

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**March 20, 2013 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

1. The acting Chair, Jim Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:  
**Members Present:** Robert Allen, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes III, Thomas Karwinski, and Jim Wagoner.  
**Members Absent:** Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.  
**Staff Members Present:** Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the March 6, 2013 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

**B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.**

1. **Applicant: Susan Rhodes**
  - a. Property Address: 22 South Ann Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/27/13
  - c. Project: Construct a deck off the rear elevation per the submitted plan.
2. **Applicant: Cynthia K. Johnson**
  - a. Property Address: 115 North Catherine Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/25/13
  - c. Project: Install a six foot tall interior lot wooden privacy fence. Said fence will not extend beyond the front plane of the body of the house.
3. **Applicant: Bailey DuMont**
  - a. Property Address: 162 Roberts Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/26/13
  - c. Project: Reroof the house with Timberline slate gray asphalt shingles.
4. **Applicant: Joe Bradley**
  - a. Property Address: 359 Saint Francis Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/27/13
  - c. Project: Repaint per the existing color scheme. Repair the roof to match the existing.
5. **Applicant: Derald Eastman**
  - a. Property Address: 1455 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 2/25/13
  - c. Project: Reroof with 30 year architectural shingle, weather wood color.
6. **Applicant: Carl Norman**
  - a. Property Address: 501 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/4/13
  - c. Project: Install a hanging sign. The double-face brushed aluminum sign will measure a total of 12 square feet. The sign will be extended from a metal bracket. The sign will be positioned so that it meets height requirements. The sign will feature the name of the establishment.

- 7. Applicant: All State Renovators**
  - a. Property Address: 1457 Ohio Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/6/13
  - c. Project: Reroof the house with matching asphalt shingles.
- 8. Applicant: Damon Leet Roofing**
  - a. Property Address: 2252 Ashland Place Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/7/13
  - c. Project: Replace roofing shingles to match the existing.
- 9. Applicant: Gary Lee**
  - a. Property Address: 200 Michigan Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/8/13
  - c. Project: Install an eight foot tall privacy fencing in the rear lot (The property is a multi-family dwelling). Said fencing will not extend beyond the front plan of the façade.
- 10. Applicant: Gary Lee**
  - a. Property Address: 202 Michigan Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/8/13
  - c. Project: Install an eight foot tall privacy fencing in the rear lot (The property is a multi-family dwelling). Said fencing will not extend beyond the front plan of the façade.
- 11. Applicant: Gary Clark Builders**
  - a. Property Address: 109 Beverly Court
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/8/13
  - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork and roofing on the front porch to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
- 12. Applicant: Lin Mans-Walters**
  - a. Property Address: 1150 Texas Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/11/13
  - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile dimension and material. Repair and replace deteriorated tongue-and-groove decking to match the existing. Return the columns to the original location (one had been removed and the others adjusted, based on “ghost marks” and photographs). Repaint the house. The body will be buttercup yellow, the trim will be white, the decking and steps will battleship gray, the porch roof will be dove gray. Install fencing. Install a three foot aluminum fence around the front and side yards. Install a six foot privacy fence around starting at the end plan of the house and extending around the rear portion of the lot not extending beyond the front plane o the house.
- 13. Applicant: Lin Mans-Walters**
  - a. Property Address: 1152 Texas Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/11/13
  - c. Project: Install a six foot high wooden privacy fence around the inner lot. The fencing will not extend beyond the front plane of the house.
- 14. Applicant: Government Street Presbyterian Church**
  - a. Property Address: 51 South Jackson Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/12/13
  - c. Project: Paint the building per the submitted color scheme. The trim will be white and the door Chinese Red.
- 15. Applicant: Tim Bullock**
  - a. Property Address: 603 Saint Francis Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/12/13
  - c. Project: Reroof an ancillary building.

**16. Applicant: Lucy Wilson**

- a. Property Address: 1262 Elmira Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/12/13
- c. Project: Reroof school with modified rubber roof.

**17. Applicant: Take 5 Oil Change**

- a. Property Address: 1307 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/5/13
- c. Project: Install temporary plastic sign advertising employment opportunities for the franchise to be constructed. The 4' high by 8' wide sign will be placed in the northeast corner of the property for thirty day period.

