

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
December 2, 2009 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Jim Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:00.
2. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
 - Members Present:** Gertrude Baker, Kim Hardin, Bill James, Tom Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswald, Craig Roberts, Jim Wagoner, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
 - Members Absent:** Carlos Gant and Barja Wilson.
 - Staff Members Present:** Cart Blackwell and Keri Coumanis.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the 2009 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
4. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COAs granted by Staff.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: John King**
 - a. Property Address: 8 South Hallet Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/13/09
 - c. Project: Build a storage shed according to the MHDC stock plans.
2. **Applicant: Your Handy Man for Rob Holbert**
 - a. Property Address: 262 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/12/09
 - c. Project: Repair and replace siding to match the existing. Paint the work to match the existing color scheme.
3. **Applicant: Anita Nguyen, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 255 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/09/09
 - c. Project: Retain current sign, 48"x 37," on a temporary basis (not to exceed thirty days).
4. **Applicant: Orin Robinson for Satterwhite & Erwin**
 - a. Property Address: 1325 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/09/09
 - c. Project: Replace sign face, only the name(s) will change.
5. **Applicant: Chip Hackett**
 - a. Property Address: 1862 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/10/09
 - c. Project: Install a temporary banner for a grand opening. The banner will be removed within three weeks of its installation.
6. **Applicant: Stacy Meek**
 - a. Property Address: 262 South Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/13/09
 - c. Project: Repaint house per the existing color scheme. Repair and replace rotten woodwork.
7. **Applicant: Linda Crawford**
 - a. Property Address: 58 Semmes Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/12/09
 - c. Project: Repaint the house. The trim will remain the same color. The body will be a deeper hue.
8. **Applicant: Alec Glenn**

- a. Property Address: 202 South Catherine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/12/09
 - c. Project: Reinstall and repair windows.
- 9. Applicant: Newman Ambulance**
- a. Property Address: 1507 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/12/09
 - c. Project: Install new 3-tab, black tile, architectural shingles.
- 10. Applicant: Assup Contractors**
- a. Property Address: 564 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/13/09
 - c. Project: ARB approval for interior work only; Any changes to the exterior will require a separate approval
- 11. Applicant: Ruby Tadlock for the St. Francis Street United Methodist Church**
- a. Property Address: 15 North Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/16/09
 - c. Project: Repair and paint window sashes and frames. Work is to match the existing profile, dimension, and material. Paint sashes and frames to match the existing color scheme.
- 12. Applicant: Paul Howen**
- a. Property Address: 17 Oakland Terrance
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/16/09
 - c. Project: Repaint house per existing color scheme. Repair and replace any rotten woodwork.
- 13. Applicant: Adam Doty**
- a. Property Address: 101 Michael Donald Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/17/09
 - c. Project: Remove debris from property. No further demolition is to occur.
- 14. Applicant: Michael Doty**
- a. Property Address: 101 Michael Donald Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/18/09
 - c. Project: Partial demolition of unapproved, non-conforming rear porch. Only the porch posts and roof are to be removed for purposes of restoration assessment and debris removal.
- 15. Applicant: Dean Gordon**
- a. Property Address: 305 Rapier Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/1/09
 - c. Project: Remove porch screening to open porch back up.

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 127-09: 57 Saint Emanuel Street
 - a. Applicant: Robert Cummings for Hargrove & Associates
 - b. Project: Pave a parking lot. Enclose the west and north sides of the proposed parking lot with a fence. Landscape the perimeter of the parking lot.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
- 2. 128-09: 155 Levert Avenue
 - a. Applicant: Henry and Ashley O'Connor
 - b. Project: Construct a rear/side addition at the southwest corner of the house.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
- 3. 129-09: 1112 Old Shell Road

- a. Applicant: Matthew DeHart
- b. Project: Ancillary Construction.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

- 4. 130-09: 1262 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Griffith Shell
- b. Project: Sign Approval – Reconstruct a monument sign.

TABLED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

- 5. 131-09: 206 State Street

- a. Applicant: Paul David for the Water Front Rescue Mission
- b. Project: Porch Construction.

DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Guidelines

The Board discussed the current status of the Guidelines. Ms Coumanis informed the Board of the revision process.

- 2. Midmonth COAs

The Board and the Staff addressed a proposal for expanded midmonth COAs or staff level approvals. After comparing the existing staff approvals, amendments to the existing staff approvals, and board suggestions, the Board voted to expand the scope of midmonth COAs.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

127-09-CA: 57 Saint Emanuel Street
Applicant: Robert Cummings for Hargrove & Associates
Received: 11/05/09
Meeting: 12/2/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Pave a parking lot. Enclose the west and north sides of the parking lot with an aluminum fence. Landscape the parking lot.

BUILDING HISTORY

The German Relief Hall occupied this corner lot. The building has since been demolished. Currently, the empty lot functions as an unpaved parking lot.

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. A gravel parking lot occupies the site. The applicants would like to install a paved parking lot. Landscaping would surround the street-facing portions of the proposed parking lot. 3’ aluminum fence matching fencing on the southern and eastern sides of the lot would be extended across the northern and western sides of the lot.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 1. Fences “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
 2. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.”
 3. “Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting. Asphalt is inappropriate for walkways. Gravel and shell are preferred paving materials, however, a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment is required for commercial applications. Hard surface materials may also be acceptable.”
 4. “The appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design. New materials such as grasspave or grasscrete, which provide a solid parking surface while still allowing grass to grow giving the appearance of a continuance of the lawn, may be a feasible alternative.”
 5. “Parking areas should be screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences or landscaping.”
 6. Ordinances relating to parking and landscaping will be enforced by the City of Mobile Urban Development Department in reviewing requests for parking lots.”
 7. “Proposed lighting should be designed to avoid invading surrounding areas.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Pave a parking lot (per submitted plan).
 - A. Remove existing sections of concrete paving.
 - B. Remove remnants of the Relief Hall's foundation walls and tile pavers.
 - C. Install 12' wide exit to provide access to Conti Street.
 - D. The parking lot will provide 12 spaces off street parking.
2. Landscape the perimeter of the parking lot (per submitted plan).
3. Remove the existing wooden and cable fencing.
4. Install a 3' black powder coated aluminum fence with top mounted finials along the northern and western sides of the lot.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This proposal calls for a paved parking lot with surrounding landscaping, and fencing. As indicated in the site plan, a centrally located drain will provide for water runoff. Currently there is not landscaping on the lot. The installation of landscaping along the perimeter of the parking lot will introduce greenspace, as well as provide for additional rainwater absorption. The combination of fencing and landscaping would provide visual definition to the prominent corner location. The proposed fencing matches existing fencing enclosing two sides of the lot. Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical character of the district, therefore recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Robert Cummings was present to discuss the application. Mr. Cummings stated he was coming before the Board on behalf of the owners of the lot, the law firm of Burns, Cunningham, & Mackey. He said the firm would like to improve the appearance of the parking lot through landscaping and fencing. Mr. Cummings informed the Board the proposed design had been examined by other City departments regarding codes and regulations.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Cummings if he had anything to add and clarify with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Cummings said he did not have any further comment. Mr. James asked Mr. Cummings why the proposal called for an extension of the sidewalk along Conti Street. Mr. Cummings said his clients would prefer to landscape that section of the property instead of adding more paving.

Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Cummings about the size of the handicap spaces. A discussion of parking space sizes as specified by the Americans with Disabilities Act ensued. Mr. Karwinski commended the design, noting the significant amount of space devoted to landscaping. He said he thought such ample provision for greenspace would result in an attractive addition to the downtown landscape.

Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Cummings if he would like to amend the application to allow additional greenspace (instead of the proposed hard surface treatment) along Conti Street. Mr. Cummings answered yes.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski 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 the application to allow additional landscaping along Conti Street.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski 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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/02/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

128-09-CA: 155 Levert Avenue
Applicant: Henry & Ashley O'Connor
Received: 11/17/09
Meeting: 12/02/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a rear/side addition at the southwest corner of the house

BUILDING HISTORY

This house, one of the earliest in Ashland Place, dates from 1909. In terms of style and design, the house marries neoclassical detailing of a Colonial Revival vein onto a Queen Anne influenced plan.

