

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
October 19, 2011 – 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: Kim Harden, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, and Jim Wagoner.
Members Absent: Gertrude Baker, Carlos Gant, Craig Roberts, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Oswalt moved to approve the minutes of the October 5, 2011 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. After asking for clarification regarding several Staff approvals, Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Douglas Carlton**
 - a. Property Address: 53 North Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/3/11
 - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted Benjamin Moore color scheme. The body will be Tate Olive. The trim will be Linen White. The decking and caps will be Black Forest Green.
2. **Applicant: Guy Miller**
 - a. Property Address: 116 Providence Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/3/11
 - c. Project: Reroof to match the existing. Repair and replace woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme, matching the north elevation's color scheme to rest of the house.
3. **Applicant: Chapman's Masonry**
 - a. Property Address: 158 South Jackson Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/30/11
 - c. Project: Install galvanized aluminum lintels; repairing brick jack arches to the original appearance. Mortar to be type N.
4. **Applicant: David Naman**
 - a. Property Address: 207 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/28/11
 - c. Project: Work approved: Reroof flat surface with white granulated torch down roof.
5. **Applicant: Kevin Beuke**
 - a. Property Address: 208 Conti Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/30/11
 - c. Project: Replace chain link fence with black aluminum fence behind building. Said fence will be six feet in height.
6. **Applicant: Kevin Beuke**
 - a. Property Address: 209 Conti Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/30/11

- c. Project: Replace chain link fence with black aluminum fence behind building, six feet.
- 7. Applicant: W. M. Construction**
- a. Property Address: 17 McPhillips
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/30/11
 - c. Project: Replace damaged 35 foot portion of chain link fence at rear of property.
- 8. Applicant: Chip Noland**
- a. Property Address: 209 South Cedar Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/30/11
 - c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood to match, where necessary and repaint to match.
- 9. Applicant: Adam Woodworth**
- a. Property Address: 454 Chatham Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/30/11
 - c. Project: Erect a temporary power pole.
- 10. Applicant: David Newell**
- a. Property Address: 960 Savannah Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/30/11
 - c. Project: Replace wooden windows to match.
- 11. Applicant: Renita Smith**
- a. Property Address: 100 Michael Donald Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/4/11
 - c. Project: Finish painting the house per a previously approved color scheme.
- 12. Applicant: Kitchen on George**
- a. Property Address: 351 George Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/5/11
 - c. Project: Suspend a hanging sign from the main entrance's canopy. The single faced aluminum sign will feature the name of the establishment. The total square footage of the sign will be 5.81 square feet.
- 13. Applicant: NSA Agencies**
- a. Property Address: 260 North Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/30/11
 - c. Project: Repaint shutters BLP color Summerville Red and porch deck battle ship gray and ceilings white.
- 14. Applicant: Spring Hill Landscaping**
- a. Property Address: 261 North Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/6/11
 - c. Project: Repaint exterior stairs and handrails to match existing in materials, style, and dimension.
- 15. Applicant: Buzz Rummel**
- a. Property Address: 1002 Charleston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/6/11
 - c. Project: Reroof with charcoal gray shingles.
- 16. Applicant: William Johnston**
- a. Property Address: 1223 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/6/11
 - c. Project: Replace porch decking to match existing in dimension and material.
- 17. Applicant: Diane Caylor**
- a. Property Address: 1308 Brown Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/10/11

c. Project: Repair and replace and woodwork to the match the existing. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.

18. Applicant: The Springboard to Success

- a. Property Address: 260 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/10/11
- c. Project: Install vinyl lettering on the ground floor display windows. The lettering will measure approximately 4.63 square feet.

19. Applicant: Adam Woodworth

- a. Property Address: 454 Chatham Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/11/11
- c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated siding and woodwork to match the existing. Paint the house per the submitted color scheme. The body will be “Cool Elegance,” the trim will be white, the porch decking will be “Beachcomber,” and the porch ceilings will be “Peaceful Night.” Repair and when necessary replace wooden windows to match the existing in material composition and light configuration. Remove a non-historic railing. Install crushed grey stone in the existing vehicular drive. Install a brick pedestrian walkway between the sidewalk and the front porch accessing the façade’s southernmost porch.

