

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**July 6, 2011 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:  
**Members Present:** David Barr, Mary Cousar, Kim Harden, Thomas Karwinski, Harris Oswalt, and Craig Roberts.  
**Members Absent:** Gertrude Baker, Carlos Gant, Bill James, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Jim Wagoner, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson.  
**Staff Members Present:** Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, Keri Coumanis, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the June 15, 2011 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

**B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED**

1. **Applicant: Wrico Signs for Bain & Associates**
  - a. Property Address: 9 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/7/11
  - c. Project: Install a hanging metal sign from the soffit of a suspended canopy. The double-faced sign will measure 4' x 3' feet. The sign will feature the name of the establishment.
2. **Applicant: Marcio Simao for David Newell**
  - a. Property Address: 960 Savannah Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/7/11
  - c. Project: Remove asbestos siding to expose wooden siding. Repair and replace wooden siding. Reroof the house.
3. **Applicant: Tissa Loehr**
  - a. Property Address: 201 South Dearborn Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/7/11
  - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork and decking to match the existing. Touch up the paint to match the existing color scheme.
4. **Applicant: Jack Zieman**
  - a. Property Address: 701 Saint Michael Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/7/11
  - c. Project: Paint the building per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme. The body will be Chat Room. The detailing will be Dover White and Sedate Gray. The shutters and the decking will be Bellingrath Green.
5. **Applicant: Jeffrey Jurasek**
  - a. Property Address: 61 North Monterey Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/10/11
  - c. Project: Replace the façade's French doors to match the existing. Remove a later door from the rear elevation. Install siding to match the existing siding over the location of this later insertion. Remove a later two story deck-like platform supporting a HVAC unit. Construct a small single story addition. The addition will square out the building's southwest elevation. The addition will be located beneath a jettied second floor space. The single

window in the affected area will be reused. The addition will not be visible from the street and will feature the same foundation and siding treatment of the main house. Repair and replace siding on the garage. Remove later aluminum windows from the garage. Install wooden windows matching those found on the main house in location of said aluminum windows.

**6. Applicant: Michael Radder**

- a. Property Address: 1770 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/14/11
- c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Replace porch decking to match the existing. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

**7. Applicant: Thomas Roofing**

- a. Property Address: 901 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/15/11
- c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.

**8. Applicant: Gretchin Hamlin**

- a. Property Address: 73 South Lafayette Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/15/11
- c. Project: Remove non-historic front window and replace with paired 2/2 wood windows to match original fenestration.

**9. Applicant: Grant Gibson**

- a. Property Address: 8 South Monterey Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/14/11
- c. Project: Level house and add piers as needed. New piers will not be visible from street.

**10. Applicant: Distinctive Products for the Mobile Archdiocese**

- a. Property Address: 14 South Franklin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/16/11
- c. Project: Apply a Lexicon Panel in front of the third story's windows. The panels will fit within the within the reveals.

**11. Applicant: David Thomas, Sr.**

- a. Property Address: 263 Cedar Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/17/11
- c. Project: Remove grass from front yard and replace with brick pavers.

**12. Applicant: Albert Owen**

- a. Property Address: 1051 Caroline Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 6/17/11
- c. Project: Tear off rotten lean-to at rear, rebuild as before; replace rotten siding as necessary to match original; replace porch column to match; replace broken glass; and repaint white overall.

**13. Applicant: Fred South for Roxie Leslie**

- a. Property Address: 1138 Montauk Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 6/20/11
- c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork. Touch up the color scheme to match the existing.

**14. Applicant: Fred South for Susan Rhodes**

- a. Property Address: 22 South Ann Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/20/11
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.

**15. Applicant: Brian Doyle**

- a. Property Address: 1752 Hunter Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 6/21/11
- c. Project: Replace the fenestration of an infilled porch. Replace wooden windows with wooden windows. Replace the door onto the porch. Touch up paint.

**16. Applicant: Pamela Dykes**

- a. Property Address: 64 South Ann Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/23/11
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing. Relocate an existing six foot privacy fence from the front portion of the lot to a rear portion of the lot. Stabilize the detached garage. Paint the per the submitted Devoe and BLP color schemes. The body will be Devoe's Pepper Tree (greenish grey). The trim will be Devoe's Wedding White. The porch and the foundation will be BLP's Bellingrath Green.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2011-43-CA: 753 Saint Francis Street**

- a. Applicant: Clark, Geer, Latham & Associates, Inc. for Mickie Russell
- b. Project: New Construction - Install a deck and railing atop the building's projecting entrance block.

