

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
February 15, 2012 – 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: Gertrude Baker, Nick Holmes, III, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Jim Wagoner.
Members Absent: Carlos Gant, Kim Harden, and, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the January 18, 2012 and the February 1, 2012 meetings. 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: Kimberley Knowles**
 - a. Property Address: 16 South Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/25/12
 - c. Project: Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant: Richard Brown**
 - a. Property Address: 164 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/27/12
 - c. Project: Power wash, replace rotten siding (as necessary) to match original, prime and paint to match existing, remove gutters, remove and replace two shutters on garage.
3. **Applicant: Gregory Ball**
 - a. Property Address: 1221 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/24/12
 - c. Project: Install electric gate opener to/for existing gate on side yard.
4. **Applicant: Blankard's Roofing Company**
 - a. Property Address: 1320 Azalea Street, B.
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/25/12
 - c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.
5. **Applicant: Mobile Bay Coins**
 - a. Property Address: 2204 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/25/12
 - c. Project: Install a metal sign. The sign will not feature internal illumination.
6. **Applicant: Michael Gazzier**
 - a. Property Address: 153 South Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/24/12
 - c. Project: Replace rotten columns on the front porch and carport, matching the existing in profile, dimension and materials, painting to match the existing. Replace front steps with brick steps to match the existing configuration. Install brick walk from front door to city sidewalk. Windows will be brought back to the ARB in the future.
7. **Applicant: Oakleigh Custom Woodwork for Barbara Turley**
 - a. Property Address: 1062 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/25/12

- c. Project: Construct a picket fence. Said fence will be located within the lot per submitted plans.
- 8. Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. Rennie Brabner**
 - a. Property Address: 303 North Conception Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/25/12
 - c. Project: Repair and replace any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing. Repair windows. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
- 9. Applicant: Bay Landscaping**
 - a. Property Address: 1550 Eslava Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/31/12
 - c. Project: Remove a section of interior lot chain link fencing. Install a four foot aluminum fence in the same location.
- 10. Applicant: Betty J. Bentley**
 - a. Property Address: 1256 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/1/12
 - c. Project: Repair the property's pedestrian entrance walk.
- 11. Applicant: Hargrove and Associates**
 - a. Property Address: 115 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/2/12
 - c. Project: Complete the remodeling of the interior courtyard.
- 12. Applicant: Joe Tarver Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 26 South Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/12/12
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing. Stabilize a balcony. Repaint the work to match the existing.
- 13. Applicant: Kiel Home Renovations**
 - a. Property Address: 1719 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/3/12
 - c. Project: Reroof asphalt shingles, black.

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 2012-08-CA: 105 Ryan Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: Ralph & Kimberly Hargrove
 - b. Project: Replace windows.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
- 2. 2012-09-CA: 1118 Selma Street**
 - a. Applicant: Dwight Hasty for En En Yu
 - b. Project: Alter fenestration.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
- 3. 2012-10-CA: 153 Macy Place**
 - a. Applicant: Christopher & Lesley Rainosek
 - b. Project: Alter fenestration.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
- 4. 2012-11-CA: 150 Macy Place**
 - a. Applicant: Robert Dueitt with Robert Dueitt Construction for Bruno P. Cosimi
 - b. Project: New Construction - Construct an addition.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

5. 2012-12-CA: 151 Macy Place

- a. Applicant: Vanessa Murphree
- b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – retain alterations; Paint the house.

APPROVED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

6. 2012-13-CA: 1307 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Trey Jinright for Henry Robert of Take 5 Oil Change, LLC
- b. Project: Demolition - Demolish a service station and canopy; Redevelop the lot; New Construction – Construct a new service station; Install landscaping, hardscaping, and signage.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Guidelines
- 2. Discussion

Mr. Ladd addressed the Board. He said that it was not the Board's mandate to give personal opinions regarding submitted designs. He stated that the Board's task was to consider if an application does or does not impair a building and/or a district. Mr. Ladd encouraged his fellow Board members to seek a middle ground in their dealings with applicants.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-08-CA: 105 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: Ralph & Kimberly Hargrove
Received: 1/31/12
Meeting: 2/15/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-and-one-half-story house dates from 1940/41. Like many Mobile houses of comparable date, the house features salvaged brick and ironwork.