20. Applicant: Noland Construction, Inc.

- a. Property Address: 1058 Church Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/11/11
- c. Project: Replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2011-68-CA: 1950 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Mitchell Signs for Navigator Credit Union
- b. Project: Out of District Signage – Install a wall sign and construct a monument sign.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2011-69-CA: 1900 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Gator Sign Factory for various building tenants
- b. Project: Out of District Signage – Install a window sign; construct a monument sign; and install a new sign in an existing pole sign.

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

3. 2011-70-CA: 1461 Eslava Street

- a. Applicant: C. James Beard
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a fire damaged residence.

DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2011-71-CA: Hank Aaron Loop Lighting Project

- a. Applicant: City of Mobile
- b. Project: Lighting – Remove pole lights and install new lighting fixtures.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-68-CA: 1950 Government Street
Applicant: Mitchell Signs for Navigator Credit Union
Received: 9/21/11
Meeting: 10/19/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Out of District (Government Street Signage Corridor)
Classification: N/A
Zoning: B-3
Project: Signage – Install a wall sign and construct a monument sign.

BUILDING HISTORY

This single story commercial building was constructed during the latter half of the 20th Century.

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 installation of a wall sign and the construction of a monument sign.
- B. The Sign Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Signs shall not be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building.”
 - 2. “The height of free standing signs shall be higher than 8 feet.”
 - 3. “For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and color.”
 - 4. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion of the building and the neighboring structures and signs.”
 - 5. “The total allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet.”
 - 6. “The total square footage for the display area of a monument sign is (50) fifty square feet.”
 - 7. “The size of the sign shall be determined by measuring the area within each face of a geometric shape enclosing all elements of information or representational matter including blank masking. Structural supports not bearing information shall not be included in the computation of display area. For double faced signs, each side shall be counted toward the maximum allowable square footage.”
 - 8. With regard to materials “wood, metal, stucco, stone, and brick, is allowed.”
 - 9. “Internally lit signs are prohibited. 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. Lighting fixtures mounted on the ground shall be screened by landscaping.

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Install a wall sign.
 - a. The wall sign will be mounted on the building's South (Government Street) Elevation.
 - b. The sign will be located on the same location as the previous wall signage.
 - c. The aluminum sign will measure 2.6' in height and 9' 7/8" in length.
 - d. The sign will feature reverse channel LED illumination.
 - e. The entity's name and logo will comprise the sign design.
2. Construct a monument sign.
 - a. The monument sign will be located atop the location of an earlier pole sign. The pole sign will be removed. Said sign is located to the east of the property's rear (Airport Avenue) entrance.
 - b. The aluminum monument sign will measure approximately 80" in height and 5' in length.
 - c. Of the aforementioned height, the sign cabinet will measure 59" (approximately 6') and the sign base measure 20" (1' 8").
 - d. The sign base will be 10" in depth and the sign cabinet will be 14" in depth.
 - e. The entity's name and logo will comprise the sign design.
 - f. The sign will not feature internal illumination.
3. The total square footage of all signage (not including directional) will not exceed 64 square feet.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of a wall sign and the construction of a monument sign. Signage applications involve the review of the following components: placement, design, size, composition, and lighting.

With regard to placement, both signs will be located in the same location as earlier signage. The proposed locations meet the criteria outlined the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street. The wall sign will neither obscure building features nor extend beyond the roof of the building. The monument sign would not be located in the right of way.

Both sign designs feature the applicant's name and logo. The sign designs do not detract from the historic and architectural character of either the western section of Government Street.

The Sign Design Guidelines restrict signage size on two counts. Overall signage for a given property cannot exceed 64 square feet without the issuance of a variance. The total square footage of the proposed signage does not exceed the allotted amount. Secondly, the total square footage of monument signage cannot exceed 50 square feet. The proposed monument sign will not exceed 50 square feet. The Board generally restricts the height monument signs to 5'.

As per materials, aluminum is an approved signage material.

Approved types of lighting include external means such as spotlights and Reverse Channel LED. The proposed wall sign would employ the latter while the proposed monument sign would rely upon external illumination.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-9), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical

character of the Government Street Signage Corridor, but recommends that the monument sign be dropped in height to be in accord with previous Board rulings. Pending clarification of the height change, Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Kyle Edmonds 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. Edmonds if he had any questions to ask, clarifications to make, or comments to add with regard to the Staff Report.

