

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
October 16, 2013 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Robert Allen, Kim Harden, Nick Holmes III, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone.
Members Absent: Carolyn Hasser, Harris Oswalt, Jim Wagoner, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the October 16, 2013 meeting as posted. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff as presented. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: Mike Henderson Roofing and Repair**
 - a. Property Address: 25 Macy Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/25/13
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with shingles to match the existing.
2. **Applicant: Ginny Harris**
 - a. Property Address: 72 North Reed
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/27/13
 - c. Project: Replace rotten siding to match; repaint house, body--gray; trim--white; door--red.
3. **Applicant: Richard Lewis**
 - a. Property Address: 304 Breamwood Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/25/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the exiting in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
4. **Applicant: Maggie Utsey Johnson for Charles and Thomas Johnson**
 - a. Property Address: 365 Tuttle Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/30/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing. Repaint per the existing color scheme. Replace windows to match the existing. Reroof to match.
5. **Applicant: Ross Holladay**
 - a. Property Address: 609 Conti Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/27/13
 - c. Project: Recoat roof on the addition; repaint the front porch; repaint the staircase (black in color); repair/replace any rotten wood on eaves; repair/seal cracks, repaint foundation; remove rotten paneling on rear second story and replace/paint to match existing; repair/repaint curb to match existing.
6. **Applicant: Michael Stanley**
 - a. Property Address: 208 South Dearborn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/1/13
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in composition, profile, and material.

7. **Applicant: Crosby Latham**
 - a. Property Address: 51 North Reed Avenue (also listed as 1704 New Hamilton Street)
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/1/13
 - c. Project: Replace garage doors (the news doors will be wooden and more in keeping with the style and period of the ancillary building). The doors will be painted to match the trim. Repair and replace (when necessary) fenestration to match the existing.
8. **Applicant: Claire Miller**
 - a. Property Address: 1015 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/2/13
 - c. Project: Replace fenestration (later French Doors) to match the existing.
9. **Applicant: Robbie Montgomery**
 - a. Property Address: 950 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/7/13
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.
10. **Applicant: Bernhardt Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 1459 Monroe Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/7/13
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.
11. **Applicant: Commercial Contracting Services**
 - a. Property Address: 351 Conti Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/7/13
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.
12. **Applicant: Wanda Cochran and Arthur Madden**
 - a. Property Address: 300 McDonald Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/8/13
 - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted color scheme. The body will be Thunder Gray and the trim will be Colonnade Gray.
13. **Applicant: Dennis Langan**
 - a. Property Address: 1412 Brown Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/8/13
 - c. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repair roofing to match.
14. **Applicant: Chuck Dixon**
 - a. Property Address: 207 South Cedar Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/8/13
 - c. Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2013-75-CA: 551 Dauphin Street**
 - a. Applicant: Tony Atchison with Atchison Home
 - b. Project: Commercial Renovation – Remodel an altered ground floor storefront.
WITHDRAWN. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
2. **2013-73-CA: 222 Dauphin Street**
 - a. Applicant: David Naman
 - b. Project: Construct a balcony and remodel a storefront.
HELDOVER. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2013-76-CA: 301 Conti Street

- a. Applicant: Bob Sain for the Center of the Living Arts
- b. Project: Murals – Complete a second phase of a mural project.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2013-77-CA: 101 Dauphin Street (16 South Royal Street portion)

- a. Applicant: Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood for the Retirement Systems of Alabama
- b. Project: Infill Construction – Construct a screen wall shielding service areas and fronting a second –story conference room on vacant portion of a larger complex.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Signage – Serda’s
- 2. Design Review Committees
- 3. 1413 Old Shell Road
- 4. Agendas (nomenclature)
- 5. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-75-CA: 551 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Tony Atchison with Atchison Home
Received: 9/30/13
Meeting: 10/16/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Commercial Renovation – Remodel an altered ground floor storefront.

BUILDING HISTORY

551 Dauphin Street (known as the Chamberlain Building) dates from 1865. The Postbellum building’s plan and elevations adopt a formula established during the decades leading up to the Civil War. The main buildings ground floor commercial space was surmounted by upper story residential areas. The occupying tenants had the use of both floors of rear service wing. A cantilevered balcony once extended across the façade.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The owner/applicant proposes the removal OF a historically inappropriate storefront and the construction of new storefront more in keeping with the style and period of the building.
- 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. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible the 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.”
 - 3. “Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.”
 - 4. “Changes that create a false sense of historic sense of historic development such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall be not be undertaken.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Remove a later ground floor storefront.
2. Install a new storefront.
 - a. The storefront will be constructed on the location of the existing storefront.
 - b. The cast iron grilles located within the storefront's lunettes will remain in place.
 - c. The spacing of the storefronts bays will respect the arcuated bays of the surviving columnar screen.
 - d. Four glazed and paneled doors will be centered within the storefront's bays.
 - e. Intervening expanses of glazed and paneled divisions will extend between the operable fenestrated units.