**18. Applicant: Sign Pro for Hargrove and Associates**

- a. Property Address: 20 South Royal Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/13/13
- c. Project: Install temporary plastic sign advertising employment opportunities for the franchise to be constructed. The 4' high by 8' wide sign will be placed in the northeast corner of the property for thirty day period. Install a wall sign in the parapet. The sign will be installed so that it does not damage the building or obscure architectural details. The sign will measure 4' in height and 10' 6' in length. The aluminum sign will be illuminated by reverse channel lettering. The sign will feature the name and logo of the establishment.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2013-17-CA: 1001 Augusta Street**

- a. Applicant: Kevin Cross
- b. Project: Fencing – Install interior lot iron and wooden privacy fencing.

**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**2. 2013-18-CA: 1209 Selma Street**

- a. Applicant: Jonathon Boyer with Weatherguard Metal Roofing for Katherine Lubecki
- b. Project: Metal Roofing – Install a metal roof.

**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**3. 2013-19-CA: 213-219 Dauphin Street**

- a. Applicant: Ricky Armstrong for Maggie Smith of Soul Kitchen
- b. Project: Signage – Install signage on the building's marquee.

**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**4. 2013-20-CA: 1023 Dauphin Street**

- a. Applicant: Salvation Army
- b. Project: Post Demolition Redevelopment – Install sod on the site of a building approved for demolition and construct fencing around the perimeter of the lot.

**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. 300 McDonald Avenue

Mr. Blackwell addressed the Board. He reminded the assembled Board members that the expanded midmonth approval list authorizes Staff to approve ancillary construction if said buildings meet the Guidelines, setback requirements, and lot coverage restrictions. Mr. Blackwell said that the subject property had last appeared before the Board on November 7, 2012. At that time, the Board had approved the construction of ancillary

buildings and fencing. The applicants had now revised that application. Mr. Blackwell explained that Staff believes that the design, construction, materials, and location of the work will not impair the architectural and the historical character of the property or the district. He stated that since the initial project had been approved by the Board, Mr. Bemis had thought it best to present the application before them as a matter of procedure. The Board authorized Staff to review and approve the application.

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

**2013-17-CA: 1001 Augusta Street**  
**Applicant: Kevin Cross**  
**Received: 2/27/13**  
**Meeting: 3/20/13**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Fencing – Install interior lot iron and wooden privacy fencing.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

The dwelling is one of three Italianate side hall houses that line the southern side of Washington Square. All three houses feature monumental porticos. This residence dates circa 1870. For many years, the house was the home of local preservationist Velma Croom.

**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 10, 2007. At that time, the Board approved alterations to the rear the dwelling.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. Fencing should “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property of multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face toward the public view. All variances required by the Board of Adjustment should be obtained prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan and pictures):
  - 1. Remove the wire fencing extending between the West Elevation and the western lot line.
  - 2. Install iron fencing.
    - a. The fencing will commence at the northwest corner of the body of the house (the front wall) and extend to the western lot line.
    - b. The fencing will measure five feet in height.
    - c. Intermediate iron bar posts will punctuate the expanses of fencing.
    - d. An iron pedestrian gate will allow for ingress and egress.
  - 3. Remove the chain link fencing that extends along the western lot line.
  - 4. Install wooden privacy fencing on the location of the aforementioned chain link fencing.

- a. From north to south, the fence will be 8' in height, but will step down in height to 6' upon reaching a plane equal with the rear elevation of the main house on the adjacent property to the west.
- b. The six foot height fence will terminate at the adjacent property's existing vehicular gate.
- c. A three foot wooden fence will extend from the aforementioned vehicular gate to the inner edge of the sidewalk.
- d. The design of the 8' and 6' sections of fencing will match that of existing fencing located on the property.
- e. The fencing will be shadow-boxed.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the installation of iron and privacy fencing. Fencing applications involve the review of the following criteria: design, scale, height, location and materials.

A proposed 5' high iron fence featuring a pedestrian gate would extend between the front plane of the body of the house and the western lot line. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, the design, scale, height, location, and materials of the fence would complement the building and not detract from it (See B-1).

The height of solid fencing is generally restricted to 6', however if a property is designated or abuts a commercial or multi-family property, an eight foot fence may be considered (See B-1). This property's non-conforming multi-family status is in the process of being reviewed.