Mr. Edmonds answered yes. He told the Board that upon receipt of the Agenda, review of the Staff Report, and consultation with Staff, he altered the monument sign design to reflect the 5' high recommendation. Mr. Edmonds distributed to Staff and the Board drawings of the new design.

Lighting was discussed. Mr. Edmonds told the Board that the monument sign would rely upon external illumination.

Mr. Ladd 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. Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any further comments to make or questions to ask. No further questions or discussion 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, amending facts to reflect that height of the monument sign would not exceed 5'.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/19/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-69-CA: 1900 Government Street
Applicant: Gator Signs for various building tenants
Received: 10/3/11
Meeting: 10/19/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Out of District (Government Street Signage Corridor)
Classification: N/A
Zoning: B-2
Project: Out of District Signage – Install a window sign; construct a monument sign; and replace signage in an existing pole sign.

BUILDING HISTORY

This building dates from circa 1949. The single story building, which features a façade faced in “Old Mobile,” was constructed according to the designs of local architect Thomas Cooper Van Antwerp.

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 appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicants’ representative proposes the installation of a window sign, the construction of monument sign, and the replacement of signage within a pole sign.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Signs shall not be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building.”
 - 2. “The height of free standing signs shall be higher than 8 feet.”
 - 3. “For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and color.”
 - 4. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion of the building and the neighboring structures and signs.”
 - 5. “The total allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet.”
 - 6. “The total square footage for the display area of a monument sign is (50) fifty square feet.”
 - 7. “The size of the sign shall be determined by measuring the area within each face of a geometric shape enclosing all elements of information or representational matter including blank masking. Structural supports not bearing information shall not be included in the computation of display area. For double faced signs, each side shall be counted toward the maximum allowable square footage.”

8. With regard to materials “wood, metal, stucco, stone, and brick, is allowed. Plastic, vinyl or similar materials are prohibited.”
9. “Internally lit signs are prohibited. 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. Lighting fixtures mounted on the ground shall be screened by landscaping.

C. Scope of Work:

1. Install a window sign.
 - a. The vinyl window sign will be affixed to the third most window from the façade’s (Government Street) southeast corner.
 - b. The sign will measure 2’ in height and 6’ in length (total of 12 square feet).
 - c. The sign design will feature the name of one of the building’s tenant’s as overlay of an advertising motif.
 - d. The sign will not feature internal illumination.
2. Construct a monument sign.
 - a. The double-faced monument sign will measure 4’ in height and 6’ in length (total of 24 square feet per sign face, 48 square feet total).
 - b. The aluminum sign will extend between wooden posts.
 - c. The sign will feature altered swan’s neck top.
 - d. The sign design will feature the names, logos, imagery, numbers, etc... of two of the building’s tenants.
 - e. The monument sign will not feature internal illumination.
3. Replace a unit of signage in an existing pole sign.
 - a. The replacement pole signage unit will be located in the uppermost register of the existing sign.
 - b. The double faced signage will measure 4’ in height and 8’ in length (32 square feet per individual sign face, total of 64 square feet).
 - c. The individual sign unit will not feature internal illumination.
 - d. The sign will be vinyl in composition.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application entails the installation of a wall sign and the construction of a monument sign. Signage applications involve the review of the following components: placement, design, size, composition, and lighting.

With regard to placement, the proposed locations of all three signs meet the criteria outlined the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street. The monument sign would not be located in the right of way. The pole sign is an existing feature. The window signage will be located on an inner face of the façade’s glazing.

All the sign designs feature the name and logo of the respective tenant.

The Sign Design Guidelines restrict signage on two counts. Overall signage for a given property cannot exceed 64 square feet without the issuance of a variance. That said the pole sign is an existing feature therefore is “grandfathered” into the districts. The applicants propose replacing one of the pole’s individual signs. Unless the sign is removed or its size increased, the size of the proposed pole signage is not up for review. Removing the pole sign from the proposed signage size request, the remaining total square footage is below 64 square feet. One of the proposed signs is a monument sign. The total square footage of monument signage cannot exceed 50 square feet. The proposed monument sign will not exceed

50 square feet. Furthermore, while the Sign Design Guidelines allow freestanding signage a height up to 8', the Board generally restricts the height monument signs to 5'. The proposed sign is 6' in height. If the pole sign is ever demolished/destroyed, the site would lose this as an exception and any additional signage would be counted against the site's 64 square foot total.

