29/13
 - c. Project: Replace rotten sills, porch structure, and decking (to match). Repair and replace the foundation piers to match the existing in composition and configuration. Temporarily remove the one story porch columns for later reinstallation. Stabilize and

reconstruct the porch. Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork and details to match the existing composition, profile, and material.

6. Applicant: Elite Roofing Company

- a. Property Address: 30 McPhillips Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/2/13
- c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.
- d.

7. Applicant: Brenda and Charles Chapman

- a. Property Address: 521 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/2/13
- c. Project: Repaint per the existing color scheme. Replace shutters to match the existing. Replace the rear canopy.

8. Applicant: Tuan Tiddlestan with Baytown Builders

- a. Property Address: 259 North Jackson Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/3/13
- c. Project: Repair and repoint the brickwork when and where necessary to match the existing using appropriate mortar. Repair, and when necessary replace, windows to match the existing.

9. Applicant: Randolph Wilson

- a. Property Address: 1004 Elmira Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/4/13
- c. Project: Replace siding on as needed to match existing in profile, dimension and materials. Paint repairs to match.

10. Applicant: Donna Lambert and Todd Hicks

- a. Property Address: 10 North Dearborn Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/8/13
- c. Project: Repair, and when necessary replace, deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2012-24-CA: 404 Regina Avenue

- a. Applicant: Samuel Laughlin for Robert Watts
- b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain unauthorized replacement fenestration and siding.

DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2012-25-CA: 107 Saint Francis Street

- a. Applicant: Rodney DePriest and Sandi Gaddy with Knight Sign Industries for the Retirement Systems of Alabama
- b. Project: Signage – Install logo signs.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2012-26-CA: 101 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Tracy Bassett and Carrie Day with Goodwyn, Mills and Cawood for the Retirement System of Alabama
- b. Project: Fenestration – Replace ground floor storefront units and upper story fenestration.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Signage
2. Murals
3. Foley Conference

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-24-CA: 404 Regina Avenue
Applicant: Samuel Laughlin for Robert Watts
Received: 3/27/13
Meeting: 4/17/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain unauthorized replacement fenestration and siding.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house dates from middle third of the 20th Century. The “bungalow” type dwelling was influenced by the Arts and Crafts movement design sources.

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. Wooden siding and wooden windows were removed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness or the pulling of a building permit. Urban Development issued a Stop Work Order. The applicant submits an application requesting approval of the unauthorized work.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The exterior of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. Original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension, and material.”
 - 2. “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.”
 - 3. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible with the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted application):
 - 1. Retain unauthorized replacement siding.
 - 2. Retain unauthorized replacement windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the After-the-Fact-Approval of replacement siding and windows. The work was conducted without the issuance of either a Certificate of Appropriateness or the pulling of a building permit. The applicant appears before the Board with a request to retain the siding and the windows.

With regard to exterior siding, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension, and material (See B-1). The replacement siding does not match the original siding. The lap siding was replaced with vertical board panels.

Along with the siding, the original windows were removed. The Design Review Guidelines state that the type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing (See B-2). The Design Review Guidelines go on to state that replacement windows should be compatible with the general character of the building (See B-3). The original windows were six-over-six wooden windows. The replacement windows, while six-over-six in configuration, are aluminum in composition.

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.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Samuel and Catherine Laughlin were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicants. He asked them if they had any comments to make, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. and Mrs. Laughlin explained that they are in the process of purchasing the property from the estate of a deceased relation. Mr. Laughlin proceeded to explain the reason why they executed the unauthorized work. He told the Board that the windows had been broken out and that there was drug activity in the area. Mr. Laughlin said that he and his wife only wanted to secure the property from break ns and vagrants. Mr. Ladd stated that he and the Board could understand such a concern. Mrs. Laughlin told the Board that of the adjacent houses, one was vacant and the other had vagrants living in it. Mr. Ladd said the Board is aware of the area's problem with vagrants and that as individuals he and his fellow Board members understand the concerns surrounding the threats vagrants can pose.

Mr. Karwinski addressed the applicants. He told them that if they had pulled a building permit, they would have been made aware of the processes and standards by which work is conducted in a historic district.

Mr. Stone asked Mr. Laughlin if the replacement siding was installed over the wooden siding. Mr. Laughlin answered yes, but only in certain location. He explained further by saying that the only siding to remain was that which was not in disrepair. Mr. Laughlin stated that majority of the siding had been removed.

Mr. Laughlin asked the Board if he replaced the siding could he be allowed to retain windows for the time being in order to secure the building and make a plan to come into compliance.