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 Board in December of 1993. The Board approved the partial enclosure of a rear/side porch at the northwest corner of the house. The current owners come before the Board with a proposed addition to the southwest corner of the house.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district, but to avoid creating a false sense of history.”
 - 2. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new 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.”
 - 3. “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 rear/side one-story addition at the northwest corner of the house (per submitted plan).
 - A. The addition measures 24’ x 7’ (with a 2’ x 3’ indentation).
 - B. The addition will maintain the foundation level and replicate the existing foundation treatment of the body of the house.
 - C. Wooden lattice foundation vents will be relocated and replicated on the addition.
 - D. The wooden siding will match the existing.
 - E. Windows will be salvaged and reused from the main house.
 - F. Corner posts will demarcate the addition.
 - G. A hipped roof with shingles matching the existing will cover the addition.

- H. The south elevation will feature one paired one-over-one window units and two individual one-over-one windows (see C(E)).

STAFF ANALYSIS

This rear/side addition squares off the first floor of the house. Existing landscaping and a wraparound porch will obscure the addition from the public view. While the materials and detailing match that of the house, corner posts provide transition which will allow this small expansion to “read” as an addition to an older building. The applicants will reuse elements from the existing south elevation, including window sashes, latticed vents, and louvered shutters. Staff recommends approval of this application for the proposed addition does not impair the architectural or historical character of the house or the district.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Henry O’Connor was present to discuss the application. Mr. O’Connor addressed the Board saying that he was appearing on behalf of his wife and himself. He said that he and his family had relocated to Mobile in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. Mr. O’Connor elaborated saying that were happy with their house and excited about the proposed addition. He explained that the addition would allow for an expanded kitchen.

BOARD DISCUSSION

No discussion followed the Public Testimony.

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 as written.

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 not 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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/02/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

129-09-CA: 1112 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Matthew DeHart
Received: 11/12/09
Meeting: 12/02/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Ancillary Construction

BUILDING HISTORY

This Queen Anne house dates from circa 1890. The façade features a prominent paneled and 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’s proposal calls for the installation of utility shed on an existing concrete slab. The proposed utility shed would not be visible from the street.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation 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:
 - 1. Place a prefabricated wooden storage in the northwest corner of the backyard
 - A. The storage shed is to measure 16’ x 16’ in plan.
 - B. The storage shed will feature vertical board siding.
 - C. The storage shed will measure approximately 11’6” in height.
 - D. The storage shed will rest on an existing concrete slab.
 - E. The storage shed will be painted beige or white.
 - F. The roof will be covered with asphalt shingles.
 - G. The side elevations will feature sash windows (one per elevation).
 - H. The front elevation will feature a double door of vertical boards.
 - I. The storage shed will be located approximately 8’ to 10’ from the property line.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposed utility shed meets the material standards set by the Guidelines and the setback requirements set by the City Code. Located in a corner of the back yard, the utility shed would not be visible from the street. Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical character of the house or the district therefore recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. James asked Staff about the overall height of the storage shed. Mr. Wagoner said he had no objection to the proposed shed saying this was the type of ancillary structure which could be approved by Staff. Mr. Oswalt asked Staff if the shed was made of wood. Mr. Blackwell answered yes. A discussion of the material requirements of ancillary construction ensued. Mr. Karwinski noted the impermanent nature of the proposed shed by pointing out that the proposed shed would be installed in the backyard as opposed to be set on foundations.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski 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 the application to state the installation of a non-permanent ancillary structure.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski 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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/02/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

130-09-CA: 1262 Government Street
Applicant: Griffith Shell
Received: 10/29/09
Meeting: 12/02/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Sign Approval – Reconstruct a monument sign.

BUILDING HISTORY

Griffith Shell has occupied this corner lot location since the 1980s.