The design of the proposed sections of 6' and 8' high wooden privacy fencing would match existing fencing located elsewhere on the property. Said fencing would extend along a portion of the western lot line. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet; however, if a commercial property of multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered (See B-1). Upon reaching the front plane of the house, the fence would drop down to 3' in height in order to comply with municipal height requirements.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1) and pending clarification of the property's non-conforming status, Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of the 5' high iron fencing, 6' high privacy fencing, and 3' high fencing. If the non-conforming usage agreement is not compliant, Staff recommends the use of 6' high fencing instead of the 8' high fencing.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Kevin Cross was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

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

Mr. Cross responded by saying that Mr. Blackwell had summed up the request.

Mr. Wagoner asked for clarification regarding the property status. Mr. Cross stated that he was unaware of an uncertainty. He said that papers had been submitted.

Mr. Wagoner asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant.

No comments ensued from the Board.

Mr. Wagoner asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application.

Carla Sharrow addressed the Board. She told the Board that she is a next door neighbor of Mr. Cross and that she had some clarifications that she would like to have addressed.

Ms. Sharrow first referenced the site plan. She asked if the 8' fence would extend to the rear of the lot. Mr. Cross said he could extend the fence if so desired.

Ms. Sharrow then spoke to the Board with regard to her neighbor's guest house. She said that she had privacy related concerns regarding the guest house on account of its proximity to her own home. Ms. Sharrow told the Board that she had submitted an application for fencing that was scheduled for review at the March 6, 2013 meeting. She explained that she had put the application on hold. Ms. Sharrow elaborated upon her privacy related concerns.

Mr. Wagoner said that according to his understanding an 8' fence would extend from back of the lot to a point equal to the rear plane of Ms. Sharrow's residence. Upon reaching the rear plane of the Sharrow residence the fence would drop down in height to 6'. The 6' fence would extend to the existing vehicular gates upon which a 3' high fence would extend to the sidewalk. Mr. Wagoner asked Ms. Sharrow if explication clarified her concerns.

Ms. Sharrow reiterated her privacy related concerns. She explained that the guest house is used consistently and that she feels it invades her family's privacy. Returning to the application that she had submitted to the Board, Ms. Sharrow explained that her request for a privacy fence had been approved by Staff. The application had been scheduled to appear before the Board, but Ms. Sharrow said she had pulled it from review. She reiterated her concerns for privacy.

Mr. Wagoner said that while he can understand privacy related concerns, use and privacy are not under the Board's purvey.

Ms. Sharrow raised another concern. She said that she did not see how the proposed 3' foot fence could be installed. Ms. Sharrow said that existing trees and plantings would impede the fence's construction.

Mr. Karwinski entered into the discussion. He stated it was his personal opinion the design proposed 3' tall fence is not appropriate to the area. He asked for further clarification as to the design of the fence. Mr. Cross said the design of the fence would match that of the proposed privacy fencing.

Mr. Cross spoke to the Board. He explained to them that he and his family had extended much time and expense in restoring their home and improving its grounds. He said that this request for additional appropriate improvements felt like a mental slap in the face. Mr. Cross stated that he was trying to do justice to the property, the district, the Guidelines, and the Banner and Shield requirements.

Ms. Sharrow returned the discussion to the 3' high fence. She said that shrubbery would be more appropriate. Ms. Sharrow then stated that no other such fence was in a similar location within the vicinity of the house.

Mr. Holmes suggested the use of a 3' picket fence instead of 3' board fence.

Discussion ensued as to the proposed iron fencing.

Mr. Cross agreed to extend sections of the proposed iron fence not needed to partition the side lawn along the western lot line. He also said that he was amendable to not constructing the proposed 3' fence.

Mr. Wagoner asked if there was anyone else from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Ms. Fran Hoffman addressed the Board. She explained to the Board that she is the mother of Ms. Sharrow. Ms. Hoffman that given the given the unclear use of the property, a hardship existed thereby warranting an eight foot fence. She asked the Board to review photographs attesting to privacy related concerns. The Board reviewed the submitted photographs.

No further comments were made from the audience.