**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**2. 2011-44-CA: 470 Dauphin Street (Staff File lists as 472-476 Dauphin Street)**

- a. Applicant: Jack Beisel for Walker Brothers Enterprises
- b. Project: Rehabilitation and Restoration - Construct galleries; install storefront units; alter fenestration; and repair & replace deteriorated features.

**DENIED FOR LACK OF INFORMATION AND THE CONVENTION OF A DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**3. 2011-45-CA: Washington Square**

- a. Applicant: Benjamin Cummings for the Oakleigh Garden District Society
- b. Project: Amend a Certificate of Appropriateness – Switch the locations of figural and planter components on the Square's fountain.

**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**4. 2011-42-CA: 77 South Lafayette Street**

- a. Applicant: Julia Stallings for Anthony J. Stallings
- b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain replacement windows.

**DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**5. 2011-46-CA: 1307 Government Street**

- a. Applicant: Nicholas H. Holmes, III for Team Holdings LLC & Baker Family Holdings LLC
- b. Project: Demolition Request & Redevelopment - Demolish a service station and gas canopy; construct a new a gas station/convenience store and canopy; remove and install hardscaping; install landscaping; and install signage.

**WITHDRAWN. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Application Withdrawals

Mr. Karwinski initiated a discussion of the application withdrawal procedure. He stated that there should be a cut off date as well as sign posting of any withdrawals. Mr. Blackwell disagreed noting that applicants frequently withdraw applications if they are

unable to meet clarifications or requests outlined in the Staff Report. He said that messages could be placed upon signs. Discussion ensued. Ms. Coumanis stated that the comments of people who come to a meeting to speak for or against an application which has been withdrawn will be recorded in the minutes and incorporated into application's next Staff Report.

2. Alternative Decking Treatments

The Board examined two alternative porch decking projects. Mr. Blackwell reminded the Board of the accompanying literature which he had distributed at previous meetings. He informed the Board that one company's product had been used as replacement decking at Oak Alley, one of the most famous plantation homes along Louisiana's River Road. Mr. Blackwell stated that the approval was to some degree on account of the tremendous amount of foot traffic experienced by the house museum. No ruling was made, but Mr. Bemis stated that the product seemed acceptable for new construction. He told the Board that the replacement of porch decking is one of the most frequently issued midmonth approvals.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2011-43-CA: 753 Saint Francis Street**  
**Applicant: Clark, Geer, Latham & Associates, Inc. for Mickie Russell**  
**Received: 6/16/11**  
**Meeting: 7/6/11**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning:  
Project: New Construction - Install a deck and railing atop the building's projecting entrance block.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This complex, formerly the Convent of Mercy, occupies the whole of a city block. The St. Francis Street-facing main block was constructed in 1907. The Beaux-Arts informed plan and elevations of the multi-story main building fronts a 1920s addition.

**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 October 16, 2006. At that time the Board approved the construction/installation of a rooftop deck. That earlier approval allowed the heightening of the parapet wall and the installation of iron railings. The applicant returns to the Board with an application that entails the installation of steel decking and the installation of iron railings.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “New additions, alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old shall be differentiated from the old and compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architecture 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 will be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
  - 1. Install decking and a railing atop the building's projecting entrance block.
    - a. The rooftop deck will be laid with steel channels.
    - b. The railing will be set behind the existing parapet wall.
    - c. The iron railing will measure 3.6” in height

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the installation of steel decking and an iron railing atop the building's projecting entrance block. On October 16, 2011, the Board approved the construction of the same deck, the installation of a railing, and the heightening of the parapet. The applicant returns to the Board with an application calling for the installation of a railing and the construction of the deck. Both interventions are reversible. Neither would damage historic materials. On account of the unobtrusiveness of the design and the reversibility of the request, Staff does not believe the proposed railing and decking 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. Staff recommends approval of this application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mickie Russell and Linda Snapp were present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt asked Ms. Russell and Ms. Snapp if they had any comments to add, questions to ask, or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. The applicant and her representative answered no.

Mr. Oswalt asked his fellow Board members if they had any comments to make or questions to ask. Mr. Karwinski said he had one comment to make. He stated that while the design was ok, he wished that it were more refined. Mr. Karwinski stated that he believed the design could be improved if the railing stepped in about the corners, but that was his personal opinion.

Mr. Oswalt asked if any other Board members had any comments to make or questions to ask. No further comments ensued from the Board.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, he closed the period of public comment.