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. In the Fall of 2009, a motorist damaged the Griffith Shell Monument sign. That sign was erected before the adoption of the current Sign Design Guidelines. The applicants rebuilt the sign to match the old sign. The sign does not meet the current height and material standards for signage in the historic districts. The applicants come before the Board for post construction approval of the reconstructed monument sign.
- B. The Design Guidelines for Mobile’s downtown commercial buildings, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Signs shall be mounted or erected 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. Buildings with a recognizable style such as Greek Revival, Italianate, Victorian, Queen Anne, Neo-classic, Craftsman, et al., should use signage of the same style. This can be done through the use of similar decorative features such as columns or brackets.”
 - 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 principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet. A multi-tenant building is also limited to a maximum of 64 square feet.”
 - 5. “The height of free standing signs shall not be higher than 8 feet.”
 - 6. “The total allowable square footage for display area on a monument sign is (50) fifty square feet.”
 - 7. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.”

8. The size of the sign shall be determined by measuring the area within each face of the geometric shape enclosing all elements of informational or representational matter including blank masking. Structural supports not bearing information shall not be included in the computation of display area. For double faced signs, each face shall be counted toward the maximum allowable square footage.”
9. Allowable sign materials include “wood, metal, stone, or brick.” “Plastic, vinyl or similar materials are prohibited.”
10. “Internally lit signs are prohibited. Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination.”
11. “Flashing, blinking, revolving, and rotating lights are not allowed.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Reconstruct an aluminum framed and plastic faced double faced monument sign .
 - A. The two sign faces measure 7’ in width by 3’5” in height.
 - B. The total square footage of the sign is 49 feet.
 - C. A 2’6” brick base supports the sign (Posts set in concrete connect the sign to the base.).
 - D. The two-part internally illuminated sign displays the Shell name, logo, and petrol price.
2. Though the guidelines restrict the maximum height of a monument sign to 8 feet, the Board has rarely allowed any sign in excess of five feet due to the looming nature of a large sign near pedestrians.
3. The Department of Urban Development requires that all signage be in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicants constructed the present sign to match a severely damaged sign in the belief that damaged sign meet the material and design requirements. Unfortunately, the previous sign was erected before the adoption of the current Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street. The sign does not comply with the current Sign Design Guidelines.

The Sign Design Guidelines state that internally illuminated and plastic signs are not appropriate for the historic districts. While the Guidelines state that the maximum height for freestanding signage is 8’, the reconstructed sign exceeds the maximum 5’height set by previous Architectural Review Board rulings on monument signs.

The sign will have to comply with the current Sign Design Guidelines. Additionally, the Department of Urban Development requires that all constructed or reconstructed signage be in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance. Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and historical character of the historic district therefore does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Stephen Griffith was present to discuss the application. Mr. Griffith reiterated that the existing sign replaced an earlier damaged sign which had been approved by the Board. He explained that having been through the sign permitting and approval process before, he was familiar with the Board’s procedures. Mr. Griffith said he was unaware that the height and material requirements had changed. He informed the Board that he had told the sign contractors to have the sign match the damaged sign in belief that the sign still met the standards set by the Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts.

Mr. Griffith closed by telling the Board that in addition to working with sign contractors, the sign had to be ordered from the Shell Corporation. He closed by saying the nature of his business is a cost sensitive one. Gas prices must be displayed in a visible location and manner.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner said he understood Mr. Griffith's situation, but the Guidelines needed to be upheld. He asked Mr. Griffith if he had examined ways which he could come into compliance with height, material, and lighting requirements. Mr. Griffith said he was open to suggestions.

Mr. Ladd asked Staff how the application came into the office. Mr. Blackwell told the Board the application was a result of a 311 call. Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members and Staff if there were any other options than spotlighting the sign. Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Griffith if the sign's base was intended to serve as a planter. Mr. Griffith said yes, saying the previous sign base served that same dual function. He added that there was one difference between the reconstructed sign and the previous sign. The new sign's base was not painted, but left unpainted to highlight the "Old Mobile" brick matching that of the service station. Ms Baker asked Mr. Griffith if it was necessary for him to obtain a sign directly from the Shell Corporation.