CLARIFICATIONS/REQUESTS

1. Provide a plan of the proposed work.

STAFF ANALYSIS

As is the case with many storefronts, the ground floor of this 19th-Century building has been altered. The textured brick bulkhead and aluminum windows represent late 20th-Century alterations. Original cast iron columns and lunettes that characterize the storefront have survived. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the aforementioned historic features will remain in place (See B-1). The proposed ground floor store front would be located on the location of the existing one. While no photographic documentation survives of the original appearance of the original storefront, extant and documented examples often adopted a similar placement. Unlike the existing storefront, the proposed replacement would respect the original bay system. The traditional materials are appropriate for use in Mobile's historic districts. The contemporary design will "read" as a sympathetic intervention that is both differentiated from, yet compatible with the historic fabric (See B 1 & 4)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-4), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tony Atchison was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He noted that the building had been vacant for several years and stated that he was glad to see efforts were being made to bring the property back to use. Mr. Ladd then asked Mr. Atchison if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Atchison spoke of the architect responsible for the drawing.

Mr. Roberts inquired as to the location of the ground floor entrance. Mr. Atchison replied that all of the openings would function as doors.

Steve Stone stated that no plan had been provided. He stated that windows had been rendered in the drawings but were not addressed in the Staff Report. Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that Mr. Atchison

had received a midmonth approval for installation of six-over-six windows that would match the original windows. Mr. Stone then asked for clarification as to paint colors. Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that Mr. Atchison had also received a midmonth approval for painting. He added that the color scheme was still being worked out. Mr. Stone asked for clarification as to work on the Cedar Street Elevation. Mr. Atchison stated that with exception of the aforementioned painting and fenestration, no other work was planned.

Mr. Karwinski stated that he thought the application was incomplete. He said that without a plan, a side elevation, and details, questions were still outstanding. Mr. Karwinski stated that paired doors were usually employed on 19th-Century storefronts.

A code related discussion ensued.

Mr. Atchison stated that he had contacted City officials with regard to code requirements (ingress and egress, and right of way) and had been informed that the proposed plan was in compliance. He said that he was simply trying to work with the City to avoid fines. Mr. Atchison added that he did not currently have a tenant and they wanted to restore the exterior shell in such a way that would allow for multiple uses therein.

Mr. Holmes recommended to Mr. Atchison that he withdraw the application so as to fully address code-related concerns and then return before the Board.

Laura Clark, head of Urban Development who was present in the audience, volunteered her assistance in arranging a pre-development meeting to assist the applicant. She noted that Mr. Atchison's efforts were motivated by a recent sweep of the downtown area and that he was working on addressing those concerns.

Mr. Atchison withdrew the application.

WITHDRAWN

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-73-CA: 222 Dauphin Street
Applicant: David Naman
Received: 9/3/13
Meeting: 10/2/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Construct a balcony and remodel a ground floor storefront.

BUILDING HISTORY

Erected in 1879, 222 Dauphin is one of the three units comprising the Demouy Row, one of Mobile's finest extant examples of Italianate commercial architecture of the Postbellum period.

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 2, 2013. At that time, the Board tabled an application for lack of information. The application involved the construction of a balcony and the remodeling of a storefront. With this application the applicant intends to clarify the Board's concerns.
- 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 historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible the 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."
 - 3. "Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence."
 - 4. "Changes that create a false sense of historic sense of historic development such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall be not be undertaken."
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Construct a cast iron gallery.
 - a. The gallery will be supported by four cast iron posts matching those employed on the two other units which comprise the complex.