Mr. Ladd thanked Mr. Laughlin for the direction he was taking the discussion. He told Mr. Laughlin that the Review Board has earned an unfair representation. Mr. Ladd elaborated by explaining that the Review Board is here to work with people, not against them.

Mr. Allen asked Mr. Laughlin for clarification regarding the size of the windows. Mr. Laughlin addressed Mr. Allen's query.

Mr. Ladd suggested to his fellow Board members that they entertain Mr. Laughlin's suggestion of a phased replacement of siding and windows. He stated that would be positive alternative.

Mr. Roberts agreed with Mr. Ladd, but added that if this application was the result of a 311 call, neighboring residents might take the Board's action in a different manner than intended.

Ms. Harden entered into the discussion. She said that she was amenable to following the applicant's solution to the dilemma. Ms. Harden stated that the treatment should be seen as stabilization and not a temporary approval. She added that there should a specific time when the applicants reappear before the Board.

Mr. Blackwell asked the applicants what would for them to address the siding. Mr. Laughlin answered six months.

Mr. Ladd told the applicants that the Board was working with them and they should do likewise.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that the applicants would return to the Board within six months with a plan to replace the work. It was added that a Certificate of Appropriateness could be issued for in kind replacement on Staff level for any approvable work that would resolve the issue.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DENIED.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-25-CA: 107 Saint Francis Street (31 North Royal Street)
Applicant: Redney Depriest and Sandi Gaddy with Knight Sign Industries for the Retirement Systems of Alabama
Received: 4/1/13
Meeting: 4/17/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Signage – Replace signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

This thirty-four story skyscraper originally housed the First National Bank. From time of its completion in 1965 to 1986, the building was the tallest structure in the state of Alabama.

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 August 22, 2012. At that time the Board approved the installation of new signage. The application up for review calls for the replacement of logo signs.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Signs shall be mounted or placed so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building.”
 - 2. “The overall design of all signage including the mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property.”
 - 3. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.”
 - 4. “The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the building, not exceed 64 square feet.
 - 5. “Internally lit signs are prohibited.”
 - 6. “Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination. Such lighting shall not shine into or create glare at pedestrian or vehicular traffic nor shall it shine into adjacent areas.”
 - 7. “Plastic” is not an approved material.”

- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans and supplemental materials):
1. Install a logo sign on the South Elevation.
 - a. The sign will measure 12' 2 7/8" in width and 11' 1/4" in height.
 - b. The total square footage of the sign will measure 135 square feet.
 - c. The sign will be faced with Lexan and vinyl.
 - d. The sign will feature LED lighting with a halo effect.
 2. Install a logo sign on the West Elevation.
 - a. The sign will measure 13' 3 7/8" in width and 1' in height.
 - b. The total square footage of the sign will measure 160 square feet.
 - c. The sign will be faced with Lexan and vinyl.
 - d. The sign will feature LED lighting with a halo effect.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of replacement of logo signs. When reviewing signage applications the Board addresses the following concerns: location, installation, size, design, lighting, and materials.

On August 22, 2013, the Board approved the installation of a sign package that recognized the identity of a combine banking entity. Upper story logo signs for the South and West Elevations were approved on that date. The applicant's representative appears before the Board with a request for larger logos to be installed on the previously approved locations. The installation of will neither obscure prominent architectural features nor endanger historic materials (See B-1).

The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts restrict signage size to 64 square feet (See B-4). Variances are issued for large skyscrapers of this type in cases where the size of the sign would not adversely impact the architectural or the historical of the building and district. Said signage should be proportional to the building and neighboring buildings (See B-3). A variance would be required to approve the increased square footage. The applicants are in the process of applying for a variance.

The design of the logos remains the same and is in accord with the present design of the building (See B-2).

The logos would employ channel-lite illumination aimed at creating a halo effect. Internal lighting other back-lighting or reverse channel illumination is not authorized by the Guidelines (See B-5). Two trial cases have been approved by the Board. On December 5, 2012, the Board approved routed aluminum signage featuring a halo effect at 213 Dauphin Street. Said signage was not installed. On April 3, 2013, the Board approved similar lighting at 3-5 South Royal Street. The aforementioned signage has not been installed. In both of the two instances cited above, the signage was smaller in scale and designed to achieve a traditional appearance.