## **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 written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Karwinski 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: 7/6/12**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2011-44-CA: 470 Dauphin Street (Staff Files lists as 472-476 Dauphin Street)**  
**Applicant: Jack Beisel for Walker Brothers Investments**  
**Received: 5/31/11**  
**Meeting: 7/5/11**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Rehabilitation and Restoration – Construct galleries; install storefront units; alter fenestration; and repair & replace deteriorated features.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This eleven bay, four unit building is known as the Tobin Building. The 1854 building (which also features a 1937 NW corner addition) is one of Mobile’s finest extant rows of two-and-one-half-story commercial storefronts. Once found across downtown Mobile, these buildings offered ground floor retail space and upper story living quarters.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on April 24, 2006. At that time, the Board denied an application calling for the demolition of eastern unit’s east wall. The applicant returns to the Board with a proposal calling for the rehabilitation of the entire complex.
- B. The Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Guidelines, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Many changes over time have occurred to storefronts in the LDSCD. In the event that a storefront does not fit the context of the district, a new more compatible design may be introduced. Lacking knowledge of the original storefront, a new design can be introduced taking into account the scale, style, and properties of the adjacent buildings and the context of the district into consideration. The purist may look toward returning it to a more original appearance.”
  - 2. “Maintain original space patterns and locations of windows.”
  - 3. “Many buildings in the district either had a cantilevered iron balcony or a cast iron balcony covering the sidewalk. Should documentation exist that a balcony or gallery was originally the part of the building façade, the appropriate type balcony or gallery may be added. Should there be no documentation that a balcony or gallery existed, a balcony or gallery appropriate to the age and character of the building may be added.”

4. “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 a property shall be avoided.”
5. “Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.”
6. “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.”
7. “Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms, or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Construct a two-tiered gallery.
  - a. The L-shaped gallery will be six feet in depth.
  - b. The gallery will extend along the Dauphin Street façade, as well as the older portion of the Lawrence Street (West) Elevation.
  - c. The Dauphin Street Gallery will be six bays in length.
  - d. The Lawrence Street or West Elevation will be five bays in length.
  - e. The Dauphin Street bay sequence will correspond to the individual units within the larger building.
  - f. The gallery will be constructed of cast iron posts and cast iron railings.
  - g. The circular posts will feature simple banding and capitals.
  - h. The railings will measure 42” in height.
  - i. The second story gallery will feature tongue-and-groove wooden decking.
2. Install new storefronts, alter fenestration, and repair & replace fenestration.
  - a. The storefront units will be made of wood.
  - b. The lower wooden paneled portions of the storefront units will be surmounted by glazed bays and transoms.
  - c. Six light glazed and paneled doors will be employed on the storefronts.
  - d. A canted corner entrance will be employed at the building’s southwest corner.
  - e. The canted corner entrance will measure just over 9’ on the South Elevation and just under 8’ on the West Elevation. A single glazed and paneled door with flanking lights will occupy the canted corner entry.
  - f. Convert three of the South Elevation’s second story window bays into door bays. Six light glazed and paneled doors matching those proposed for the ground floor will be installed.
  - g. Install two two-over-two wooden windows within the bricked up southern expanse of the West Elevation.
  - h. Add a door on the West Elevation. The door will be a glazed and paneled door matching those installed elsewhere on the building.
  - i. Shutter the two northernmost doors on the West Elevation.
  - j. Repair, replace, and install four-over-four wooden windows within the existing second story window bays to match the existing.
  - k. Install operable wooden shutters in the aforementioned windows.
3. Repair and replace rotten woodwork to match the existing.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This extensive rehabilitation/restoration project involves the construction of galleries, installation of storefront units, the alteration of fenestration, and the repair & replacement deteriorated features.



The Secretary of the Interior's standards state that replacement of missing features should be supported by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence. The 1904 Sanborn Maps indicate that this building once featured a gallery. As was often the case, the 19<sup>th</sup>-century gallery was removed at some point during the second third of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The original gallery extended the length of the Dauphin Street façade and a portion of the West Elevation. The proposed gallery would extend the whole of the complex's original West Elevation. Precedent for full length wrap around galleries abounds in the form of extant and lost buildings (extant 1 North Royal and destroyed the Manassas Club). The Lower Dauphin Commercial District Guidelines allow the construction of galleries in appropriate locations. The design and the materials meet the standards outlined the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. The simple detailing of the proposed ironwork contrasts with the more decorative treatments that characterize traditional ironwork. By adopting a simple design, the gallery will "read" as a historically appropriate alteration to a historic building. The lower portions of the second story façade have been refaced. The applicants propose the conversion of two window bays into doors. The fenestration rhythm will remain the same.