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 16, 1998. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a carport. With this application, the homeowners propose the replacement of the sun porch’s windows.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The porch is a regional characteristic of Mobile architecture.”
 - 2. “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance.”
 - 3. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted materials):
 - 1. Remove the aluminum windows enclosing the house’s northeast corner sun room.
 - 2. Install replacement windows.
 - a. The replacement aluminum window units will maintain the tripartite configuration established by the existing window units.
 - b. The window units will be more substantially framed than the existing. Said framing will be white in color.
 - c. The double-paned Low “E” units will be tinted gray.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the removal and replacement of sun porch windows. As evidenced by photographs in the Staff file, the current aluminum windows were installed prior to 1986. The window units are not original as the sun porch was probably built as a screened porch.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts do not specifically address sun room windows. In taking into account non historic alterations to a historic building, the design, composition, durability, and nature of the proposed installation/construction should be taken into account.

With regard to the proposed design, the proposed double-paned window units will maintain the tripartite bay divisions of both the affected elevations. The proposed units will be white in color so as to match the trim. The framing of the proposed windows will be more substantial. While the proposed design does not constitute an impairment, Staff suggests that the applicants consider a railing-like divider. An example of such a treatment can be seen at 163 Saint Emanuel Street. The use of divider would make a more traditional "read" or appearance, as well as provide additional structural support

The material composition of the window framing will remain the same.

Unlike the existing windows, the proposed will be double-paned as opposed to single paned. While the Design Review Guidelines do not specifically address double-paned windows, the Board has in times past ruled against their use as replacements within historic structures. That said the space in question is not a historic enclosure. No existing historic windows will be removed. The proposed windows are then a removable alteration.

The proposed windows would be coated with a tinted, low "E" glass. Reflective or tinted glass is not allowed for usage on historic windows. That said proposed windows are not historic.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), 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.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ben Cummings was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Cummings if he had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address. Mr. Cummings provided the Board with a sample section of the proposed framing. He told the Board that the framing was the same composition as the existing, only thicker.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant's representative.

Mr. Karwinski asked for clarification as to the original treatment of the sun porch enclosure. Mr. Blackwell clarified Mr. Karwinski's query. He stated that the design could be improved both structurally and aesthetically by a more substantial corner treatment. Mr. Cummings told the Board that additional reinforcement existed within the enclosure.

Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Cummings why white framing was selected as opposed to a bronze colored treatment. Mr. Cummings replied that white was selected for reason on account of the window framing which is the same color. Mr. Roberts stated that both the framing and color of the enclosure would not only blend with the house, but solidify the northeast corner of the house.

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. Wagoner moved that, based upon the facts as approved 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: 2/15/13

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2016-09-CA: 1118 Selma Street
Applicant: En En Nu
Received: 1/27/12
Meeting: 2/15/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Alter fenestration.

BUILDING HISTORY

This single story Arts & Crafts influenced dwelling dates from 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. The applicants propose the alteration of existing fenestration. The proposal calls for the replacement of a secondary façade door with a window.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation 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 window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
 - 2. “Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors should be retained along with any moldings, transoms, or sidelights. Replacements should reflect age and style of the house.”
 - 3. “Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.”
- C. Scope of Work (Per Submitted Plans):
 - 1. Alter fenestration
 - a. Remove a secondary door from the façade.
 - b. Said door occupies the central portion of tripartite fenestration grouping.
 - c. A single, fixed light window would be installed. The window would be made of wood.
 - d. The affected areas below the window would be faced with wooden siding matching the existing in profile and dimension.
 - e. The window sill/apron of the flanking windows would continue beneath the reconfigured central bay.
 - f. The steps currently accessing the door would be removed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the alteration of a façade fenestration. The façade features two front doors. The principal entrance is located on the front porch. A secondary door is located to the west of the front porch. The applicants propose the removal of the latter door and its replacement with a window.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that the replacement of original features should be supported by pictorial, documentary, or physical evidence. The Staff file for this property contains photographs that record the existing door treatment. Imagery in the collection of the University of South Alabama Archives (the Doy Leale McCall Rare Book and Manuscript Library) corroborates the same. Photographic evidence aside, on site examination reveals that the steps accessing the secondary door are of a later date of construction than those accessing the façade's principal entrance. This assessment is based on a pronounced variation in the height of two flights and the differing treatment of the checks. Similarly, the reveals of the secondary door are treated differently from the façade's principal and other secondary entrances. Having stated all this, staff believes the door in question is not original and this house, like many others, was subdivided in a multi-family residence at a later date.

The replacement of the door in question with a window would involve the insertion single light sash. The framing of the sash, the lower height of the window, and location of the apron would match the existing. Siding to be placed in the affected areas would likewise match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. The steps accessing the door would be removed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), 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.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board listened to Staff's explication of the request. No discussion took place.

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 approved 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 approved. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/15/13

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-10-CA: 153 Macy Place
Applicant: Christopher and Lesley Rainosek
Received: 1/30/12
Meeting: 2/15/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Alter fenestration.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house dates from the first third of the 20th Century. As with many Arts & Crafts informed “bungalows,” the house is defined by an asymmetrical composition and a prominent roof.