Mr. Griffith asked the Board about the recently constructed sign at the northwest corner of Ann and Government Streets. Ms. Coumanis said that particular sign was unapproved recent construction which would have to appear before the Board. Ms Whitt-Mitchell asked the Board and Staff if a differentiation could be made between replaced signs and newly constructed signs. Ms Coumanis and Mr. Roberts explained that both were subject to changing regulations and ordinances.

Ms. Harden asked the applicant if the Shell sign distributors offer alternative signs utilizing materials that are acceptable for signs in historic districts. She said historic districts in other cities should have similar statutes so there would likely be alternatives. Mr. James addressed Mr. Griffith saying that while he thought sign's location, size, and design appropriate, he must realize that there are layers of regulations and considerations governing signage in historic districts. Mr. James closed by saying the sign was plastic which does not meet the Guideline's standards. Mr. Ladd said the sign was plastic because of the internal illumination.

Mr. Wagoner addressed the applicant telling him he had two options. He could either use spotlights to illuminate an acceptable sign or contact Shell regarding alternatives. Mr. Griffith said he was amenable to the latter, but he was uncertain as to whether he would be reimbursed for the existing sign if other options were available.

Mr. Karwinski said he would like to make a final comment. He said that the previously mentioned sign opposite the Griffith Shell on Ann Street does not meet the Guideline's standards. Staff clarified that since both properties were under Review Board jurisdiction, the other sign would have to appear before the Board as well. Ms. Coumanis reminded the Board that a replacement of a non conforming features were subject to current standards. Mr. Wagoner asked the applicant if he would like to table the application for thirty days. Mr. Griffith answered yes.

| The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

TABLED.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

131-09-CA: 204 State Street (also listed as 206 State Street)
Applicant: Paul Davis for the Water Front Rescue Mission
Received: 11/16/09
Meeting: 12/02/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Detonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-B
Project: Construct a Porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Water Street Rescue Mission occupies four lots on State Street. The easternmost lot is undeveloped. 204 State is two-story stucco-faced building that originally housed the Northside Baptist Church. The building dates from the 1920s.

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. The Water Front Rescue Mission property was scheduled to appear before the Architectural Review Board on October 7, 2009, but withdrew the application which proposed painting all the complex’s buildings with ceramic based Rhino Shield Paint. The Mission returns to the Board with application proposing the construction of a portico atop the entrance stoop at 204 State Street.
- B. The Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district, but to avoid creating a false sense of history.”
 - 2. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new 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.”
 - 3. “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.”
 - 4. “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 handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
 - 5. “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with the style of the house.

6. “The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of the features and spaces that characterize the property shall be avoided.”
7. “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. Remove the existing railings accessing the entrance stoop.
2. Construct antepodia at the southern termination of the existing steps to support the portico.
3. Construct a tetrastyle porch supported by Tuscan columns with elongated necks atop the antepodia.
 - A. A metal railing will extend between the Tuscan columns.
 - B. A hipped metal roof will cover the porch.
4. Remove the existing nine-panel double doors with two-panel double doors.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicants propose the construction of a porch atop an existing entrance stoop. This building was constructed circa 1920. Staff has referenced the 1920s Sanborn Maps. Neither the maps nor later inserts therein indicated the presence of a porch. The construction of the proposed porch would alter the historic façade. Staff believes this application would violate B 4-6 and thus impair the architectural and historical character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Ladd asked Staff if the present porch configuration constituted the original façade treatment. Mr. Blackwell answered yes. Mr. Roberts asked Staff if an awning could be installed in lieu of a porch. Ms Coumanis and Mr. Blackwell answered yes. Mr. Wagoner reminded his fellow Board members that an awning was not part of the application. A discussion of the Rescue Mission’s signage followed. If the existing signage was replaced, a proposal for a replacement would be required to appear before the Board

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Oswalt 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 not be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.