Mr. Wagoner 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, amending facts to note that the 3' high fence would not be constructed and that sections of the iron fence approved for the side yard would extend (as supply allows) in southern direction along the western lot line.

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: 3/20/14**



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

**2012-18-CA:**           **1209 Selma Street**  
**Applicant:**           **Jonathon Boyer with Weatherguard Metal Roofing for Katherine Lubecki**  
**Received:**           **3/4/13**  
**Meeting:**           **3/20/13**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District:       Oakleigh Garden  
Classification:        Contributing  
Zoning:                R-1  
Project:                Reroofing – install a metal roof.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This residence dates from 1913. The house, one informed both by both Aesthetics and Arts & Crafts Movements, features classical and vernacular elements.

**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 13, 2005. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a small rear addition. The application up for review calls for the installation of metal roofing panels.
- B.     The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1.     “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and the pitch and the color.”
- C.     Scope of Work:
  - 1.     Remove the existing asbestos roofing shingles.
  - 2.     Install 5-V crimp metal roofing panels.
  - 3.     The roofing panels will be – in color.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the installation of a metal roof. Applications for metal roofs are reviewed on a case by case basis. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s state that a roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Materials should be appropriate to the form, pitch, and color of the roof (See B-1).

This two-story residence is surmounted by a hipped roof. The lower level of the two-tiered front gallery is surmounted by truncated hipped roof. The upper gallery is surmounted by jerkin head roof. Shed extensions skirt the side and rear elevations.

Standing Seam and 5-V crimp panels have been approved on account of the fewer number and lower height of dividing seams. In reviewing previous applications calling for the installation of panel system roofs, the Board has discussed the number and spacing of ridges. These types of roofs were employed on more regionally defined buildings featuring less complex roofing structures. During the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century and early 20<sup>th</sup> Century, high style residences such as this dwelling rarely featured metal roofing panels. This roof structure, one more complicated than a single surmounting roof structure, would not have featured metal panels. Individual shingles have a compartmentalization that is more in keeping with period and the style of the building.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on (B-1), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and the historical character of the building. Staff does not recommend approval of the installation of metal roofing panels. The applicant is encouraged to investigate metal roofing panels.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Rip Hanks and Jonathan Boyer with Weatherguard were present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner welcomed the applicant's representatives. He asked Mr. Hanks and Mr. Boyer if they had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address.

After introducing Mr. Boyer and himself, Mr. Hanks stated that 5-V crimp roofing panels have been in use for over one a century. He said that they are appropriate for the area and fit the historical context. Mr. Hanks explained that 5-V crimp and other metals roofs have been improved and installed throughout the area. He mentioned several examples and reminded the Board of one recent application. Addressing the subject property, Mr. Hanks explained to the Board that as the photographs show the roof is largely out of the view of the passerby. He reiterated that only portions of it can be seen. Mr. Hank addressed how the roof would be constructed and fitted. Mr. Hanks then explained the reason why the applicant wished to install a metal panel roofing shingles. He told the Board of the expense involved in this application. Not only would the asbestos tiles have to be removed and abatement measures taken, but also the wooden shakes would need to be removed. He said the inherent costs were then considerable. Mr. Hanks stated that while asphalt shingles are not historic, metal roofing is a traditional roofing material. Mr. Hanks and Mr. Boyer said that Weatherguard can manufacture and install individual metal shingles, but the cost difference between individual metal shingles and metal panels is substantial. Mr. Boyer raised the Board's attention some possible issues regarding individual metal tiles. He explained that individual tiles increase the number of spaces which allow for water penetration. Mr. Boyer mentioned the longevity of metal roofing products.

Ms. Hasser asked what color the roofing panels would be. Mr. Hanks responded by saying that they would be traditional galvalume in color.

Mr. Bemis interjected by saying that the Staff's recommendation was intended to allow a metal roof yet maintain the historic appearance.

Mr. Karwinski cited the Staff Report by saying that residences of this type and sophistication rarely employ metal roofing panels. He recommended that the applicant consider a high end asphalt shingle.

Mr. Hanks said that while asphalt shingles were an option they are not manufactured with longevity in mind. He said that asphalt shingles being manufactured today do not last for long periods of time. He reiterated that individual metal shingles could be installed, but would at a higher cost.