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 homeowners propose altering the existing fenestration. The proposal calls for the removal of a secondary front door, the replacement of a door, and the painting of the dwelling.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation 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 window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
 - 2. “Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors should be retained along with any moldings, transoms, or sidelights. Replacements should reflect age and style of the house.”
 - 3. “Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**
 - 1. Alter fenestration – Remove a door unit.
 - a. Remove the Façade’s northernmost door bay.(Left)
 - b. Install siding matching the existing in the location of and about the surrounding areas of the proposed door.
 - 2. Alter fenestration – Remove and replace a door.
 - a. Remove the Façade’s southernmost door (not the entire bay or unit).(Right)
 - b. Install a replacement door. The replacement wooden “Craftsman” door will feature simulated divided light glazing.

3. Paint the house per the submitted Benjamin Moore color scheme.
 - a. The body will be Templeton Gray.
 - b. The trim will be Berkshire Beige.
 - c. Secondary accents will be Black Forrest Green.
 - d. The door will be Heritage Red.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the alteration of a façade's fenestration and the painting of the building.

The fenestration changes involve the removal of a door bay and the replacement of a door.

With regard to the removal of the door bay, the door unit in question is the northernmost of two door bays punctuating the house's façade. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that the replacement of original features should be supported by pictorial, documentary, or physical evidence. Since awnings and screens shielded the porch bays at the time the house was first surveyed, the Staff file photograph does not record the configuration of the façade's fenestration. Images of the house in the collection of the University of South Alabama Archives (the Doy Leale McCall Rare Book and Manuscript Library) are duplicates of those found in the MHDC Staff files. That said, long time residents of the district who are familiar with the house remember it having only one front door. According to these residents, the second door was added when the house was subdivided into apartments.

On site examination reveals that the framing of the two doors differs. The southernmost door bears evidence of later insertion. It is less substantially framed than the northernmost door. Staff recommends that the northernmost door be retained.

As per the removal and replacement of southernmost, the Design Review Guidelines state that replacement doors should respect the age and period of the house. Staff does not believe the existing door has deteriorated to such an extent to warrant its removal. The door matches the windows. While the proposed door is appropriate to the period, the replacement should match the existing.

The proposed color scheme is appropriate the period and style of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval in part and denial in part.

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe the removal of a door will impair the architectural or the historical character of the house, but Staff recommends that the northernmost not the southernmost door be retained.

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes the replacement door will impair the architectural and the historical character of the building. Staff does not recommend approval of that portion of the application.

Staff does not believe the proposed color scheme will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of that portion of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Lesley Rainosek, David Gwatkin, and Katherine Singer were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant, her representative, and neighbor. He asked them if he had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address. Ms. Rainosek explained that the photographs did fully indicate deteriorated state of the doors. She stated that their condition posed safety and security concerns.

Mr. Ladd asked Ms. Rainosek if she had a preference as to which door was removed. Ms. Rainosek explained that she and her family preferred to remove the left or northernmost door for reason of interior layout and porch configuration.

Mr. Karwinski explicated Staff's surmise as to the leftmost door.

Ms. Rainosek asked Ms. Singer to speak on her behalf. Ms. Singer explained that the subject property was one of many Mobile houses that were subdivided into multi-family housing during the Second World War. She said that a second door was added at that time.

Mr. Holmes stated that leftmost door could be the older doorway. He noted that only more extensive onsite examination would solve the question as to which doorways constituted the original front entrance. Mr. Holmes and Mr. Oswalt exchanged ideas as to the origin and date of the two door treatments.

Ms. Rainosek and Mr. Gwatkin explained that both doors were framed in the same manner. Mr. Bemis stated that the Staff assessment was in part determined by the timing of the onsite Staff visit.

Mr. Ladd noted that the Staff file picture was of little assistance with regard to application at hand.

Mr. Roberts and Mr. Holmes stated it mattered little which door unit was closed or retained.

Mr. Karwinski redirected the discussion. He stated that the existing glazed door should be retained.

Mr. Bemis pointed out that the door design corresponded with the window treatment.

Mr. Gwatkin explained that both doors had deteriorated to such an extent that they could not be salvaged.

Mr. Roberts suggested that the applicants conduct a cost benefit analysis juxtaposing door repair and replacement.

Mr. Karwinski and Mr. Roberts noted that the proposed door featured simulated dividers. A discussion ensued.

Ms. Rainosek stated doors of similar design could be found on other houses located within Mobile's historic districts.