- b. The gallery will be 6' 2" in depth and extend between the unit's pilasters.
- c. The gallery will feature an Italianate style railing. The sections of railing will be extended between newel-like posts vertically aligned with the posts supporting the gallery.
- d. The decking will match that employed on the adjacent unit's gallery.
- 2. Remove the 1950s recessed entrance.
- 3. Reconfigure the ground floor storefront.
 - a. The ground floor storefront will be comprised of two parts.
 - b. All of the storefront vertical and horizontal members will be made of wood.
 - c. The western portion of the storefront will feature a glazed wooden door surmounted by a transom.
 - d. The eastern portion of the storefront will feature a recessed bay featuring a double door flanked by glazed bays.
 - e. All of the storefront's easternmost fenestrated bays will be surmounted by transoms.

REQUESTS/CLARIFICATIONS

- 1. Provide a rendering of the proposed upper story door.
- 2. Clarify the materials and treatment of the ground floor storefront.
- 3. Provide a plan showing the ground floor storefront.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a gallery and the alteration of a ground floor storefront.

As the building's upper-story door bay indicates and early 20th-Century photographs and Sanborn Maps depict show that this building once featured a cast iron gallery. Cantilevered in form, the balcony was later replaced by a projecting marquee (See B-3). The proposed gallery would feature the same four bay elevation and 6' 2" depth as the galleries fronting the buildings two western units. The balcony to the east is of the same projection. Traditional railings like that proposed have been approved on reconstructed balconies located across the Lower Dauphin Commercial District. The structure and posts of the balcony allow this historically informed intervention to read as a sympathetic addition to traditional commercial context (See B-1 and 4). The Board voiced concern over the type of door. The applicant is in the process of providing clarified imagery of the type of door and its relationship to other doors in similar conversions.

The ground floor storefront dates from the 1950s. While a testament with regard to changing technologies, marketing practices, and design aesthetics; the recessed entrance is not an exemplar of Modern design. Better examples survive and have been preserved elsewhere on Dauphin Street (223 Dauphin Street for instance). The proposed store front accommodates access to the ground floor and upper story units, a common feature of many 19th-Century commercial buildings. A similar solution can be seen at the remodeled storefront located at 3 South Royal Street. Wooden ground floor storefronts have been approved across the Lower Dauphin Commercial District. Revised drawings are being executed regarding materials and articulation of the ground floor's elevation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe this application (in concept) will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Pending the submission of revised drawings, Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to represent the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

No Board discussion took place.

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Harden moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as presented.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Harden moved to holdover the application for lack of information.

The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-76-CA: 301 Conti Street
Applicant: Bob Sain for the Center of the Living Arts
Received: 9/27/13
Meeting: 10/16/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Murals – Complete the second phase of a mural project.

BUILDING HISTORY

This building was constructed during the middle third of the 20th Century as an addition to the *Mobile Register* complex.

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 April 3, 2013. At that time, the Board approved painting murals on the building. With this submission, the applicants propose painting additional murals.
- B. The Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street and The Lower Dauphin Commercial District Guidelines state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “With regard to painting “period color schemes are encouraged.”
 - 2. “The way in which color is applied as a design element is important to the overall appearance of a building. Use colors that may be typical of the period and/or blend with adjacent buildings. For purpose of design review, colors are classified by the following categories of use: body, trim, and accent.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Paint murals (per submitted drawing)
 - a. The murals will be multicolored.
 - b. The murals will be decorative and figural in content.
 - c. The windows will be of the same color and feature the same motifs as the existing murals.
 - d. The murals will be located upon the wall bays separating the second story’s windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the completion of a mural program. The individual sections of the mural would be located on the wall bays separating the second story windows. Neither the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts nor the Lower Dauphin Commercial District Guidelines specifically address murals. The Design Review Guidelines encourage the use of period color schemes (See B-1). The Lower Dauphin Guidelines state that color is important to the overall appearance of the building (See B-2). The latter compilation goes on to break down a color into body, trim, and accent colors.

In reviewing previous applications entailing the painting of murals, the Board has discussed the following: the style of the building; location; the subject/content; execution; and maintenance.

With regard to the style of the building, murals should obscure architectural features which define the character and style of a building. Murals located on plywooded storefronts are found in and around the Lower Dauphin Commercial District. Like most murals, these interventions are reversible in nature. Along with a mural's relationship to the style of the building and location upon it, the subject matter/content of a mural and its consequent maintenance are all matters that should be considered. With regard to subject matter, the Board does not engage in the review of the appropriateness of content, but the appearance and meaning of content are open to interpretation. Execution and maintenance can prove problematic. Vandalism, weather, and medium all affect the condition of a mural.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Taking into account the approval of the first phase of this building's mural program and possibility of other mural requests, Staff recommends that the Board review the previous concerns which are highlighted above and develop a general policy for murals as well as a ruling on this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Bob Sain was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Sain if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Sain stated the application was pretty straight forward, simply the painting of 2' x 3' spaces connecting the bands of previously approved murals with the same designs as employed above and below the subject spaces.

