

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
November 17, 2010 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Jim Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Gertrude Baker, Bill James, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswald, Craig Roberts, Jim Wagoner, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Members Absent: Carlos Gant, Kim Hardin, and Barja Wilson.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, Keri Coumanis, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Oswald moved to approve the minutes of the November 3, 2010 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Oswald 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: Bob Caron for Lyle and Margaret Hutchison**
 - a. Property Address: 109 Levert Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/28/10
 - c. Project: Connect the two sections the rear addition's first story eave umbrage. Paint the work to match the existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant: Scogin Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 1116 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/28/10
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten eaves. Repair and replace porch decking. The work will match the existing in profile dimension and material. Repaint to match the existing color scheme.
3. **Applicant: Derrick Juzang**
 - a. Property Address: 954 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/28/10
 - c. Project: Repair and replace woodwork to match the existing. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
4. **Applicant: Gina Finnegan**
 - a. Property Address: 1306 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/28/10
 - c. Project: Replace rotten wood as needed and repaint body Sherwin Williams Classical Yellow, trim classical white, deck gray and three trim colors that are Caribbean Coral, Classical Gold, and Sea Harbor.
5. **Applicant: Mary Bridler**
 - a. Property Address: 304 State Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/1/10
 - c. Project: Install a small cedar pergola in the northwest corner of the lot.
6. **Applicant: Art(ology), Inc.**
 - a. Property Address: 306 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/1/10
 - c. Project: Paint in the following Benjamin Moore colors (or equivalent): downstairs bulkhead – Passion Fruit (2171-40); door – Pear Green (2028-40).
7. **Applicant: Mary Bridler**
 - a. Property Address: 258 State Street

- b. Date of Approval: 11/1/10
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair rotten woodwork to match the existing. Reinstall the shutters.
- 8. Applicant: M C Roofing**
- a. Property Address: 1754 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/1/10
 - c. Project: Reroof with asphalt shingles, brown wood in color to match brick.
- 9. Applicant: Susan Holland**
- a. Property Address: 1152 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/1/10
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the submitted Sherwin William's color scheme. The body will be Orchard (green). The trim will be white. The stucco work will be Summer House Beige. The porch decking, steps, skirting, will be Buckthorn.
- 10. Applicant: Martha LoCicero**
- a. Property Address: 1158 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/1/10
 - c. Project: Remove the fixed four light replacement transom-like windows located in the façade's gable. Install an operable wooden window of the same design. Replace the existing six foot interior lot privacy fence to match the existing.
- 11. Applicant: Timothy Campbell**
- a. Property Address: 956 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/1/10
 - c. Project: Relocate the 4' iron fence that extends along the west side of the property to south side of the property where it will abut the sidewalk.
- 12. Applicant: David Thomas**
- a. Property Address: 1109 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/3/10
 - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted Valspar color scheme. The body will be La Fonda Cactus. The trim will be Ultra White. The porch deck will be Fired Earth. The shutters and accents will be Fired Earth.
- 13. Applicant: Janine Wood**
- a. Property Address: 24 South Reed Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/3/10
 - c. Project: Repair rotten woodwork on the porch. Replace sections of the metal roof to match the existing.
- 14. Applicant: Scott Markle**
- a. Property Address: 205 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/4/10
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork to match the existing. Touch up the paint.
- 15. Applicant: Richard Gibson**
- a. Property Address: 206 South Dearborn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/3/10
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork to match the existing, including two window sills. Install operable wooden shutters. Paint per the submitted Valspar color scheme. The body will be Homestead Resort Moss. The shutters and porch decking will be La Fonda Deep Olive. The doors will be Montpelier Red Velvet.
- 16. Applicant: Richard Brown**
- a. Property Address: 1107 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/4/10

- c. Project: Replace rotten wood as necessary and repaint in following Benjamin Moore color scheme: body King Bird, shutters Iron Mountain, and door a cross between Garrison Red and Hadley Red.

17. Applicant: Ellen Ching

- a. Property Address: 118 Garnett Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 11/9/10
- c. Project: Remove a prefabricated carport.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2010-82-CA: 665 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley for Wendell Quimby
- b. Project: New Construction - Develop the lot by installing fencing, paving, and landscaping.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2010-83-CA: 2205 Spring Hill Avenue

- a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley for Bennett & Stephen Griffith
- b. Project: Construct a screened porch of the Rear (South Elevation).

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2010-84-CA: 165 Saint Emanuel Street

- a. Applicant: Nicholas H. Holmes, III for Larry Posner
- b. Project: Install a handicap access ramp.

WITHDRAWN.

4. 2010-85-CA: 309 Stocking Street

- a. Applicant: Jewel Davis
- b. Project: New Construction - Construct a rear addition.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

5. 2010-86-CA: 2256 DeLeon Avenue

- a. Applicant: Pete Vallas for Mr. & Mrs. Thomas Leland
- b. Project: New Construction and Alterations – Construct a porch off the East Elevation. Alter the fenestration and wall treatment of the same. Alter fenestration on and fenestration to the garage.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

6. 2010-87-CA: Old Dauphin Way

- a. Applicant: Old Dauphin Way Neighborhood Association
- b. Project: Install new historic district signage.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

7. 2010-88-CA: 107 Saint Francis Street / 31 North Royal Street

- a. Applicant: Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood for the Retirement Systems of Alabama
- b. Project: Install a special amenity feature.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

8. 2010- 89-CA: 107 Saint Francis Street / 31 North Royal Street

- a. Applicant: Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood for the Retirement Systems of Alabama
- b. Project: Install signage.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Discussion
- 2. Municipal Street Lamps
- 3. Satellite Dishes

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-82-CA: 665 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Wendell Quimby
Received: 11/1/10
Meeting: 11/17/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: New Construction - Develop the lot by installing fencing, paving, and landscaping.