Mr. Gwatkin said that he could construct the dividers in such a way as to make the dividers appear to be true-divided-light construction.

Mr. Holmes said that preferred solution was to retain or replicate one of the existing doors.

Ms. Rainosek reiterated that the proposed door design was a product safety and security related concerns.

Mr. Karwinski stated that the problem with the proposed door was more a matter of selection than replacement. Mr. Roberts concurred. He said that doors more closely resembling the original should be obtained.

Ms. Baker and Mr. Holmes reminded their fellow Board members as to their responsibilities. Both stated the Board was present to determine impairment or absence thereof.

Ms. Rainosek stated restorations cost could skyrocket.

Mr. Oswalt reiterated that door should be repaired if at all possible.

Mr. Ladd explained to Ms. Rainosek that the Board was trying to work with not against the application.

Mr. Bemis stated that economics should not be the sole determinant as to what type door should be used.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any further questions.

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, amending facts to note that the northernmost door unit would be removed and that the proposed design should match as much as possible the existing doors.

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 not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/25/13

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-11-CA: 150 Macy Place
Applicant: Robert Dueitt with Robert Dueitt Construction for Bruno Cosimi
Received: 1/30/12
Meeting: 2/15/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: 150 Macy Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This 1923 house combines forms and features of both the Southern Colonial Revival and the Arts & Crafts Movement. A “twin” house is located at nearby 123 Macy Place.

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 homeowner proposes the construction of single story rear addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with 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 (per plans):**
 - 1. Remove the northernmost section of the existing deck. If necessary, install new underpinning and foundations along the northern side of the deck.
 - 2. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The single story addition will measure 26’ in depth and 14’ in width.
 - b. The addition will rest atop brick veneered foundation piers.
 - c. The appearance of the aforementioned piers will match the existing.
 - d. The wooden siding will match that employed on the main house.
 - e. The corner boards will remain in situ.
 - f. The six-over-one wooden windows will match those employed on the main house.
 - g. The addition will be surmounted with a hipped roof.
 - h. The roofing shingles will match those employed on the body of the house.
 - i. The South Elevation will feature two six-over-one windows.

- j. The aforementioned windows will be salvaged from the rear elevation and reused.
- k. The East Elevation will not feature fenestration.
- l. The North Elevation will have a six-light wooden transom window and double French door.
- m. New steps will be constructed to provide access to and from the deck.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a rear addition.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that additions to historic structures should be differentiated from yet compatible to the existing.

With regard to differentiation, corner boards will provide demarcation between the old and the new. The drop in height from the original two story massing of the main house to the new single story wing will provide an additional sense of transition. As per compatibility between the old and the new, the use of matching siding, window surrounds, window type, and roof sheathing will provide continuity between the original portion of the house and the addition.

Based on the balancing of differentiation and continuity of design and detail, Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), 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.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Bruno Cosimi and Robert Dueitt were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant and his representative. He asked Mr. Cosimi and Mr. Dueitt if they had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address. The applicant and his representative answered no.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask or comments to make.

Mr. Karwinski said he had one comment to make. Referencing the window pattern, cornice treatment, and roof pitch, he stated that he believed the design to be a poor one. Mr. Ladd explained to the applicant and his representative that Mr. Karwinski's statement was a matter of opinion.

Mr. Dueitt explicated the reasoning behind the roof pitch.

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. Oswald moved that, based upon the facts as approved 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. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/15/13

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-12-CA: 151 Macy Place
Applicant: Vanessa Murphree
Received: 1/25/12
Meeting: 2/1/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain alterations; Paint the house.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Arts & Crafts inspired house dates from the first quarter of the 20th Century. The use of shingled siding makes this bungalow dwelling a representative of the “Shingle Style.”

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 owner/applicant appears before the Board with a requests to retain replacement siding and paint the dwelling.
- 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. The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):

- 1. After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain replacement siding.
 - a. The replacement siding occupies the dado zone of the house’s street facing elevations (the West/Façade and North/Side).
 - b. The replacement siding is – in composition.
- 2. Paint the house the following Sherwin Williams color scheme.
 - a. The body will be Brick Red.
 - b. The trim will be beige.
 - c. The decking will be dark green.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the after-the-fact approval of replacement siding and the proposed painting of a house.

With regard to the siding replacement, the work was executed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness or the pulling of a building permit. Prior to receiving a COA allowing the in kind repair

and replacement of work, the shingles sheathing the dados of the North and West Elevations were removed. The shingles were replaced with siding. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that original siding be retained. When either repair or replacement is required, said work should match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. This house is one of the few remaining shingle style houses in Mobile. The shingle siding is a character defining feature of the house. The replacement siding impairs the architectural and the historical character of the building and the district.