Mr. Roberts inquired as to why the proposal had not been presented as part of the initial application. Mr. Roberts also noted that murals did not turn out as they had been proposed. He said that he knew the artist was famous, but in his opinion the work as executed looked like graffiti in appearance.

Mr. Sain referenced the packets that the Board received. He stated that among the items up for their consideration were letters submitted by supporters of the mural project. He spoke of the positive feedback that the CLA had received on the project.

Mr. Roberts said that art is all about opinion. Mr. Sain concurred. He added that the murals encouraged people to stop and be engaged. Mr. Sain said they are part of a larger effort to create more energy in downtown Mobile.

Mr. Roberts said that he might well vote in favor of the application. He stated that murals could be painted over at a later date (therefore not permanent, but temporary in nature).

Mr. Ladd concurred with Mr. Roberts as to the subjectivity of art, but inquired as to the reversibility of the intervention.

Mr. Sain referred to the Staff Recommendation for the original proposal. He stated that maintenance listed therein as a matter of concern. Mr. Sain stated that the artist used special paints which prevented fading and allowed for cleaning.

Mr. Ladd asked if any additional murals were envisioned for the exterior of the building. Mr. Sain answered yes with regard to Kenny Scharf, the artist of the existing and proposed murals.

Mr. Karwinski stated that when the first application was submitted for review, he had voted in opposition. He said that the proposal did not respect the International Style character of the building. Mr. Karwinski added that the proposal for review added a vertical element that would work in opposition to the linear elements that characterize the building.

Mr. Roberts stated that the concern centers on the opposition of architecture versus art.

Mr. Sain stated that in denying the application, a bad message would be sent to the world about Mobile. He reminded the Board that Kenny Sharf had volunteered to execute the murals as a gift to Mobile. Not being able to accept them would be awkward. Mr. Sain stated that he appreciated different points of view because that is what art is all about.

Ms. Harden asked for clarification as to the material composition of the affected areas. Mr. Holmes addressed Ms. Harden's query.

A discussion ensued as to the reversibility of the intervention.

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

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/16/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-70-CA: 101 Dauphin Street (16 South Royal Street portion)
Applicant: Tracy Bassett with Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood for the Retirement Systems of Alabama
Received: 9/30/13
Meeting: 10/16/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing and Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Infill Construction – Construct a screen wall shielding service areas and fronting a second-story conference room on vacant portion of a larger complex.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Van Antwerp Building (101 Dauphin Street) is Mobile’s first skyscraper. The building was built between 1904 and 1906 according to the designs of George B. Rogers. 16 South Royal Street was acquired by the Van Antwerp family in the late 1890s. The northern portion of 16 South Royal Street was occupied by the remains of the Fistorazzi Building. The 1880s building was remodeled several times over the course of the 20th Century. The inner lot buildings and their appendages dated from 1901 and later. The site is vacant.

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 16 South Royal Street portion of the Van Antwerp Building complex last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on September 18, 2013. At that time, the Board denied an application for new infill construction atop the presently vacant lot. A Design Review Committee was scheduled. With this application, the applicant’s representative submitted a design that takes into account recommendations made at the last Architectural Review Board meeting and during the Design Review Committee session.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the building or the district.”
 - 2. “New construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby buildings.
 - 3. “The choice of materials and ornamentation for new construction is a good way for a new building to exert its own identity. By using historic examples as a point of departure, it is impossible for new construction to use new materials and ornamentation and still fit into the historic district.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans and visuals):