BUILDING HISTORY

This vacant lot occupies a prominent corner location at the intersection of Dauphin and Washington Streets. According to Sanborn Maps, a two-story brick commercial building with a wrap around gallery once occupied the site.

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 20, 2010. At that time, the Board denied the application on account of the lack of a landscape plan and a gate design. The applicant appears before the Board with a landscape plan and a gate design.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. Fencing “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along 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 or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered...All variances required by the Board of Zoning Adjustment must be obtained prior to issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.”
 - 2. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.”
 - 3. “Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting. Asphalt is inappropriate for walkways. Gravel and shell are preferred paving materials; however a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment is required for commercial applications. Hard surface materials may also be acceptable”
 - 4. “The appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design. New materials such as grasspave or grasscrete, which provides for a solid

5. "Parking areas should be screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences or landscaping."
6. "Ordinances relating to parking and landscaping will be enforced by the City of Mobile Urban Development Department in reviewing requests for parking lots."
7. "Proposed lighting should be designed to avoid invading surrounding areas."
8. "Lighting can be an important element in the historic districts. Therefore, where lighting impacts the appearance of a building or of the district in which the building is located, it shall be reviewed for appropriateness as any other element."

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

1. Level the lot.
2. Remove a concrete sign base.
3. Replace a section of sidewalk. The repair/replacement will match the existing.
4. Construct a 6' 4" wall around the northern and western sides of the lot (the corner and entrance posts will measure 7' 5" in height).
 - a. A 2'4" stucco-faced coping wall featuring a concrete cap will comprise the lower portion of the fence.
 - b. A 4' cast iron fence will surmount the coping wall.
 - c. The cast iron fence will feature a corner post, a pair of pedestrian posts, and a pair of vehicular posts along with intermediate posts.
 - d. The sections of iron fencing will feature arrow finials.
 - e. The wall will feature 15' long sliding iron gate providing access from the existing west facing curbcut. The gate will be located on the inner side of the fence and will slide to the north.
 - f. The wall will feature a double, inward opening, north facing iron gate.
5. Pave the lot in concrete.
 - a. Four parking spaces will be located within the lot.
6. Install landscaping.
 - a. Landscaping stations of varying size will be located in the four corners of the lot.
 - b. A narrow strip of landscaping will extend along the southwest side of the lot.
 - c. One 3 gallon Holly or boxwood and three 12' Crape Myrtle will be planted in the northeast corner landscape station.
 - d. Eight three gallon Holly or Boxwoods will be planted in the northwest corner landscaping station.
 - e. One 12' Crape Myrtle and seven 3 gallon Holly or Boxwoods will be planted in the southwest corner landscaping station.
 - f. One palm and eighteen 3 gallon ligustrums will be planted in the southeast corner landscaping station.
7. Construct an 8' stuccoed wall along the east side of the lot.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The site of the proposed parking enclosure is a vacant lot at the intersection of three heavily trafficked streets. The largely unpaved lot is currently used for parking. Two popular commercial establishments border the lot. The Dauphin Street establishment is located within the Lower Dauphin Commercial District, while the Washington Street establishment is located between two historic districts.

The proposed parking enclosure calls for the construction of a two part stucco and iron wall, the installation of interior landscaping, the construction of a stucco wall, the repair of the side walk, and the installation of paving.

The Guidelines state that fences should complement not detract from a property or surrounding properties. The fencing (one which features a lower stucco-faced coping section and an upper cast iron picket fencing section) measures six feet in height. A fence of a similar design encloses the corner courtyard of 615 Dauphin Street. The latter fence features a three foot base. The design and materials of the proposed wall meet the standards established by the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts.

As per the eastern stucco-faced concrete wall, the utility connections of the adjoining property have been relocated to another location. Staff does not believe the proposed wall will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the district.

The Guidelines state landscaping can assist in creating appropriate settings for buildings in the historic districts. The proposal calls for the installation of landscaping stations. The four stations will be of varying size and will be located in the four corners of the lot. The applicant proposes the use of traditional plantings. Staff does not believe the landscaping will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the district.

The in kind repair and replacement of the damaged sections of the sidewalk will not impair the historical or the architectural character of the district. The applicant will need to speak and coordinate with the City Traffic and Engineering with regard to that section of the proposed scope of work.

The Guidelines state that, depending on the location, modern paving materials such as concrete are appropriate for use in the historic districts. Staff does not believe the concrete parking area will impair the architectural or the historical character of the historic district. Both the applicant's representative and MHDC staff have shown the plans to City Staff from the offices Traffic & Engineering and Planning. Additional approval from those offices will be required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-8), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Kearley if he had any clarifications to make or comments to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Kearley answered no. Mr. Wagoner asked the Board if they had any questions to ask Mr. Kearley.