The façade's altered ground floor was gutted at a later date. The proposed storefront calls for the reinsertion of recessed entries and maintenance of the distinction between individual building units. The reinsertion should conform to the footprint of the original units. A canted corner entry would be located in the building's altered southwest corner. The two proposed West Elevation windows would be located just north of the canted entry. The proposed windows will align with second story windows. The new door proposed for the west elevation would be located slightly north of transition between the gabled and flat parapets. The door will match those proposed elsewhere on the building. One of the two existing door bays located on the West Elevation retains its transom and frame. A second has been significantly altered. Both units feature replacement doors. The proposed shutters are stylistically and temporally appropriate. Staff recommends that the proposed shuttering be divided by a transom bar and held within a surrounding frame.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff does not believe that this application as a whole impairs the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. That said the deviations from the original south-facing ground floor storefront (canted corner entry included) and the proposed treatment of the West Elevations doors would result in impair. Based on B (1-6), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the district. Staff recommends approval of this application on the condition that the applicants replicate the original storefront (not using the canted corner entry) and utilize a transom bar and a surrounding frame on the West Elevation's existing door bays.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Jim Walker was present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt asked Mr. Walker if he had any comments to add, questions to ask, or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Walker answered no.

Mr. Oswalt asked his fellow Board members if they had any comments to make or questions to ask the applicant or staff. Mr. Roberts asked for clarification regarding the Staff Recommendation. Discussion ensued and centered on the proposed corner and former Dauphin Street recessed entrances.

Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Walker if he had any plans for the second story because the use of the second floor would affect ingress and egress. Mr. Walker stated that ingress and egress issues were adequately addressed by the submitted plans.

Mr. Roberts addressed Mr. Walker saying that the Staff Report is based on the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation. He stated that the Board could take into account reality and context in their review of individual applications. Mr. Roberts said that this property was one of the few eyesores left on Government Street. He applauded the applicant's steps to rehabilitate the building.

Mr. Roberts then redirected discussion to the ground floor fenestration. Mr. Walker said that in recreating the 1920s canted entryways he would be losing sixteen seats, therefore affecting sales, as well as creating an awkward seating arrangement. He stated that the proposed corner entry was designed take into account traffic driving down Dauphin Street. It would draw customers into the establishment. Mr. Karwinski reiterated his concerns regarding ingress and egress, but he noted that access requirements were not under the Board's jurisdiction.

Mr. Karwinski told the applicant he had inspected the 1904 Sanborn Map. He said that the Sanborn indicated a single story wooden gallery. Mr. Karwinski said that it was his opinion that the balcony should be single not multi-tiered type. He noted that the Staff Report stated that the fenestration would respect the individual units but the proposed balcony bays did not align with said party walls.

Mr. Karwinski distributed two drawings addressing the gallery rhythm and the fenestration sequence. He said that he could see the Board approving the project in concept, but more details would be required.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Walker if his architect had contacted Staff. Mr. Walker answered yes.

Mr. Roberts concurred with Mr. Karwinski saying that the proposed plans were a good start, but needed some additional work. He suggested the convention of a Design Review Committee.

Mr. Walker said that the former storefronts were not the original but dated from the 1920s.

Ms. Harden spoke to her fellow Board members and the applicant with regard to the storefronts. She said that since these were documented features, they should be the basis from which a new design was developed.

Mr. Roberts again suggested Design Review Committee. He explained to Mr. Walker that by convening a Design Review Committee an application could be improved for likely approval.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, he closed the period of public comment.

## **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 written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application be denied for lack of information and convention of a Design Review Committee.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2011-45-CA: Washington Square**  
**Applicant: Benjamin Cummings for the Oakleigh Garden District Society**  
**Received: 5/25/11**  
**Meeting: 6/7/11**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: NA  
Zoning: NA  
Project: Amend a Certificate of Appropriateness – Switch the locations of figural and planter components on the Square’s fountain.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

The site of Washington Square was deeded to the City in 1850 on the condition that property become a public park and promenade. Bordered by Chatham, Palmetto, Charleston, Charles, and Augusta Streets, the pentagon-shaped park features a large center fountain. The fountain was installed sometime between 1906 and 1916. Four identical sculptural groupings (a female figure astride a dolphin-like creature) once occupied four of the fountains eight pedestals.