In reference to the proposed painting of the house, the color scheme is appropriate to the style and period of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval in part and denial in part.

Based on B (1), Staff believes the replacement siding impairs the architectural and historical character of the house or the Historic District. Staff does not recommend approval of the aforementioned.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed color scheme. Said work will not impair the architectural or historical character of the house or Historic District.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

George Baird was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Baird if he had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address.

Mr. Baird told the Board that he was the applicant's painter. He explained why the owner was not present.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Baird if the shingled siding was cedar. Mr. Baird answered yes.

Mr. Baird told the Board of the structural failings that necessitated the replacement siding.

Mr. Roberts noted that replacement shingles could be obtained locally.

Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Baird if he or the applicant were aware that the property is located in a historic district. He further queried if they knew that the procedures and processes behind obtaining building permits in Mobile's Historic Districts. Mr. Baird answered that he was unaware.

A discussion regarding permitting and authorization ensued. Mr. Bemis read the approved scope of work as stated in the Certificate of Appropriateness. The document clearly stated that the replacement siding was to go before the Architectural Review Board.

A discussion of the siding and its framing ensued.

Several failed motions were made.

Mr. Baird agreed to reinstall and replace shingles. He said that most of it had been salvaged.

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 as amended by the Board. The siding will be reinstalled and the building will be painted.

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 for either the placement of shack shingles over the hardiplank siding or the removal of said siding prior to installation of shingles. Mr. Karwinski and Mr. Roberts volunteered to serve on committee reviewing the installation.

The painting was approved.

The motion received a second.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/15/13

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-13-CA: 1307 Government Street
Applicant: Trey Jinright for Henry Robert of Take 5 Oil Change, LLC
Received: 1/30/12
Meeting: 2/15/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Demolish a non-contributing service station and canopy; Redevelop the lot;
Construct a new service station and canopy; Install landscaping, hardscaping, and signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to the 1955 Sanborn Map, a gas/corner store stood on this lot. The current building dates from the 1970s.

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...”

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 last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on July 20, 2011. At that time, the Board granted demolition approval for existing non-contributing buildings, but final approval of new development was dependent on the submission of additional drawings. The current application calls for the demolition of the existing buildings, the construction of a service station, the planting of landscaping, the installation of hardscaping, and the installation of signage.
- B.1. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be

detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:

- i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
 1. This service station constitutes non-contributing commercial infill in the Leinkauf Historic District.
- ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 1. The building does not contribute architecturally or historically to the district or the streetscape. The development is indicative of the commercialization of Mobile's grandest commercial thoroughfare.
- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced.
- iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 1. "Strip" commercial design of this type is found across the United States. Government Street possesses a number of these ensembles.
- v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 1. If granted demolition approval, the applicants will demolish the existing non-contributing structures and build a new building. The redevelopment would result in more landscaping, smaller curbcuts, and less hardscaping.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The applicant has entered into a purchase agreement regarding the sale of the property. The purchase price is listed as \$268,000.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. The previous owners and other potential developers considered other types of commercial redevelopment.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. See B (vi).
- ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 1. The applicant has entered into a purchase agreement.
- x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 1. See submitted materials.
- xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and
 1. Application submitted.
- xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
 1. See submitted materials.

2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”
- B.2. 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 the appealing aspects of historic districts. Therefore, new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
 - 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 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.
 6. Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.”
 7. The appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design. New materials such as grasscrete, which provides solid parking while still allowing grass to grow giving the appearance of a continuance of a front lawn, may be a feasible alternative.”
- B.3. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street state, in Pertinent part:
1. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.”
 2. “The total maximum sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet.”
 3. “The maximum allowable square footage for the display area of a monument sign is (50) fifty square feet.”
 4. 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 side shall be counted toward the maximum allowable square footage.”
 5. “Plastic, vinyl, or similar materials are prohibited.”
 6. “Internally light signs are prohibited. 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. Light fixtures mounted on the ground shall be screened by landscaping.”
 7. “The height of free-standing signage shall not be higher than six feet.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Demolish a single story service station and gas canopy.
 2. Construct a new service station.
 - a. The building will be set back 40’ from the Government Street right of way and 27’ 9” from the Michigan Avenue right of way.
 - b. The service station will measure 26’ in width (not counting an approximately 2’ 8” projection for a pilaster-like support) and 58’ in depth.
 - c. The building will rest atop a concrete slab.
 - d. The total square footage of the building will amount to 1,508 square feet.
 - e. The masonry building will feature a continuous brick veneered dado and stuccoed walls. The stuccoed walls will be treated in two colors.
 - f. The building will feature glazed and ribbed aluminum garage doors and aluminum storefront windows.
 - g. The building will feature a northeast corner tower with a bronze colored standing seam pyramidal roof. The tower will feature stuccoed brackets. The remainder of the roof, that covering the body of the building, will be flat. A bronzed colored aluminum coping will be employed on the latter.