Mr. Karwinski said he had one comment and one suggestion. He asked Mr. Kearley if the two Oak trees depicted in the submitted plan, but not listed in the Staff Report would be planted off Washington Street. Mr. Kearley thanked Mr. Karwinski for mentioning the proposed trees. He said that after discussion with

Urban Development, it was decided that the trees would not be planted. Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Kearley if the eastern side of the eight foot wall would be stuccoed. Mr. Kearley said it could be stuccoed. A discussion as to how far the eastern side of the wall would be stuccoed ensued. A distance of ten feet was deemed appropriate.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Ladd 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 two oaks trees depicted in the plans would not be planted and that the eastern face of the eight foot wall would be stuccoed a distance of ten feet.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/17/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2010-83-CA: 2205 Spring Hill Avenue
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Bennett & Stephen Griffith
Received: 11/1/10
Meeting: 11/17/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction - Construct a Screened Porch of the Rear (South) Elevation.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to Staff Files, this house dates from 1937. The wraparound porch and eaves feature Italianate detailing.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Board on July 23, 2001. At that time, the Board approved the construction of 8’ wall fronting Spring Hill Avenue. The applicants return to the Board with a proposal calling for the construction of a rear porch.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials which characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
 - 2. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Remove a stoop and a flight of steps from the South Elevation. The later steps are located in a space just west of the proposed porch.
 - 2. Construct a screened porch off the Rear (South) Elevation.
 - a. The screened porch will measure 20’ 6” in width and 25’ in depth.
 - b. The porch will extend from the house’s brick walled east pavilion.
 - c. The porch will rest on brick foundation piers like those of the main house.
 - d. Framed, suspended, and recessed lattice skirting will extend between the porch piers.

- e. Square section wooden piers with necking and bases will demarcate the porch bays.
 - f. The porch piers are based on those of the main house (minus the upper brackets).
 - g. The porch's architrave, brackets, and cornice will match those on the main house.
 - h. Intermediate wooden vertical and horizontal framing will secure the screening.
 - i. A gable roof will surmount the porch.
 - j. The porch's gable roof will extend from the existing gable.
 - k. The porch roof's 3-tab shingles will match those found on the body of the house.
 - l. The five bay West Elevation will feature a painted brick chimney.
 - m. The chimney will occupy the second bay from the south.
 - n. The three bay South Elevation will feature a central entrance.
 - o. Pyramidal pressure treated steps will access the South Elevation's entrance.
 - p. The South Elevation's hardiboard sheathed, gable will feature a lunette.
 - q. The four bay East Elevation will feature a flight of pyramidal steps.
 - r. The East Elevation's steps will be located in the second bay from the south.
3. Install a wooden bracketed overhang over the paired windows unit located west of the proposed porch.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This house fronts Spring Hill Avenue. The house is set back in a deep lot. A vine-covered wall blocks the view from Spring Hill Avenue. A side alley allows for access to and from the Ashland Place's interior avenues. The proposed porch and overhang will be located off the rear (south elevation.). Houses and outbuildings of adjoining properties facing Ashland Place Avenue block the view of the rear elevation. The porch would not be visible from the public view.

The existing fenestration, historic and later, will remain intact. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, the proposed porch will be differentiated from yet compatible with the historic building. The proposed porch takes design queues from the detailing and proportioning of the main house's wrap around porch. The detailing has been simplified in form and rendered in modern materials thereby providing differentiation between old and new construction. Staff does not believe the proposed porch will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building.

The proposed overhang will not be visible from the street. The overhang's brackets are based on those found on the main house. Staff does not believe the proposed overhang will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

The proposed overhang will be located above an existing flight of steps and a stoop. The steps and stoop are later additions. The removal of the steps will not 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 impairs the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Kearley if he had any clarifications to make or questions to ask with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Kearley answered no.

A discussion of the age of the house ensued. Mr. Blackwell was asked the house's designation. He answered that the house was listed as non-contributing. Mr. Kearley explained that the 1930s Neo-Georgian dwelling was remodeled in Italianate style at a later date.

Mr. Wagoner asked his fellow board members if they had any comments or questions regarding the Staff Report. Mr. Karwinski said he had one comment. Alluding to the B (1) of the above, Mr. Karwinski stated that he did not feel that the proposed porch was appropriately differentiated from the body of the house. A discussion ensued. Mr. Blackwell pointed out the use of modern materials, such as the hardiboard-faced gable, and the simplified columnar format provided material and design differentiation. Mr. Kearley reiterated that the house had been heavily remodeled at an earlier date. Mr. Karwinski pointed out that the windows mentioned in C (3) were doors. He said that the Staff Report should be amended to reflect the actual fenestration type. Mr. Karwinski also said that the porch supports should be called columns not piers. Mr. Blackwell addressed the difference between columns and porch piers.