**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 November 3, 2010. At that time the Board approved the reinstallation of figural components atop the fountain’s pedestals. The Oakleigh Garden District Society’s representative reappears before the Board with a request to invert the location of the approved figural sculptures and the existing planters.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.”
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Alterations to a Certificate of Appropriateness – Switch the locations of figural and planter components on the Square’s fountain.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the amendment of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The approved scope of work allowed the reinstallation of sculptural components atop four of the fountains eight pedestals. Four of the fountains pedestals are circular in shape and four are square in shape. The square bases always help planters. The current urn-like planters and their accompanying pedestals replaced earlier lotus-like

planters. The circular pedestals were designed to be surmounted by figural elements. It was discovered after approval and issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness that the installation of the sculptures would in the locations of the original figural components would require the relocation of external bibs and internal plumbing. The applicants propose reversing the location of the figural elements and the planters.

Owing to the complexity of the Square's plan (an irregular pentagon with a central focal point accessed by an uneven network of radiating walks) the "flipping" would be minimal on account of the aforementioned siting concerns, as well as trees and fencing. The proposed "flipping" of the dolphin astride putti and the planters would position the planters with their square bases atop the circular pedestals. The further alteration of the original design would impair the architectural and historical integrity of the fountain.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the Square or the district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application. The figural elements may be installed, but on the approved locations.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Benjamin Cummings and Stoney Chavers were present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicants. He asked Mr. Cummings and Mr. Chavers if they had any comments to add, questions to ask, or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report.

Mr. Cummings stated that Chip Herrington, then acting president of the Oakleigh Garden District Society, accompanied him when the project received initial approval in November of 2010. He introduced Mr. Chavers to the Board.

Mr. Cummings explained that in the process of developing engineering drawings for the final installation two issues were discovered which caused him to rethink the proposal and make the present submission. Mr. Cummings acknowledged the original siting of the two types of components. He stated that the statues were situated at corner locations while planters were located at the intervening midpoint stations. First, he said that approval statuary was not identical but similar to the original figures, putti astride fish-like creatures. Pointing to an illustration of one of the sculptural casts, Mr. Cummings noted that the new statues would not be placed in the center of their respective stations but would hang over the fountain basin on account of their design and construction. Secondly, existing hose bibs prohibited placement of the fountains in their original locations.

He said that neighborhood residents contributed and raised funds for the project. They hoped Public Works would install and plumb the reworking of the fountain. He added that the fountain would look better if the figures were placed at the midpoint and not the center locations.

Mr. Oswalt asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask or comments to make. Mr. Karwinski suggested that it might be possible to place the new statuary on the original locations if bases were used. Mr. Cummings said he had investigated that alternative, but as previously stated the new statuary required an overhanging placement.

Mr. Chavers addressed the Board and Staff saying he was exasperated with the City bureaucracy. He stated that citizens, Oakleigh citizens and residents had raised the money and made the effort. Mr. Chavers said that current facets and jets were not appropriate. He spoke of the historical significance of the Square and its recreational uses, as well as the Board's task, but he stated much time and money had been extended without compensation by numerous individuals to bring the project to fruition. Mr. Chavers said that not only Washington Square residents but the whole of the neighborhood were behind the effort. He said that in light of Mr. Cumming's aesthetic and practical observations that he supported the flipping of the fountain components.

Mr. Roberts addressed the applicants. He said that Staff was obligated to uphold the Design Review Guidelines, but the Board could at its discretion rationalize matters.

Ms. Harden asked a plumbing-related question. Mr. Cummings addressed Ms. Harden's query.

Mr. Karwinski said he had one comment to make and one question to ask. First, he said that it should not be too difficult for the City to stucco and plumb the fountain. Second, he asked for clarification as to the size of the fountains. Mr. Cummings smiled saying he had heard the statues described as the height of a large dog so they were roughly two-and-one-half to three feet in height. Mr. Karwinski said that he would not object to the relocation of the figural and planter components but scale was a concern. Alluding to the period photograph of the fountain and the Staff Report, he pointed out that the original planters squat and wide but the current urns were taller and atop plinths.

Mr. Oswalt asked for clarification regarding the planters. Mr. Cummings told the Board that two of the existing planters had been located at Russell School and two had been from located on a nearby lawn.

A discussion of heights of the planter and figural components ensued.