Mr. Wagoner stated that while he understands the cost associated concerns, the Board is tasked with reviewing applications with regard to the architectural and historical character of the building and the surrounding district.

Mr. Hanks reiterated that the vast majority of the roof cannot be clearly viewed and that asphalt shingles are not a historic roofing option.

Ms. Harden asked if the existing roof could be repaired.

Mr. Boyer said that given the age and condition of the roof, repair was impossible.

Ms. Lubecki, the applicant, addressed the Board. She said that she had already spent \$18,000 in attempts to retain the existing roof. Ms. Lubecki said that in hindsight that money could have been sent installing a new roof. Upon investigating her options, Ms. Lubecki allowed that she had looked at and knew of other properties that have the same roof as she is proposing. Some of these examples are of the same style and period as her home. Ms. Lubecki stated that she wanted a roof that would last for the remainder of her lifetime, which would preserve the house for her descendents.

Ms. Harden complimented Ms. Lubecki for investigating her options.

Ms. Harden asked Mr. Boyer at what locations did two wooden shingles still existed. Mr. Boyer and Ms. Lubecki clarified Ms. Harden's question.

Mr. Allen turned the discussion to the manufacture, installation, and appearance of roofing panels and shingles. A lengthy discussion ensued.

The Board discussed the partial use of metal shingles in the more visible areas of use.

The applicant's representatives said that that reroofing the lower story and the more visible portions of the varying roofs was an option. A revised motion was made to that affect.

A motion was made. Five Board members voted in opposition on account of the appearance of a bifurcated roof. Two Board members voted for approval.

After the failed motion, the Board resumed the discussion. Other alternatives were discussed. The applicant's representatives amended the application for a section time. The applicant's representatives amended the application to call for installation of individual metal roofing panels.

Mr. Wagoner asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Wagoner 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 amending facts to note that individual metal roofing tiles would be installed.

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. Staff was authorized to approve the color and type of shingle.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/20/14**

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

**2013-19-CA: 213-219 Dauphin Street**  
**Applicant: Ricky Armstrong with Modern Signs for Maggie Smith of Soul Kitchen**  
**Received: 3/4/13**  
**Meeting: 3/20/13**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Signage – Install signage on the building’s marquee

**BUILDING HISTORY**

The façade of this building dates from 1935. Constructed for a Woolworth’s Five and Dime, the façade constitutes one of Mobile’s finest extant examples of the streamlined Moderne 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 last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on December 5, 2013. At that time, the Board approved the installation of signage atop the building’s marquee. The applicant returns before the Board with an alternative signage proposal, one involving the installation of signage within the marquee’s signboard.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Signs shall be mounted or placed so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building.”
  - 2. “The overall design of all signage including the mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property.”
  - 3. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.”
  - 4. “The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the building, not exceed 64 square feet.”
  - 5. “Internally lit signs are prohibited.”
  - 6. “Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination. Such lighting shall not shine into or create glare at pedestrian or vehicular traffic nor shall it shine into adjacent areas.”
  - 7. “The structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building. Wood, metal, stucco, stone, or brick, is allowed. Plastic, vinyl or similar materials are prohibited. Neon, resin to give the appearance of wood, and fabric may be used as appropriate.”

- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Install signage upon the signboard of the building's marquee
    - a. Three signs will be equidistantly spaced on the signboard.
    - b. Two 2' 6" (tall) x 15' (wide) signs will feature the names current performing acts.
    - c. A single 2' (tall) x 17' 11" (wide) sign featuring the name of the establishment will be centered between the two aforementioned signs.
    - d. All of the signage will be situated on an aluminum display board.
    - e. The center sign will feature open channel lettering. The lettering will be painted red and feature yellow bulbs that spell the name of the establishment.
    - f. The flanking aluminum signs will feature three rows of interchangeable letters.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the installation of signage. Three signs are proposed. All three signs would be located on the marquee's signboard. Two signs advertising current performing acts would flank a sign featuring the name of the music venue. Applications involving signage entail the review of the following: design; placement; installation; size; lighting; materials; and design

With regard to design, the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street state that the overall design of all signage including the mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property (See B-2). The design is in keeping with the style and period of the building. The proposed location of the signs was originally intended as space to display signage. Installation of the proposed signage would not obscure architectural features that characterize the façade (See B-1).