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Whitt-Mitchell 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 C (3) to note that the bracketed overhang would be located above a paired door unit, not a paired window unit.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/17/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-84-CA: 165 Saint Emanuel Street
Applicant: Nicholas H. Holmes, III for Larry Posner
Received: 10/25/10
Meeting: 11/17/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: H-B
Project: Install a handicap access ramp. Alter a fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Hall-Ford House is one of Mobile's most significant 19th-century residential buildings. This 1836 house illustrates the application of Georgian planning (symmetrical façade, treatment of floors) and classical detailing (Doric columns) to the traditional Creole cottage type. Of equal importance, the house is a rare surviving example of a Creole cottage with a fully finished ground floor.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on August 19, 2009. At that time, the Board approved the construction of an elevator shaft. The applicant's proposes the construction of a handicap located north of the façade's front portico as well as the alteration of the front coping wall and surmounting fence.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
 1. "The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and preserved to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details."
 2. "The form and shape of the porch should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with the style of the building."
 3. "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials which characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."
 4. "New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired."

5. Fencing “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.”
- 6 “The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of the features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.”

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

1. Alter the knee wall and surmounting fence.
 - a. Remove the portion of the brownstone knee wall which extends north of the façade.
 - b. Utilize the brick from the knee wall in the construction of a new section of wall.
 - c. The wall will extend from the inner side of northwest column to the existing wall.
 - d. Stored iron fencing will be reinstalled atop all sections of the knee wall.
 - e. Remove two sections of the knee wall located to either side of the main entrance.
 - f. Reinstall the southern section of the aforementioned wall on the northern side of wall.
 - g. The reorganization of the wall will result in a symmetrical approach.
2. Install a handicap access ramp.
 - a. The concrete handicap ramp will be located off the northern side of the front portico.
 - b. The ramp will be situated atop a compacted fill incline which will adjust to the site.
 - c. The ramp will measure 3’ 4” in width and 29’ in depth.
 - d. The will extend to the sidewalk.
 - e. The ramp will connect to the porch via a 4’ 8” wide and 5’ deep concrete landing.
 - f. The depth of the landing is included with the overall depth of the ramp.
 - g. A 2’ 10” Steel railing will be located on the northern and southern sides of the ramp.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This house is in one of the grandest “Creole” cottages surviving in Mobile. It was documented by the Historic American Building Survey in 1935. The existing fencing configuration, one with an off center entrance, was present at that time. The two part enclosure is comprised of a stucco-faced knee wall surmounted by cast iron fence (latter in storage). The stucco-face knee wall is topped by a brownstone cap. The sections of brownstone cap are of equal width, which argues against a later alteration. The Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state removal or alteration of historic features should be avoided. While the removal and reconfiguration of portions of the wall/fence would result in a symmetrical approach, the historical record proves otherwise. The historical integrity of the house would be altered. Similarly the removal and reinstallation of a section of fencing that extends beyond the body of the house would alter the experience and the appearance property from the right of way. Based on documentary and physical evidence, Staff believes this portion of the application impairs the historical and architectural integrity of the house.

The newly renovated 19th century Hall-Ford home will function as a bed and breakfast. Currently, there is no means of handicap access to the building. Applicants propose constructing a ramp which would allow handicap access/entrance to the house from the front sidewalk to the front porch. The proposed ramp would extend beyond the existing fence, across a section of grass, and tie into the north side of the front porch. As stated above, the applicants wish to relocate the existing fence so that it flanks the south boundary of the ramp. By placing the handicap ramp adjacent to the front porch and moving the fence in such close proximity to the porch, the construction of the ramp results in an asymmetrical and unbalanced front façade. Staff does not find this treatment appropriate to this structure, particularly when one

considers the care the original builders gave to construct a perfectly symmetrical building. Further, Staff does not find the proposal appropriate to the neighborhood and/or the historic streetscape.

It should be noted: though many of Mobile Historic Landmarks provide handicap access for its patrons, the customary practice has been to place ramps in locations where the front façade would not be altered. As such, Staff recommends the use of a less prominent location for the proposed handicap entrance, one preferably located off the rear of the building near the newly-constructed elevator shaft. Furthermore, Staff notes that the rear entrance to the Hall-Ford home is located almost at-grade, which means the construction of a ramp would not be necessary. Staff highly recommends the applicants take advantage of this situation and provide handicap access to the structure from the rear of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-6), Staff, Staff believes this application, as currently proposed impairs the architectural and the historical character of the building. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

WITHDRAWN.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-85-CA: 309 Stocking Street
Applicant: Jewel Davis
Received: 10/29/10
Meeting: 11/17/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction - Construct a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This single story Craftsman-influenced house was constructed circa 1925.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicant proposes the construction of a two-story rear addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials which characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
 - 2. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Construct a two-story rear addition.
 - a. The addition will measure 26’ in depth and 26’ in length.
 - b. Corner posts will demarcate the addition.
 - c. The addition will be situated atop a concrete slab.
 - d. The slab will be faced with lattice skirting
 - e. The addition will maintain the same foundation level as the house.
 - f. Wooden siding or Hardiplank siding will sheath the addition.
 - g. The three-over-one windows will match that of the body of the house.
 - h. The true-divided-light windows will be either wood, vinyl clad wood, or aluminum clad wood.
 - i. The eave treatment will match that of the body of the house.