Channel illumination of this type requires a plastic face. The Design Review Guidelines list plastic as inappropriate signage material for use in Mobile's Historic Districts (See B-7).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (7), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and historical character of the surrounding district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Rodney DePriest with Trustmark and Cal Holt with Knight Signs were present to discuss the application. Buddy Huff and Mike Fitzhugh with Trustmark and Russell Phifer with Knight Signs were in the audience and willing to speak on behalf of the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representatives to the meeting and thanked them for expanding into the Mobile market. He asked Mr. DePriest and Mr. Holt if they had any comments to make, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. DePriest thanked Mr. Ladd. He then introduced his colleagues. Mr. DePriest said that upon receiving approval from the Board for the larger signage package in August of 2012, Trustmark had further investigated the approved signage. He told the Board that Trustmark wanted to be a good neighbor and that he was present with a proposal aimed at achieving that end. He said that he and Mr. Holt would answer any questions the Board might entertain regarding the signage. Mr. DePriest distributed photographs of examples of the signage. He and Mr. Holt gestured to a sample of the proposed signage. Mr. DePriest told the Board that the proposed signage is something that Trustmark is proud of and it would not be a detriment to Mobile's historic downtown.

Upon examining the design of the Trustmark logo, Mr. Roberts noted the intricacy and complexity of the design. He asked Mr. Holt about the composition of the proposed signage.

Mr. Holt responded by saying that the signage is metal in composition. He gestured to the sample and stated it represented how Knight Signs and Trustmark had worked to achieve the effect they desired, yet still meet standards.

Mr. Roberts asked if part of the sign was plastic.

Mr. Holt said it was flex face sign.

Mr. Roberts said while it was not cheap looking, parts appeared be plastic faced.

Mr. DePriest explained the construction of the sign and the nature of lighting. He distributed additional photographs of signage.

Mr. Stone stated that given the height of the building no one would know the composition of the sign facings. He stated that even at a distance of fifteen feet that no one could determine the material.

Mr. Roberts asked Staff what they recommended.

Mr. Blackwell responded by saying that recommendation in the Staff Report was made before the submission of the sample.

Mr. Bemis stated that the proposed sign looks like it is made of plastic.

Mr. Holt elaborated on the construction of the sign and the effect of the signage.

Mr. DePriest addressed the reasoning behind the proposed signage. He cited reasons of repair and appearance.

Mr. Ladd concurred with Mr. Stone that the given the height of the building the composition of the sign face would matter little.

Mr. Bemis objected to the halo effect.

Mr. Roberts concurred with Mr. Stone and Mr. Ladd that at nearly 400' the facing of the sign face would be undeterminable.

Mr. Bemis stated that the new form based code would prohibit such a sign.

Mr. Roberts and Mr. Karwinski expressed concern regarding the lettered signage shown in the drawings. Mr. Blackwell explained that the lettered signage had already been approved by the Board.

Mr. Stone asked for explication as to which part of the sign would be illuminated in a halo effect. Mr. Pfifer gestured to the white portions of the design and sample.

Mr. Roberts and Mr. Karwinski raised the subject of the building's moon pie drop.

Mr. Pfifer told the Board that it is the same composition as the proposed signage.

Mr. Bemis interjected by saying that the moon pie had been approved as a special feature, not as a sign.

Mr. Roberts and Mr. Karwinski said that they had voted in opposition to the moon pie.

Mr. Ladd reiterated that given the height the building the face of the sign would not impair the architectural or the historical character of the district.

Mr. Holmes asked Mr. Blackwell as to the size of the signage. Mr. Blackwell explained that the applicants were applying for a variance for the signage. He added that the proposed logos are smaller than the approved logos. Mr. Blackwell said that on account of the size of the building, Staff did not object to the size of the signage.

Mr. Holmes agreed with Mr. Stone, Mr. Roberts, and Mr. Ladd that the height of the signage made discussion of the outermost facing of little importance. He said that the signage would not impair the architectural and the historical character of the district. Mr. Holmes stated that the Sign Design Guidelines fail to address signage for skyscrapers.

Ms. Harden entered into the discussion. She said that the sign would not impair the architectural and historical character of the surrounding district on account on account the style of the building, the period of construction, and the height of proposed location.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Holmes moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts note that the building is not contributing in status, but non-contributing.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued on account of the style of the building, height of the signage, and status of the building.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 4/17/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-26-CA: 101 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Tracy Bassett and Carrie Day with Goodwyn, Mills and Cawood for the Retirement Systems of Alabama
Received: 3/29/13
Meeting: 3/17/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Fenestration – Replace ground level storefronts and upper story fenestration.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Van Antwerp Building is Mobile’s first skyscraper. The building was built between 1904 and 1906 according to the designs of George B. Rogers. The three part division of the building demarcated by the commercial ground floor mezzanine, the office stack above, and the cornice-capped (removed) utility floor is indicative of Rogers’ awareness of contemporary theories on the design of tall office buildings.