Addressing earlier remarks, Mr. Bemis interjected saying that the City Council, on the instigation of Councilman Carroll, had voted to contribute \$2,500 toward the project. He also noted that it seemed to be expected that the City would attend to the plumbing involved in reworking the fountain.

Ms. Harden asked Mr. Cummings asked as to the permanency of the installation. Mr. Cummings answered that the sixty-five pound statues would be bolted down in accordance with regulations. Ms. Harden noted that there installation was then reversible. Mr. Oswalt concurred. Ms. Harden added that while reversible, the proposal was still historical inappropriate. That said the flipping of the figural and the planter components could be approved on an interim bases allowing the original configuration to be reinstated if and when funds allowed.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, he closed the period of public comment.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Ms. Harden 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 on account of the reversibility of the proposal, the planters and the statues could be relocated to their historical locations at a later date when finances allowed.

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: 7/6/12**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2011-42-CA: 77 South Lafayette Street**  
**Applicant: Julia Stallings for Anthony J. Stallings**  
**Received: 5/26/11**  
**Meeting: 6/15/11**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain replacement windows.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This Colonial Revival residence adopts the character of a one-and-one half 18<sup>th</sup>-century house.

**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 311 call was made on March 29, 2011. Vinyl windows were installed without the issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness or building permit. A Notice of Violation was issued. The applicant’s representative appears before the Board with a request to retain the replacement windows. The application was scheduled to appear before the Review Board at the June 15, 2011 meeting. Review was heldover at the representative’s request.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The type, size, and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
  - 2. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**
  - 1. After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain vinyl replacement windows.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the After-the-Fact-Approval of vinyl replacement windows. The original windows were removed and the current windows installed without the issuance of either a Certificate of Appropriateness or a building permit. While the window configuration of the replacement windows match the original six-over-one windows, the material composition of the replacements is deemed inappropriate by the Design Review Guidelines. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that historic windows should be retained and repaired. If repair is not possible, replacement windows



should be compatible with the existing. The Guidelines do not allow the replacement of wooden windows with vinyl windows.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application impair the architectural character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Julia Stallings and Anthony J. Stallings were present to discuss the application

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Roberts recused himself from the deliberations on account of personal connections with the applicant's representative.

Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant and his representative. He asked them if they had any comments to add, questions to ask, or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report.

Ms. Stallings addressed the Board. She said that she could only plead ignorance. Confronted with new grandchild and inoperable windows, Ms. Stallings explained that she contacted what she thought was a reputable concern to install operable windows that would insure both safety as well as increased environmental efficiency.

Mr. Karwinski asked Ms. Stallings and Mr. Stallings if they knew that the house was situated in a historic district. Ms. Stallings answered no. Mr. Karwinski informed the applicant there was historic district signage less than a block away further south on Lafayette Street. Ms. Stallings said that she was unaware of that sign, but had since become aware of another sign near the Old Dauphin Way Methodist Church.

A discussion of historic district signage ensued. Mr. Stallings said that he had never noticed the sign on Lafayette Street.

Ms. Stallings reiterated her actions saying that the birth of a grandchild motivated her actions. She acknowledged that while her concern was personal, she understood the contractor to be reputable and knowing of the procedures involved.

Mr. Oswalt addressed the applicant and his representative. He said that he understood their concerns and actions, but the Guidelines are clear cut when it comes to matters such as these.

Ms. Stallings said that she understood. Mr. Bemis told Ms. Stallings that she could remedy the situation by taking action against the contractor/installer. Ms. Stallings told the Board that she had already been informed this recourse by Mr. Blackwell. She thanked Mr. Blackwell for his earlier and continued assistance saying he had been most helpful. Mr. Bemis said that the contractor had not pulled a permit, if licensed he would have known the proper procedure. He reiterated to the applicant and his representative that they had reason for redress.

Ms. Stallings asked the Board to develop a better means of communicating to property buyers the presence and obligations of historic districts. Randomly placed signs were not sufficient. Mr. Bemis stated that since 2002, the City notifies new property owners within historic districts of their obligations in the form of a letter posted when water service is established. Mr. Bemis again stated that if the

contractor had attempted to pull a permit a flag would have been raised on account of the property's location within a historic district. Ms. Coumanis said it was the contractor's responsibility.

Ms. Harden explained to Ms. Stallings and Mr. Stallings the Board's predicament.