- j. A west-facing gable roof will surmount the addition.
 - k. The roof shingles will match the existing.
 - l. The West Elevation will feature a louvered ventilation window in the gable.
 - m. The South Elevation's first story will feature a multi-light French door and two three-over-one windows
 - n. The South Elevation's second story will feature two three-over-one windows.
 - o. The East Elevation's first story will feature a double, multi-light French door and one three-over-one window.
 - p. A wooden deck featuring a flight of brick south-facing steps will be centered off the East Elevation.
 - q. The East Elevation's second story will feature two three-over-one windows.
 - r. The North Elevation's first story will feature one three-over-one window.
 - s. The North Elevation's second story will feature one three-over-one window.
2. Paint the body of the addition and the main house Stone Mountain Gray. Paint the trim Cobalt Stone.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This single story, Craftsman-influenced house is a part of the recently expanded Leinkauf historic district. The applicants propose the construction of a two-story rear addition.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that new work should be "differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historical integrity of the property and its environment." While the house is only a single story in height, it is located next to and in the vicinity of several large four square houses. Houses of similar size, massing, and detail to the subject property are located opposite the house. The difference in height between the existing house and the proposed make the latter "read" as later addition. Similarly, a corner post will also demarcate the transition between old and new. The resulting camelback form has historic precedent in Mobile. The Board approved a similar configuration in 1992. Since the addition will set back within a lot and located adjacent to house of similar scale, Staff believes the difference in scale would not adversely affect the integrity of the building or the district. The addition adopts the features and detailing off the main house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Jewel Davis was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Ms. Davis if she had any clarifications to make or comments to add with regard to the Staff Report. Ms. Davis answered no. Mr. Wagoner asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask or comments to make.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Blackwell about the proposed siding. Mr. Blackwell explained that while the plans listed wood siding, the applicant requested and the Staff Report listed the use of either wood or

hardiboard siding. Mr. Roberts pointed out that while hardiboard was acceptable for additions, it was not appropriate for the body of contributing buildings.

Ms. Davis told the Board that she would like to change the submitted color scheme. Mr. Wagoner told Ms. Davis that any changes in color could be handled by Staff.

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts 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: 11/17/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-86-CA: 2256 DeLeon Avenue
Applicant: Pete Vallas for Mr. & Mrs. Thomas Leland
Received: 11/1/10
Meeting: 11/17/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction and Alterations – Construct a porch off the East Elevation.
Alter the fenestration and wall treatment of the same. Alter fenestration on and add fenestration to the garage.

BUILDING HISTORY

This 1938 house was built according to designs of Mobile architect Harry Inge Johnstone. In this design, Johnstone combined his penchant for flush siding with his knowledge of traditional design. The resulting residence exemplifies the simple sophistication of late 1930s design.

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 1, 1996. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a rear addition. The applicants propose the construction of a side porch, the replacement of doors, the construction of a chimney, the addition of dormers, and the alteration of existing features.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, related new construction shall not destroy the 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 architecture features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
 - 2. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Construct a one-story side porch off the East Elevation
 - a. The porch will measure 12’ in width and 57’ in depth.
 - b. The five bay porch will rest on brick foundation
 - c. The porch will feature wooden Tuscan columns matching those employed on the West Elevation.

- d. Depending on their location, the columns will be either engaged, single, or paired in distribution.
 - e. The porch will be paved with bricks.
 - f. Remove the existing ground floor fenestration.
 - g. New operable wooden French doors will be installed in place of the fixed existing.
 - h. The new units will match those located on South Elevation of the 1996 addition.
 - i. The outer groupings of French doors will be tripartite in form (rhythm of single, double, single).
 - j. The inner sets of French doors will be double in form.
 - k. Remove the later brick wall facing from the central portion of the east elevation.
 - l. Install ship lap siding to match that found elsewhere on the house.
 - m. The porch will feature a blind architrave/frieze and a simple molded cornice.
 - n. Shallow pitched quadrant metal roofs will surmount the two outer porch bays.
 - o. Standing seam green copper roofing will comprise the roofing treatment.
 - p. The three center porch bays will be surmounted by an open gallery.
 - q. Remove the existing fenestration from the center portion of the east elevation.
 - r. Install two pairs of French doors in place of C(1)o.
 - s. A wheat sheaf balustrade will enclose the second story gallery.
 - t. The porch will feature wooden Tuscan columns matching those employed on the West Elevation's balcony.
 - u. A fireplace will be constructed between the first story's two inner French doors.
 - v. The chimney stack of C (1) u will be same height and have the same detailing as the existing chimneys.
- 2. Install two shed roof dormers over the garage.
 - a. The dormers will be feature ship lap siding to match the siding of the body of the house.
 - b. The dormers will feature true-divided light wooden casement windows.
 - c. Standing seam green copper roofing will surmount the shed roof dormers.
 - d. One of the two dormers will face east.
 - e. One of the two dormers will face south.
 - 3. Relocate garage's south facing door.
 - a. Relocate a single door unit featuring a four paneled wooden door and a three light transom approximately 14 east of existing location.
 - b. Install bricks within the location of the existing door opening.
 - c. Paint the location occupied by C (3) to match the rest of the wall.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This west-facing façade of this house does not directly engage the street. Set back to one side of a steeply graded and planted site, the house is largely shielded from the public view. The house was extensively altered in 1996. The new owners/applicants propose the construction a side porch, the installation of dormers, and reconfiguration of fenestration.