1. Infill Construction – Construct a screen wall shielding service areas and fronting a second-story conference room on vacant portion of a larger complex.
 - a. The two-story façade will be flanked by pilasters and will be slightly recessed from the façade line.
 - b. The ground floor will feature a centrally located vehicular entrance accessed by way of a curbscut. Pedestrian doors will flank the vehicular door.
 - c. A bulk head with interpretive explications will be extended to either side of the ground floor points of vehicular and pedestrian entrance.
 - d. The perforated façade will feature two bands of imagery. One band will depict the Mobile skyline in 1909 and the second will picture the skyline as of 2014.
 - e. The upper story will house a meeting room.
 - f. The meeting room will feature a glazed east-facing wall with two doors accessing the balcony. The ventilator-like covers of the façade will shield the balcony.
 - g. The ventilator-like windows, framing pilasters, and raised seams will provide a sense of rhythm on the façade.
 - h. A stepped parapet (referencing the parapet of the previous building that occupied the street frontage) will surmount the building. Lettering will be located within the aforementioned zone.
 - i. An exterior staircase (located behind the facade), parking spaces, and other service related fixtures will be located within the rear portion of the lot.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the ongoing restoration and renovation of the Van Antwerp Building complex. The plans up for review address the proposed infill for the 16 South Royal Street portion of the property. This application is a revised version that the Board reviewed on September 18, 2013. At the aforementioned meeting, the Board in a split decision denied an application for infill. A Design Review Committee was called. The proposed design takes into suggestions/recommendations made at the September 18th meeting of the Board and the September 25th Design Review Committee session

The points of concern that were taken with original submission included the following: a general lack of engagement with the surrounding buildings; a “billboard” effect; a sign as opposed to a building; too planar of a facade; and a lack of rhythm. Taking these concerns into account, the applicant’s representatives revised the proposal. Issues concerning a lack of engagement with adjacent buildings have been addressed by increasing both vertical rhythms and horizontal continuities. By adjusting proportions and stressing seam lines, the rhythmic spacing of vertical motifs has been better realized. More coordinated divisions and continuities have been established by coordinating horizontal registers. Recessing the façade, employing pilasters, adding a stepped parapet (which echoes the one employed in the preceding façade) have taken away from the billboard effect, while simultaneously counteracting planarity. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standard’s, the historic context has been used as a point of departure. The new work is differentiated from the old, yet compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the historic context. The materials differentiate the old from the new work (See B 1-3).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe the application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval 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. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representatives. He stated that following the application's last appearance before the Board, a Design Review Committee had been scheduled and conducted. Mr. Ladd stated that many of the suggestions made at the previous meeting and during the Design Review Committee were reflected in this application. He asked if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Timms thanked Mr. Ladd. He said that he was present to address any questions the Board might entertain.

Mr. Stone asked for clarification as to the sidewalk material. Mr. Timms and Mr. Bassett stated that sidewalk would be made of the same material as that employed elsewhere on the block. Mr. Stone inquired as to the composition of the pilasters. Mr. Timms responded cast iron.

Mr. Stone and Mr. Karwinski voiced concern as to intrusions into the right of way. Mr. Timms stated that the advanced pilasters had been adopted so to negate a billboard effect. He said that the work would be located on the property.

After referencing the billboard effect of the previous submission, Mr. Karwinski stated that the proposal still did not adopt a pedestrian scale nor observe the rhythmic spacing that should typify good infill design with historic districts. He said that the proposed design would take away from the two historic buildings locate to either side of the property.

Mr. Roberts said that he respected Mr. Karwinski's observations but in his opinion the first submission was better than this revised proposal.

Mr. Ladd reminded his fellow Board members that their task is to determine if an application does or does not impair a historic district.

Mr. Roberts voiced concern that in trying to placate all the suggestions, the design had been sacrificed.

Mr. Ladd commended the applicant's representatives for working with the Board.

A discussion ensued as to the lighting of the screen wall.

Ms. Harden offered guidance as to right of way related concerns.

A discussion ensued as to placement of the façade.

Mr. Stone noted that the frame of the building by pilasters and parapet was not beneficial to the design.

The parapet was discussed.

Mr. Holmes stated that in his opinion of the two designs submitted before the Board, the one up for review was an improvement over the first.

Mr. Roberts encouraged his fellow Board members to rule on the application.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was approved. Mr. Holmes, Mr. Ladd, and Mr. Roberts voted in opposition.

DENIED.

EXTENDED SESSION

The Board, applicant, and staff reconsidered the application. The Board members who ruled for denial where canvassed as per the points which they considered impairing the architectural and historical character of the building. The applicants agreed to amend their application.

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Harden moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts on amended proposal that combined the best components of the first and second designs. The second proposal was amended to adopt the cornice of the first application, the alignment of the façade with the body of the Van Antwerp Building, and the omission of the pilasters.

The motion received a second and was approved.

DECISION ON THE AMENDED APPLICATION

Miss Harden 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. Allen, Mr. Stone, and Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Discussion ensued as to the plane of the building, the horizontal registers, the cornice, and other elements that were considered successful.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/16/14