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 June 6, 2009. At that time, the Board approved an awning that was installed off of the East Elevation.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Deteriorated features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of the deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and where possible, materials.”
 - 2. “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.”
 - 3. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible with the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans and supplemental materials):
 - 1. Replace the glass in the ground floor’s storefront units.
 - 2. Replace the buildings wooden windows with aluminum clad wood replacement windows. The windows will match the existing in design.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the replacement of windows on an early 20th Century skyscraper. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that "Deteriorated features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of the deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and where possible, materials (See B-1).

The proposed aluminum clad wooden windows will match the existing in design, color, and texture. The Design Review Guidelines state that original windows openings should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing. Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible with the existing (See B 2-3)

The historic windows remain in place. While the proposed replacement windows would match the existing with regard to visual qualities, historic fabric would be removed. The buildings windows comprise a significant portion of the building's street-facing elevations. The quality of the wood comprising the existing windows is of a denser grain and therefore a higher quality than that which would be used in the proposed windows. Having survived the elements and alterations of over a century, the have stood the test of time. The life expectancy of the aluminum clad windows is only twenty-five years at best. For those windows which exhibit signs of extreme deterioration, replacement (either whole or in part) is advisable. A window schedule depicting the extent of the deterioration is recommended.

It should be noted that with the loss of the historic fabric embodied in the windows, the Van Antwerp building may no longer be considered historic.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and the historical character of the building. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Jim Walker with Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood and Martin Patrick with Bluewater Construction were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representatives. He asked Mr. Walker and Mr. Patrick if they had any comments to make, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Walker answered no. He gestured to a section of a replacement window approved for the Battle House. Noting how those windows were being manufactured to match the existing in profile and appearance, he stated that the windows proposed for the Van Antwerp Building would similarly replicate the original profiles and extrusions. Mr. Patrick reiterated the same.

Mr. Bemis told the Board that the windows constituted historic fabric on a contributing building.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Bemis as to the portion of the Staff Report regarding possible loss of the buildings historic status. Mr. Bemis said that if the work was approved the building could no longer be viewed as historic.

Mr. Ladd inquired as to the condition of the existing windows.

Mr. Patrick explained that most of the windows were beyond repair.

Mr. Walker was asked the source of the deterioration. He said the deterioration was not a cause of dampness from the walls, but decay and disrepair of the windows.

Mr. Roberts stated that if the windows were replaced to match the existing in appearance, the building would still be historic

Mr. Allen asked as to the exactitude of the replacement. Mr. Patrick said that all profiles of the extruded form would match the existing.

Mr. Allen inquired as to the possible loss of historic designation.

Mr. Bemis said it would lose its contributing status.

Mr. Holmes stated that is not known.

Mr. Walker agreed.

Mr. Holmes cited the State Capitol in Montgomery.

Mr. Roberts mentioned that many skyscrapers in larger cities have replacement fenestration in their upper stories.

Mr. Blackwell cited the National Parks Service's stance on the replacement of fenestration on skyscrapers.

Mr. Bemis said that the building would lose its historic integrity.

Mr. Holmes disagreed.

Mr. Bemis said a window schedule should be provided.

Mr. Stone asked if a schedule was conducted then who would do it and who would judge the outcome.

Mr. Roberts and Mr. Ladd spoke against piecemeal replacement.

Ms. Harden said that in her experience working for the Alabama Historical Commission, she always erred toward repair as opposed to replacement. She said that what is often perceived as beyond repair is in fact repairable. Ms. Harden stated that replacement is determined by the extent of the deterioration.

Mr. Stone asked who would conduct the review. Ms. Harden answered that someone who is not doing the work. Mr. Stone said that the expense could be considerable. He referenced the National Parks Services's stance on the replacement of windows on historic skyscrapers. Mr. Karwinski said that any good millwork company could do the survey.

Mr. Karwinski asked for clarification regarding the proposed replacement of the storefront windows. Mr. Patrick said the metal detailing would be reused.

Mr. Karwinski asked about the flood barrier. Mr. Walker and Mr. Blackwell explained that the flood prevention measures would not engage the building and that the barriers would only be in place during times of extreme inclement weather.

Mr. Karwinski criticized the piecemeal approach of the project.

Mr. Walker said that given the complexity of the program (architectural, leasing, and etc.), a phased manner of approval was unavoidable.

Mr. Karwinski expressed concern over the treatment of the West and South Elevations.

Mr. Karwinski said that the applicants should provide the following: detailed drawings of the existing storefront windows; detailed drawings of the proposed replacement storefront units; detailed drawings of the existing upper story windows; detailed drawings of the proposed upper story replacement windows; drawings of the how the proposed flood proofing would impact the building; drawings of the West and South Elevations.

Mr. Ladd thanked the RSA's representatives and spoke of all the work that the RSA had done for downtown Mobile.

The applicant's representatives withdrew the application.