- h. North Elevation
 - i. The North Elevation will feature three glazed and ribbed garage doors and a single aluminum storefront window.
 - ii. One garage door will be located within the tower bay. The two remaining garage doors will be located to the West of the tower bay. The single aluminum storefront windows will be located beyond the garage doors.
 - iii. Four aluminum checkerboard panels will flank garage bays.
 - iv. Six 8' diameter bollards will be located before the garage bays.
- i. West Elevation
 - i. A single aluminum door will be centered within the West Elevation.
- j. South Elevation
 - i. The South Elevation will feature three glazed and ribbed garage doors.
 - ii. Six 8' diameter bollards will demarcate the points of vehicular ingress.
- k. East Elevation
 - i. The East Elevation will feature two tripartite aluminum storefront windows.
- 3. Install hardscaping.
 - a. The hardscaping will be concrete in composition, both curbing and surfacing.
 - b. The one exception to the aforementioned will be the asphalt aprons.
 - c. A u-shaped sidewalk will encircle the western side of the building.
 - d. The aprons will be located in front of the garage doors.
 - e. The existing Government Street (North lot line) curbcut will remain.
 - f. A diverter will be installed in the aforementioned curbcut.
 - g. The in and out lanes will both measure 14' in width.
 - h. A 25' wide in and out curbcut will be constructed off the Michigan Avenue.
 - i. Five parking spaces will be located off of the Western side of the lot.
 - j. A dumpster alcove will pad will be located in the southwest corner of the lot.
- 4. Install landscaping (per submitted plans).
 - a. A large expanse of landscaping will occupy the northeast corner of the lot.
 - b. A 3' wide landscape planter will extend along the southern lot line.
 - c. An aforementioned five foot landscape buffer will extend between the allotted parking spaces and the West lot line. Larger green spaces will be located to either side of the parking area. A planting bed will extend around the western portion of the building.
 - d. The following trees will be planted: 5 Natchez Crepe Myrtles; 1 Taiwan Cherry; and 6 Live Oaks.
 - e. The following shrubs will be planted; 2 Camellias; 2 Tea Olives; 2 Rosemary; and 24 Clevera.
 - f. The following ground covers will be planted: 58 Day Lilies and 66 Liriope.
 - g. Centipede sod will be planted.
- 5. Install signage (See submitted designs and site plans).
 - a. A total of 64 square feet of signage is proposed.
 - b. Construct a monument sign.
 - i. The monument sign will measure 5' in overall height.
 - ii. A 4" concrete pedestal will support an 8" brick base
 - iii. The 3'4" sign aluminum field will be located above recessed coursing and below a 5 1/2" stepped aluminum cap.
 - iv. The double-faced aluminum sign will measure 2' 8" per sign face. The signage will take the form of the company logo and name.
 - v. Ground level spotlights will illuminate the sign faces.
 - c. Construct three directional signs.

- i. The three non-illuminated post and panel aluminum directional signs will be made of aluminum.
 - ii. The signs will measure 4' in height and 2' 1/4" in width.
 - d. Install a wall sign (logo).
 - i. The logo wall sign will measure 5' in height and 4' 3" in width.
 - ii. The aluminum sign will measure 21 square feet.
 - iii. The aluminum sign be located above the easternmost garage bay's entrance.
 - iv. The sign will feature applied vinyl graphics.
 - v. Two aluminum can lights will illuminate the logo sign.
 - e. Install a wall sign (lettered).
 - i. A second lettered wall sign measuring 18' in width and 1' 6" in height will be located above and beyond the westernmost garage bay.
 - ii. The aluminum sign will measure 27 square feet.
 - iii. The individual letters will rely upon reverse channel LED (back-lighting) for illumination.
- 6. Install fencing (See submitted photographs and site plan).
 - a. A 6' vinyl fence with a double gate will enclose the dumpster/recycling area.
 - b. Said fence will be white in color.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. Will the dumpster pad be located 5' from the property lines?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This two part application involves the demolition of a non-contributing commercial building along with its attendant canopy and the subsequent redevelopment of the property. The corner lot adjoins and is opposite other commercial developments. The redevelopment plan calls for the following: the construction a single story service station; the installation of hardscaping; the installation of landscaping; and the installation of signage.