As per size, the Sign Design Guidelines state that size should be in proportion to building and neighboring sizes (See B-3.) The total maximum signage is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the building, not exceed 64 square feet (See B-4.) The total square footage of the proposed signage amounts to 73.22 square feet. In order to obtain signage exceeding 64 square feet a variance is required. The applicant is in the process of applying for a variance. She has worked with suppliers and her contractors have spoken with Staff regarding locating signage in its original location. While the size of the sign exceeds the maximum of 64 square feet, Staff supports the variance for additional square footage on account of the design and the location of the signage.

With regard to lighting, the Sign Design Guidelines state internally lit signs are prohibited. Signs should employ 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 (See B-5 and B-6). The proposed signage is keeping with the style of the building. 1930s commercial buildings often employed lighting of this type.

As per materials, structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building (See B-7). The materials are in keeping with design and period of the building.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-7), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Pending approval of the variance, Staff recommends approval of this application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Ricky Armstrong and Maggie Smith were present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner welcomed the applicant and her representative. He asked Ms. Smith and Mr. Armstrong if they had any comments to make, clarifications to address, or questions to ask.

Ms. Smith reminded the Board of the property's last appearance before them. She said that upon re-evaluating the Board's comments, the building, and her establishment's needs, she and her sign contractor had developed the application before them.

Mr. Karwinski asked for clarification regarding depth of the signage. Mr. Armstrong addressed Mr. Karwinski's query.

Mr. Wagoner asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Wagoner 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, amending fact

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.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/20/14**

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

**2013-20-CA: 1023 Dauphin Street**  
**Applicant: Salvation Army**  
**Received: 2/20/13**  
**Meeting: 3/20/13**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: B-2 and R-1  
Project: Post Demolition Redevelopment – Install sod on the site of a building approved for demolition and construct fencing around the perimeter of the lot.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

A non-contributing house dating from the 1880s occupies this site. The house has been approved for demolition.

**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 18, 2013. At that time, the Board approved the demolition of the non-contributing building occupying the site. The initial site plan called for a parking. The plan was not approved (narrowly) on account of the landscaping allotment.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. With regard to landscaping abutting parking lots “landscaping can assist in providing an appropriate setting.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
  - 1. Plant sod on the site of a building approved for demolition.
  - 2. Install fencing along the northern and southern lot lines. Said fencing will match fencing located on the adjacent property to the east.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the redevelopment of a lot. The demolition of the deteriorated non-contributing building was approved on April 18, 2012. The initial redevelopment plan, one calling for the extension of the parking lot, was not approved on account of the distribution of landscaping and the treatment of the northwest corner of the lot (intersection of Dauphin and Pine Streets). The applicant’s representative



appears before the Board with an application calling for the planting of sod on the lot and the extension of fencing.

Fencing matching that found on the Salvation Army's principle address (1009 Dauphin Street) would be extended around the perimeter of the site in question. Existing curbcuts and paved surfaces would remain in place. Sod would be planted on the site of the non-contributing building.

The majority of the post demolition plans approved by the Board are for residential properties. Those projects involve the leveling of the lot and the installation of grass. This property is unique in that the residential building occupying the corner site was converted to a commercial use several decades previously. Both residential and commercial properties surround the address. While the planting of sod will not impair the architectural and historical integrity of the districts, the Board voiced concern over the landscaping during the property's last appearance and during a preliminary review of the application.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-7), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district, but recommends that the applicants over-story and under-story trees in addition to the grass.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Major Mark Brown was present to discuss the application

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that the Old Dauphin Way Neighborhood Association had agreed to donate three hundred toward landscaping.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner welcomed Major Brown. He asked Major Brown had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address.

Mr. Brown said that on behalf of the Salvation Army, he was happy to accept the donation. He said that it was his object to improve the corner. Once the building is demolished, sod and landscaping can be installed. He asked if the Board for guidance as to what trees to plant.

Mr. Karwinski recommended to Mr. Brown that he contact Keep Mobile Beautiful. Mr. Holmes recommended that he contact the office of Urban Forestry.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending fact to note that plantings would be installed.

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: 3/20/14**