Prior to the 1996 renovation, the east elevation was altered on at least one occasion. Early descriptions and physical evidence indicate that the upper floor functioned as a sleeping porch (original glazing lost). The altered fenestration was replaced again in 1996. The applicant's representative proposes the construction of a side porch. The porch would be minimally visible from the street. Due to western orientation and southeast corner placement of the house, this altered elevation is perceived as a side elevation though it functions a second rear elevation.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that additions and alterations should be differentiated from yet compatible with the historic building. The proposed porch columns, railings, and entablature would match those located on the west-facing façade. The later fenestration would be replaced with units matching those installed on the 1996 addition thereby correlating two alterations. The single story design and roof type would further differentiate the old from the new. Staff does not believe the proposed porch, chimney, and fenestration will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

The proposed door relocation and dormer installation would be located on the garage addition. The proposed alterations will be minimally visible from the street. Staff does not believe the relocation of the door and the addition of dormers will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Pete Vallas was present to discuss the application. Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Leland accompanied their representative.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Vallas if he had any clarifications to make or comments to add with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Vallas answered no.

Mr. Ladd told the Board that he lives across the street from the property. He said that he thought the proposed alterations would improve the appearance of the house while at the same time maintaining its historical integrity. Mr. Roberts complimented Mr. Vallas on his designs.

Mr. Wagoner asked if any other Board members had any additional questions or comments. Addressing the audience, he asked if there was anyone who wished to speak either in favor of or in opposition to the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Wagoner closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as 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: 11/17/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-87-CA: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Applicant: Old Dauphin Way Neighborhood Association
Received: 11/1/10
Meeting: 11/17/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Project: Install new historic district signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Old Dauphin Way Historic District was established in 1984.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The Old Dauphin Way Neighborhood Association installed the historic district’s current signage in 1994. The Association proposes replacing the existing signage with oval shaped signage.
- B. The Sign Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building.”
 - 2. “The overall design of signage including the mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property.”
 - 3. “For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors.”
 - 4. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.”
 - 5. “The structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building. Wood, stucco, stone, or brick is allowed.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

- 1. Install new historic district signage.
 - a. The aluminum double-faced signage will measure 1’ 7” in height.
 - b. The signage will measure approximately 21” in width.
 - c. The total square footage of the sign will measure 5.5’.
 - d. The signage will be suspended from “L” brackets affixed to power poles/street lamps.
 - e. The sign format and mounting will be same as the Leinkauf District.
 - f. The signage will feature a banderole with the name of the district.
 - g. An image of an Oak tree will be located within the banderole.
 - h. The sign shape and mounting will be same as the Leinkauf District.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. Has the Association contacted the offices of Traffic & Engineering and Right of Way regarding the signage?

STAFF ANALYSIS

The Sign Design Guidelines do not specifically address historic district signage. Staff bases its analysis on the design and material stipulations listed in the Sign Design Guidelines, as well as comparison to existing signage. The proposed signage meets the material and design requirements specified the Sign Design Guidelines. The sign would be a horizontally-oriented oval like that of the Leinkauf Historic District's signage. It would be feature the same size, shape, and mounting. Staff does not believe the proposed signage will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-5), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the historic district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Richard Gudmundson was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Gudmundson if he had any clarifications to make or comments to add with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Gudmundson informed the Board that the proposed signs would feature the same mounting and dimensions as the Leinkauf signage. He provided the Board with full scale paper mock up of the proposed signage.

Mr. Karwinski complimented Mr. Gudmundson on the dimensions of the signage, saying he thought the reduced oval format was both more attractive and practical. Mr. Gudmundson said that one of the Neighborhood Association's aims was to bring more uniformity to Mobile's historic district signage.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Gudmundson if the Association intended to install additional signage in conjunction with the replacement of the existing signage. Mr. Gudmundson answered yes. Mr. Karwinski voiced concerns regarding the number and concentration of signage. He volunteered his services to the Association so to provide input on the exposure and maximization of signage. Mr. Gudmundson thanked Mr. Karwinski for volunteering his time and expertise. He added that the Neighborhood Association had given extensive consideration to the amount and distribution of signage. A discussion of possible locations for additional signage ensued.

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: 11/17/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-88-CA: 31 North Royal Street / 107 Saint Francis Street
Applicant: Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood for the Retirement Systems of Alabama
Received: 11/1/10
Meeting: 11/17/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install a special amenity feature.

BUILDING HISTORY

This thirty-four story skyscraper originally housed the First National Bank. From the time of its completion in 1965 until 1986, the building was the tallest structure in the State of Alabama. Commercial establishments occupy a portion of the first floor. Floors two through six serve as a parking deck. The seventh through the thirty-three floors house offices. The Bienville Club is situated on the thirty-fourth floor.

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 the Architectural Review Board on April 21, 2010. At that time, the Board approved extensive renovations to the building’s six story base. The applicant’s representatives return to the Board with a proposal calling for the construction of a special amenity to be extended from the northeast corner of the building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standard’s for Historic Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, related new construction shall not destroy the 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 architecture features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
 - 2. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**
 - 1. Install a special amenity feature.
 - a. The special amenity will be located at the northeast corner of the building.
 - b. The special amenity will extended from a bracket located off the previously approved rooftop tower.