Demolition applications entail the review of the following: the architectural significance of the building; the existing condition of the building; the impact of the demolition on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment. 1307 Government Street features a single story convenience/service station and gas canopy. The building dates from the third quarter of the 20th century. The demolition of the derelict non-contributing building would not impair the architectural or the historical significance of the Leinkauf Historic District or the Government Street corridor.

The Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts address: placement & orientation; mass; scale; façade treatment; and materials & ornamentation; landscaping; hardscaping; and signage.

Building placement and orientation takes into account building setbacks and rhythms. Setback refers to the distance from the building to the right of way. Rhythm results from the distance between buildings.

The Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts state that both setbacks and spacings should approximate the setbacks of nearby historic buildings. By virtue of its corner location, the site entails the negotiation of two setbacks. The proposed building would be setback 40' from Government Street right of way and approximately 28' from the Michigan Avenue right of way.

As per the Government Street, this section experienced many physical changes during the last half of the 20th Century. As the residential population of the City moved westward, the number of demolitions increased. The largely residential character of western Government Street diminished. During that time and into the present, commercial infill increased. The buildings located in the immediate vicinity of this structure are not deemed contributing or historic. Traditional Government Street setbacks varied. Nearby residences such as 1407 Government Street are setback as far as 120'. Other residences are located closer to the right of way. All Saints Episcopal Church located at 151 South Ann Street (corner of Government and Ann Streets) is located approximately 27' from the right of way. 1365 Government Street, a building which is currently listed as non-contributing, is located approximately 42' from the right of way. Other more recent non-contributing infill is located at farther distances from the street. The proposed 40 foot Government Street setback is therefore in keeping with the both current context and historic setbacks.

Regarding the Michigan Avenue setback, the proposed building would be located he 28' from the right of way. The proposed setback for Michigan Avenue is typical of the residences that still line canopy covered street. By virtue of embracing its corner location, the building successfully negotiates two historic streetscapes. It adds a sense of density to the lot, presence not afforded by the existing building's on account of its pronounced setback. The spacing is commensurate with nearby historic examples.

Building mass is defined as arrangement and proportion of the components comprising a building. The Design Review Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts state that proposed new construction should reference nearby historic examples. Nearby historic structures are residential in use and multi-story in construction. Nearby commercial, non-contributing and eligible for contributing, is single story in height. The proposed single story building is a block like structure measuring 58' in width and 26' in depth. Traditional buildings employed a foundation (ground level for historic commercial), wall, and roof zones. Further divisions affected the wall zone. With regard to this building, horizontal and vertical divisions break the building mass into smaller proportional components. A brick dado surrounds the building. This lower horizontal register serves as a base for a stuccoed wall field. The expanse of wall is punctuated by bands that create the effect of an entablature zone, ergo a traditional three part horizontal layering. A tower located just west of the building's northeast corner, provides a vertical accent that adds variety to both plan and elevation, as well strengthening the building's street presence. With the exception of the pyramidal roof surmounting the tower, the building is flat roofed.

Scale refers to the proportional relationship between a building and other buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts state that proposed new construction should be in scale with nearby historic examples. As mentioned previously, nearby historic building are multi-story in height. Non-contributing commercial infill though single story in height is higher than residential and smaller, traditional commercial construction. The proposed building negotiates both the contributing buildings and non-contributing context of its corner lot location.

The Design Review Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts state that proposed construction should blend with the existing historic context yet avoid creating a false since of history. Ideally the property would revert to residential and an appropriate house built. However, since this type of commercial structure is allowed by code, the Board should judge its design within the context of an area compromised architecturally, while considering the importance of Government Street as the most visible street in the historic heart of the City.

Building materials and ornamentation serve to situate a building with its historic setting. While the proposed materials are traditional, the color scheme is not in keeping with the historic character of the surrounding district. Infill construction and ornamentation should function as an unobtrusive background within historic districts. Staff recommends that applicants employ a traditional red brick (like that

employed at the Rite Aid located at 150 South Ann Street, southeast corner of Government Street and Michigan Avenue) in the dado zone of the proposed building. A color scheme more appropriate to Government Street could be developed from the darker brick color. Staff also suggests that the color of the doors blends more with an improved color scheme.

As per hardscaping, the Design Review Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts allow modern surfacing materials, but the design, location and materials thereof should be compatible with property. With the exception asphalt aprons fronting the garage door bays, the application calls for concrete paving surfaces.