As per material composition, all of the proposed signs would utilize a different material. The aluminum monument sign board would be suspended between wooden posts. The Sign Design Guidelines list both aluminum and wood as acceptable signage materials. The window sign would be applied on window's inner facing. The proposed pole sign would be vinyl in composition. Vinyl signs are not allowed in the Historic Districts.

Approved types of lighting include external means such as spotlights and Reverse Channel LED. Neither the monument nor the window signs would employ lighting. The individual pole sign unit would not employ internal illumination, but the lighting bleeds through from other signs within the larger pole.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval in part and denial in part.

Based on B (1-9), Staff does not believe the window signs will impair the architectural or the historical character of the western Government Street. Staff recommends approval of the aforementioned signs on the condition that the monument sign is lowered one foot to be in compliance with previous Board rulings that restrict monument sign heights to five feet.

Based on B (8), Staff believes the replacement of the individual unit of existing pole signage will impair the architectural and historical character of western Government Street. Staff does not recommend approval of this portion of the signage application on account of the material. Staff recommends the use of a material that meets the standards outlined in the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Joshua J. Mosner 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. Mosner if he had any questions to ask, clarifications to make, or comments to add with regard to the Staff Report.

Mr. Mosner answered yes. He told the Board that the monument sign would be reconfigured so the height would not exceed the 5' recommendation.

Ms. Harden asked for clarification as to the proposed height of the monument sign. Mr. Blackwell addressed Ms. Harden's query.

Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Mosner if he could speak for the applicant with regard to the pole sign's composition. Mr. Mosner answered no.

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

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any further comments to make or questions to ask. Mr. Oswald asked for clarification regarding the total square footage of all signage. Mr. Blackwell and Mr. Bemis addressed Mr. Oswald's query. Mr. Blackwell stated that the pole sign was not being factored into the total square footage. He noted that it was "grandfathered in." Mr. Bemis noted that if the pole sign were altered or removed the property's square footage allotment would be reduced to 64 square feet. Discussion ensued as to the locations of the proposed signage. Mr. Ladd suggested to the Board that they approve in part and deny in part the application.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Oswald 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 monument sign would be lowered in height to reflect the 5' height requirement.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Oswald moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for the window and monument signs. The pole sign was denied on account of its material composition.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/19/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-70-CA: 1461 Eslava Street
Applicant: C. James Beard
Received: 9/30/11
Meeting: 10/19/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition – Demolish a fire-damaged house.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Arts & Crafts-informed “bungalow” dates from circa 1925. The gable roofed dwelling’s facade features a gabled porch that is accessed via a ground level terrace.

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

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 house was damaged in a July 2011 fire. A representative of the owner proceeded with demolition without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The applicant appears before the Board with an application calling for the demolition of the fire damaged house.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
 - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;

1. This contributing house is an example of middle range Arts & Crafts inspired dwelling. Simplicity of form and sturdiness of construction were combined in its design and structure. As was typical of many “bungalow” type houses, the front porch is asymmetrically placed. This example features an intermediate terrace that provides transition and access between the front walk and front porch. The interior, notably the living and dining rooms, feature well crafted and designed built in units.
 - ii. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
1. The residences lining this portion of Eslava Street survive largely intact. This house is among the finer bungalows of the many Arts & Crafts informed houses found on Eslava Street and in the District.
 - iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced, but the craftsmanship behind a complete reconstruction is nearly impossible.
 - iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
1. Mobile possesses many Arts & Crafts informed houses. This house is good example of a middle range bungalow.
 - v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
1. If granted demolition approval, the applicant would demolish the house, level the lot, and plant grass.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
1. The applicant acquired the house in 1987 at a purchase price of \$17,000.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
1. The applicant has not considered alternative uses for the property.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
1. The property has not been listed for sale.
 - ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
1. N/A.
 - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
1. N/A.
 - xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and
1. See application submitted.
 - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the Board.
 1. See application submitted.
2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Demolish the house.
2. Level the lot.
3. Plant grass.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a single family residence. Demolition applications entail the review of the following concerns: the architectural significance of the building; the effect of the demolition on the streetscape and surrounding district; the condition of the building; and the nature of the proposed development.