### **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 written.

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 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.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2011-46-CA:** 1307 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Nicholas H. Holmes, III for Team Holdings LLC & Baker Family Holdings LLC  
**Received:** 6/6/11  
**Meeting:** 7/6/11

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Leinkauf  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: B-2  
Project: Demolition Request & Redevelopment Proposal - Demolish a service station and canopy; construct a new gas station/convenience store and canopy; remove and install hardscaping; install landscaping; and install 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...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicants propose the demolition of the existing service station & gas canopy. The redevelopment plan calls for the construction of a new convenience store & gas canopy and the installation of signage, hardscaping & landscaping.
- B. The 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;  
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 structures and construct new buildings. The landscaping allotment will be increased. Hardscaping and curbcuts will be decreased.
  - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
    1. The applicants are currently negotiating the sale/purchase of the property.
  - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
    1. The owners have placed the property on market. Redevelopment plans are proposed by a possible purchaser.
  - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
    1. The sale of the property is under negotiation.
  - 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. See submitted materials.
  - 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.
  3. *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."
- C. 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

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

- D. 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.”
- E. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Demolish a single story service station and gas canopy.
  2. Construct a convenience store/gas station and gas canopy.
    - a. The pentagon-shaped building will be located in the southwest corner of the lot.
    - b. The single story brick building will measure a total 2,790 square feet.
    - c. The building will be elevated atop a concrete slab.
    - e. The larger center bay of the five bay façade will feature an arc-like roof.
    - f. The façade will feature a smooth limestone veneered dado. A cap will surmount the dado.
    - g. The façade will feature a stuccoed cornice.
    - h. The intermediate wall expanses will be faced with brick.
    - i. The two outermost bays will not feature fenestration.
    - j. The bays located adjacent to the aforementioned outer bays will feature single aluminum storefront windows. The dado will step down in height to accommodate the storefront windows.
    - k. The larger central bay will be faced with stucco.
    - l. The dado will step down in height to accommodate the storefront windows.
    - m. The center five bay store front unit will feature a centrally located aluminum double door.
    - n. A standing seam metal awning will surmount the five bay storefront unit.
    - o. A sequence of transom-like windows (whose dimensions correspond to the storefront windows) will be located above the awning.
    - p. Construct a metal gas canopy.

- q. The canopy will cover an area measuring 24' by 76' in plan.
  - r. The canopy will measure 17' in height.
  - s. Six posts will support the canopy's roof.
  - t. Three fuel islands will be located between the three pairs of piers.
3. Remove and reinstall hardscaping.
    - a. Remove two curbscuts from Government Street.
    - b. Remove two curbscuts from Michigan Avenue.
    - c. Install two curbscuts, one on Government Street and one on Michigan Avenue.
    - d. The Government Street curbscut will measure 46' at its inner edge and 70' at its outer edge. Said curbscut will feature a traffic diverter.
    - e. The Michigan Avenue curbscut will measure 36' at its inner edge and 65' at its outer edge.
    - f. Install concrete paving within the lot.
    - g. Install a 5' depth concrete entrance pad before building's central entrance bay.
    - h. The aforementioned pad will be sloped for handicap access.
  4. Install landscaping.
    - a. Landscaping will be installed around the perimeter of the lot and around the the convenience store.
    - b. Crepe Myrtles, Live Oaks, Indian Hawthorns, and Clevera will comprise the planting schedule.
    - c. The plantings will be mulched. Sections of the perimeter will be mulched.
    - b. Centipede sod will be planted.
  5. Install signage.
    - a. The total square footage of all signage will be 88 square feet.
    - b. Wall and monument signage will be installed.
    - c. Install wall signage within the central bay of the canted façade.
    - d. The wall sign will measure 2' 6" in height and 12' in length.
    - e. The name of the commercial entity will comprise the signage.
    - f. Construct a monument sign.
    - g. The monument sign will be located in the northeast corner of the lot.
    - h. The monument sign will feature a 2' brick base.
    - i. The total height of the monument sign (counting the base) will be 6' 5/8".
    - j. The double-faced monument signage will feature 78" by 58 5/8" of signage per face.
    - k. The double-faced signage will be divided into four divisions per face.
    - l. The franchise and oil company's names will be located within two divisions.
    - m. Gas prices will be shown on the two remaining divisions.