The proposed hardscaping would be surrounded by landscaping. The Design Review Guidelines state that landscaping can assist in affecting an appropriate setting. The Design Review Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts state that parking areas should be shielded from view via good site planning and design. The ample landscaping provisions include: over story trees, intermediate level trees, lower shrubs, and ground plantings: The largest expanse of green space would be located at the northeast corner of the property, the intersection of Government Street and Michigan Avenue. Planting strips would extend along the southern and northern lot lines, as well as the western portion of the building. A fence would enclose the proposed dumpster pad. While the height and design meet the standards outlined in the Design Review Guidelines, the composition does not. Vinyl fencing is not allowed in the historic districts. Staff recommends the substitution of wood instead of vinyl.

With regard to the proposed signage, sign proposals involve review size, materials, lighting, and design. The proposed signage meets the standards outlined in the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff recommends approval of the demolition of the existing buildings. Staff does not believe the demolition of the structures will impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district.

Based on C (1-7), Staff does not believe the design of the proposed building and site improvements will impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district. However, staff does believe the color scheme will create a jarring effect and should be modified. Pending approval from other City Departments, the use of wooden fencing, and the submission of a new color scheme, Staff recommends approval of the new building.

Based on D (1-7), Staff does not believe that the proposed signage will impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Henry Robert, Cameron Weavil, and Trey Jinright present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Holmes informed his fellow Board members that he had previously been involved in an earlier submission of the proposed development. Mr. Lawler communicated that he saw no conflict of interest regarding Mr. Holmes reviewing the current application. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representatives. He asked Mr.

Robert, Mr. Weavil, and Mr. Jinright if they had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address.

Mr. Ladd commended the applicants for the efforts.

Mr. Roberts asked Staff for clarification regarding the color scheme. Mr. Bemis stated that both the building and signage color schemes were inappropriate for use within the Mobile's historic districts.

Mr. Roberts asked if the paint was in the stucco as opposed to being applied to it. Mr. Roberts answered that the paint would be applied to the stucco.

Mr. Roberts said that given the proximity of adjoining residential properties, the honk if you receive good service component of the signage should be removed. Mr. Robert said he was amenable to removing that portion of the lettering from the signage.

Mr. Robert told the Board that Take 5 Oil Change has twenty-seven locations. He said that the chain had made concessions when building in historic districts.

Mr. Roberts asked as to how other historic districts handled the chain's color scheme and signage. Mr. Roberts said that the signage color scheme had been approved in New Orleans.

As per the building's color scheme, Mr. Roberts explained that the submitted renderings did not adequately represent the color selection. He provided the Board with more accurate color and material samples, along with photographs of completed buildings. Mr. Robert pointed out that contrary to the submitted color rendering the building's brick components would be red in color.

Mr. Ladd asked for clarification regarding the roof color. Mr. Robert addressed Mr. Ladd's query.

Mr. Oswalt asked Mr. Robert and Staff if the checkered panels were considered signage. Mr. Bemis said that they had not been counted as such. He stated that if they had the signage would exceed the maximum sixty-four square allotment. Mr. Oswalt asked Mr. Robert if the checkered panels were then to be considered an imaging component. Mr. Robert answered yes.

Discussion ensued regarding the checkered panels. Mr. Ladd suggested that the checkered panels could be employed, but halved in size.

Mr. Karwinski stated that he had several design related comments. He said that according to the submitted plans, the proposed corner tower was not a part of the initial submission. Mr. Holmes and Mr. Blackwell responded saying it had been proposed in the initial submission. Mr. Karwinski said that the faux tower was not appropriate.

Mr. Holmes reminded his fellow Board members of their task. Citing both – and – he stated that it was not within the Board's purview to judge or redesign, only determine impairment or lack thereof. Mr. Ladd agreed.

Mr. Karwinski questioned the location of the proposed bollards. Mr. Robert addressed Mr. Karwinski's query saying that the bollard would only be located off the South or Rear Elevation.

Mr. Ladd redirected the application to the signage. Mr. Robert said he amenable to removing to honk if you receive good service component of the lettered signage. He also stated that the checkered panels could be reduced in size by half.

Mr. Ladd broached the subject of the fencing. He asked Mr. Robert if he was amenable to amending the application to call for wood as opposed to vinyl fencing. Mr. Robert said that while wooden fencing could be employed, said fencing would rot, sag, and fade faster than vinyl fencing. Mr. Roberts said that though he understood what Mr. Robert was saying, if the proposed vinyl fencing was approved, a precedent would be set.

Mr. Ladd told the applicant's representative that Board was trying to work with not against them.

Mr. Holmes mentioned other composite types of fencing. He said that some types had the same thickness and texture as well.

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 the note that the checkered panels would be made proportion to their locations, the honk if you received good service component of the signage would be removed, and fencing would be made of wood.

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. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/15/13