- c. The special amenity will extend from and be encased in an aluminum armature and frame thus taking the form of inner and outer circular disks.
- d. When not lowered, the special amenity will be located within the aluminum frame.
- e. The special amenity will be circular in form.
- f. The special amenity will have a 10' diameter.
- g. Spotlights will illuminate the outer disk.
- h. When suspended the inner disk will be able to feature LED illumination.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This non-contributing building has been altered on three separate occasions. In 1997, the Board approved the removal of the original perforated block screen wall that encircled the seven story base. On September 2, 2009 the Board approved the replacement of windows and the on April 21st of this year approved a second remodeling of the seven story base (as well as the construction of the northwest corner tower). This application involves the last significant phase of the building's renovation.

The proposed special amenity is a collaborative venture between the Retirement Systems of Alabama and the City of Mobile. It would highlight seasonal and special events. The feature would be extended from a previously approved northeast corner rooftop tower located 34 floors above the street. The special amenity would be suspended over a section of sidewalk owned by the Retirement Systems of Alabama. The feature, which takes the form of a circular inner disk contained within a circular outer disk, would be lowered for special occasions and seasonal events. The messages thereon would not advertise the RSA or the building's tenants.

The design of the feature and the mount is in keeping with the detailing and the forms of the remodeling building. Several of the signs in a separate application adopt a circular shape. Aluminum, the material for the frame and mount, will be used on the previously approved sculptural components that will articulate the east and north elevations. Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff, Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the district. Staff recommends approval of this application. In the interest of full disclosure, Staff here notifies the Board that they are members of the Retirement System of Alabama as well as employees of the City of Mobile. These two conditions did not influence their review of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tracy Bassett with Goodwyn, Mills and Cawood and Steve Timms with the Retirement Systems of Alabama were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked the applicants if entities other than the Retirement System of Alabama and the City of Mobile could use the special amenity. Mr. Timms explained to the Board that the Moon Pie feature was a collaborative effort between the Retirement System of Alabama and the City of Mobile. He said that he could not speak on behalf of the City as to how the amenity would be used. Mr. Wagoner asked the Board if they had any questions or comments for the applicants.

Ms. Whitt-Mitchell asked if the amenity would reappear before the Board whenever the face of the inner disk was altered. Mr. Bemis clarified how the City would use the Moon Pie feature saying that special and annual events would utilize the amenity. Those installations would not be permanent therefore they would not appear before the Board. He told the Board that while a moon pie was featured on the disks, the imagery was not commercial in nature.

Mr. Roberts said that consciously or not the amenity constituted on some level an advertisement for the Chattanooga Moon Pie Company. He asked how far the inner disk would drop when used for special events. Mr. Timms told the Board that it would drop to point approximately level with the sixth floor. Mr. Roberts complimented Mr. Bassett's on his firm's previously approved renovation proposal. He said as an architect, he had reservations regarding the installation of the feature on what he considered to be an excellent example of the Modern International style. He asked the applicants the origins and impulse of the proposed amenity. Mr. Timms explained to the Board that the City of Mobile contacted the Retirement System of Alabama. He said that the City initially wanted the amenity to surmount the Battle House. The present location was deemed a better location. Mr. Ladd pointed out that the RSA had already established a Mardi Gras theme for the building. A discussion of the Mardi Gras color scheme ensued.

Mr. Karwinski said that as an architect he agreed with Mr. Roberts in that the proposed amenity was not appropriate to the style and form of the building. He said that the feature resembles a billboard. Mr. Karwinski told the Board and the applicants that the feature should not have been located atop the building in question. He said that the Riverview Hotel would have provided greater visibility and access. Mr. Timms told the Board that City expected over twenty-five thousand people to witness this year's Moon Pie drop. He said that the location had been given thorough consideration. Mr. Karwinski reiterated that the amenity should be located atop another building.

Mr. James asked, when not extended, how far the distance of the amenity from the street. Mr. Timms and Mr. Bassett explained that the proposed amenity would be located approximately 400 feet above the street. Ms. Whit-Mitchell and Mr. James asked if the feature could be disassembled for maintenance and weather-related concerns.

Mr. Ladd told the Board that while he was not an architect, he saw the Moon Pie feature as fun and a positive asset for the City. He reiterated that the RSA had already established a Mardi Gras theme for the building. The proposed device was then in keeping with the overall theme and the design of the renovated building.

Ms. Whit-Mitchell told the applicants that while she applauded the concept behind the feature, she did not approve of its design. She said that she believed the feature functioned as a sign. Mr. Bemis clarified that the amenity would not advertise commercial items or concerns, but would promote City and City affiliated events.

Ms. Coumanis asked the applicants if it would be possible to remove the feature at some later date if it was found that it did not live up to its potential. Mr. Roberts asked why the amenity took the form of a permanent fixture on the building when it could be ephemeral and temporary in construction.

Mr. Wagoner 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. Whitt-Mitchell 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.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Ladd 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 approved. Mr. Karwinski and Mr. Roberts voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/17/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-89-CA: 107 Saint Francis Street / 31 North Royal Street
Applicant: Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood
Received: 11/1/10
Meeting: 11/17/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

This thirty-four story skyscraper originally housed the First National Bank. From the time of its completion in 1965 until 1986, the building was the tallest structure in the State of Alabama. Commercial establishments occupy a portion of the first floor. Floors two through six serve as a parking deck. The seventh through the thirty-three floors house offices. The Bienville Club is situated on the thirty-fourth floor.