#### Requests/Clarifications

1. Provide a plan of the building.
2. Provide an elevation/detailing showing the depth of the entrance awning.
3. Drop more measurements on the plan (storefronts and cornice dimensions)?
4. Will the limestone veneer be true limestone or a synthetic veneer?
5. Provide material samples for the meeting.
6. Provide a color rendering of the building.
7. Provide a more detailed design of the proposed canopy.
8. What is the material composition of the proposed signage?
9. Will the proposed signage entail lighting? If so, what type?

## STAFF ANALYSIS

This two part application involves the demolition of a non-contributing commercial building 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 commercial structure; the construction a gas canopy; 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. 1503 Government Street features a single story convenience/service station and gas canopy. The building dates from the third quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> 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.

Building placement and orientation takes into account building setbacks and rhythms. The Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts state that setbacks should approximate the setbacks of nearby historic buildings. Like the existing non-contributing building, the proposed gas station/convenience store would be setback behind the plane of neighboring commercial structures on Government and Michigan Avenue. The flanking buildings (1401 Government Street and 158 Michigan Avenue), while listed as non-contributing structures are in fact eligible for contributing status. When next resurveyed, both structures would be upgraded in terms of their historical and architectural significance.

The proposed new construction would occupy of a portion of the footprint of the existing building; however the new store would be pushed further back to the southwestern corner of the lot. The new convenience store and canopy will be oriented to the corner. The approximate setback from the Government Street right of way is 62'; the approximate setback from the Michigan Ave is 79'. From the corner, the building will be setback approximately 110' from the edge of the landscaping required at the corner. The setbacks are not compatible with traditional commercial construction.

The canted corner entry of the symmetrical block-like building observes the rectilinear massing that characterizes much 20<sup>th</sup>-century commercial construction. The simple massing and relatively small scaled building is segmented into smaller components both vertically and horizontally. The five bay facade features a traditional tripartite division of dado, field, and cornice. The concentration of elements on the central entrance bay is in keeping with traditional commercial design sensibilities and tactics. The stone, brick, and stucco facings are historically appropriate as well as aesthetically conducive in their layering. However, its unclear how the proposed building, situated on the lot line, will interplay with the adjacent historic structures. The drawings should clarify this relationship.

The proposed canopy design is too indeterminately detailed for recommendation. The drawings should clarify how the canopy will relate to the proposed convenience store in both scale and design. The Board generally requires final design of the canopy before a gas station can be approved.

The proposed redevelopment of this lot would involve the removal of all existing hardscaping. The plan calls for a decrease in the amount of paved surfaces presently on the lot. The amount of pavement will still exceed 10,000 sq. ft. The number of curbcuts would be reduced by half. One curbcut would serve Government Street and a second would serve Michigan Avenue.



This landscaping plan calls for perimeter and corner landscaping. Said landscaping is a marked improvement in terms of allotment and placement; however, the ARB generally requires internal landscaping for commercial projects to break up the large expanse of concrete. The proposed plan does not include internal landscaping. The plantings and sod selected are both traditional in type and heat resistant in selection.

The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street state that the total square footage of monument signs shall not exceed fifty square feet. The proposed monument sign measures in excess of fifty square feet. Additionally, the sign exceeds the maximum five foot height limit established by previous board rulings. The proposed signage exceeds the maximum 50 square footage signage allotment for monument signs and the 64 square feet for total signage.

Staff has identified several areas of concern: excessive signage requires a variance; the sign package is incomplete; the canopy design is not detailed; the lack of a floor plan does not allow a complete understanding of the building; the materials are not available for review; generally the Board asks for some type of internal landscaping; and, the placement of the building in relation to the streets and the adjacent structures may be problematic.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on C (1-7), Staff does not believe the demolition of the non-contributing building would impair the historic integrity of the district and would recommend its approval if the Board feels confident that the problems with the proposed new building can be worked out.

There is insufficient information to approve the new construction, signage, landscaping, and hardscaping components of this application. Since new commercial construction can be very complicated, pending the aforementioned clarifications and requests, Staff recommends the Board review those portions of the application presented to provide direction for a final submission. Based on D (2-3, 5-7) and lack of information, Staff believes the proposed signage package impairs the architectural and the historical character of the building.

Staff therefore recommends denial of all but the demolition portion of the request due to lack of information. This will allow the applicants to present a modified application once they review the Board's suggestions.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

No one was present to discuss the application for it was withdrawn prior to the meeting.

At the beginning of the meeting, Councilman William Carroll raised his objections to the proposal. Citing the nearby Shoppes of Midtown, Councilman Carroll said that developments of this type were detrimental to the integrity of the historic districts.