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 21, 2010. At that time, the Board approved extensive renovations to the building’s six story base. The applicant’s representatives return to the Board with a comprehensive signage proposal.
- B. The Sign Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features of the openings of the building.”
 - 2. “No signs or portions of signs shall extend above the cornice line of the building face. Roof top signs are prohibited.
 - 3. “The overall design of all signage including the mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property.”
 - 4. For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors.”
 - 5. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring signs.”
 - 6. “The total maximum allowable 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. A multi-tenant building is also limited to a maximum of 64 square feet.”
 - 7. “Internally lit signs are prohibited.”

8. "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."

C. Scope of Work:

1. East Elevation
 - a. The East Elevation will feature one canopy, one wall, and two rooftop sign.
 - b. The aluminum canopy sign will be composed of individual lettering.
 - c. The individual non-illuminated reverse channel letters will measure 8" in width and 10" in height.
 - d. The lettering will be painted black.
 - e. The wall oval wall sign will measure 5' 8" in height and 4' 10" in width.
 - f. The non-illuminated reverse channel aluminum wall sign will feature the tenant's logo in gold-colored vinyl over a black ground.
 - g. The two rooftop signs will be mounted onto the side of the utility shaft tower.
 - h. One of the rooftop signs will be composed of individual lettering.
 - i. The individual non-illuminated reverse channel letters will measure 1' 10" in width and 3' in height.
 - j. The second roof top sign will measure 14' in height and 12' in width.
 - k. The aluminum sign will feature the tenant's logo in gold vinyl over a black ground.
2. North Elevation
 - a. The North Elevation will feature one canopy and two wall signs.
 - b. The aluminum canopy sign will be composed of individual lettering.
 - c. The individual non-illuminated reverse channel letters will measure 1" in depth, 8" in width, and 10" in height.
 - d. The lettering will be in black.
 - e. The oval wall sign will measure 7' 6" in height and 6' 6" in width.
 - f. The non-illuminated reverse channel aluminum sign will feature the tenant's logo in gold-colored vinyl over a black ground.
3. West Elevation
 - a. The West Elevation will feature four wall signs.
 - b. One of lower level aluminum wall signs will be composed of individual lettering.
 - c. The individual non-illuminated reverse channel letters will measure 1" in depth, 8" in width, and 10" in height.
 - d. The lettering will be painted black.
 - e. A second lower level oval wall sign will measure 5' 8" in height and 4' 10" in width.
 - f. The non-illuminated reverse channel aluminum wall sign will feature the tenant's logo in gold-colored vinyl over a black ground.
 - g. One upper level oval wall sign will measure 14' in height and 12' in width.
 - h. The non-illuminated reverse channel aluminum wall sign will feature the tenant's logo in gold vinyl over a black ground.
 - i. A second upper level wall sign will be composed of individual lettering.
 - j. The individual non-illuminated reverse channel letters will measure 3' in height and 2' 6" in width.
4. South Elevation
 - a. The south elevation will feature one wall and one rooftop wall sign.
 - b. The wall sign will be composed of individual lettering.
 - c. The individual non-illuminated reverse channel aluminum letters will measure 3' in height and 1' 10" in width.
 - d. The rooftop wall sign will measure 14' in height and 12' in width.
 - e. The aluminum sign will feature the tenant's logo in gold vinyl over a black ground.

STAFF ANALYSIS

In this application the Retirement System of Alabama proposes a comprehensive signage plan. Signage would be installed on all four of the building's elevations. The signage will be located on six-story base and the upper portions of the skyscraper shaft. The total square footage of all the proposed signage exceeds 500 square feet. The applicant's representatives are applying for a sign variance in order to exceed the 64 square sign limitation for buildings located within the historic districts. The sixty-four square foot allotment was established with single, two, and three storied buildings in mind, not multi-story skyscrapers. The amount of signage requested is then in keeping with mass and scale of the thirty-four story building. With exception of the two east-facing utility shaft signs (which qualify rooftop, as rooftop signs) the sign proposal meets the design and material standards established by the Sign Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. The south-facing utility shaft signage constitutes a continuation of the south elevation. Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical integrity of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the historic district. Pending Urban Development's approval of a sign variance Staff recommends approval of the whole of the request, excepting the east-facing rooftop signs. In the interest of full disclosure, Staff here notifies the Board that they are members of the Retirement System of Alabama as well as employees of the City of Mobile. These two conditions did not influence their review of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tracy Bassett and Steve Timms were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Bemis further explained the Staff Recommendation. A discussion of the east facing roof top signage ensued.

Mr. Wagoner asked his fellow Board members if they had any additional questions to ask or comments to make to the applicants. Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Bassett about the serpentine motif depicted on the building's south elevation. Mr. Bassett told the Board that the South Elevation's lighting/sculptural component was not going to be constructed.

Mr. Wagoner asked the applicants if they were amenable to amending their application to omit the proposed east-facing roof top signage. The applicants answered yes.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to state that the east-facing roof top signage will not be installed.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/17/11