This house is a contributing residence in the Leinkauf Historic District. The single story “bungalow” type house is representative of a middle grade bungalow. The dominant design component of this example’s exterior is the façade approach. As with many bungalows, the house features an asymmetrically positioned porch. A unique feature of this house is the intermediate terrace located between the porch front walk. Other noticeable components include built-ins that enrich the house’s interior.

This house is located in the heart of the Leinkauf Historic District. Bungalows and other Arts & Crafts influenced dwellings are among the most numerous house types located within the Leinkauf Historic District. Eslava Street features several fine examples. The buildings lining this section of Eslava Street survive largely intact.

A July 2011 fire damaged the house’s first floor and attic. Unauthorized demolition efforts resulted in further interior damage. The removal of later aluminum siding has exposed the original siding. The building is capable of being restored. The walls and roof remain intact. The interior can be traversed without threat of collapse.

If granted demolition approval, the applicant would demolish the house, level the lot, and plant grass on the site.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

James Beaird was present to discuss the application

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Beaird if he had any questions to ask, clarifications to make, or comments to add with regard to the Staff Report.

Mr. Beaird answered yes. He told the Board that it would be a financial burden to restore the house. Mr. Beaird stated that vandals had already removed the house’s siding. He spoke of the location. Mr. Beaird said that he did not have the money to fix up this rental property. He stated that the fire was set by a

tenant. Mr. Beaird told the Board that the insurance payment would reflect the purchase cost not reconstruction cost.

Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Beaird if he had placed the property on the market. Mr. Beaird answered no. Mr. Wagoner recommended that he at least consider that option.

Mr. Beaird said that he would donate the property to any interested party. Mr. Bemis said encouraged that alternative, but suggested to Mr. Beaird that he consider Mr. Wagoner's suggestion.

Mr. Beaird told the Board that he had been in the real estate market for several decades. He said that he believed that no one would be interested in the property. Mr. Wagoner said that he respectfully disagreed with Mr. Beaird's surmise. He told Mr. Beaird that he believed many people would be interested in purchasing a property in the area. Mr. Wagoner reiterated to Mr. Beaird that he should look into selling, not demolishing the house.

Mr. Karwinski recommended that the house's windows and doors be covered in plyboard as a means of preventing further deterioration and exposure. Mr. Bemis said that the plyboard should be painted white.

Mr. Beaird told the Board that he was under Court order to demolish the house at a date no later than December 28, 2011. Mr. Bemis said that securing the house through plyboard would suffice. He told Mr. Beaird that Staff would work with him regard to the staying off the court order. Mr. Bemis said that the house could be sealed as opposed to demolished. He said that in doing so he could protect the interiors and consider alternative courses of action.

Mr. Beaird said that he was amendable to selling the property, but that he did not think anyone would be interested in purchasing it. Mr. Wagoner told Mr. Beaird that he would not know until he tried. Mr. Beaird reiterated the costs of restoring the house. Mr. Wagoner suggested to Mr. Beaird that he mothball the house and place the property on the market. He said that if it did not sell he would have least made the effort. Mr. Wagoner told Mr. Beaird that he would at that point have a better case for demolition.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Wagoner moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does 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: 10/19/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-71-CA: Hank Aaron Loop Lamp Lighting Project

Applicant: City of Mobile

Received: 9/29/11

Meeting: 10/19/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East, Lower Dauphin Commercial, and Out of District
Classification: National Register Historic Districts and environs
Zoning: various
Project: Lighting – Remove existing cobra head lights and install cast iron street lamps.

BUILDING (SUBJECT) HISTORY

Over the course of its history, the City of Mobile has utilized numerous forms of street lighting. Cast iron posts were employed during the 19th and early 20th Centuries. During the second half of the 20th Century, timber and concrete pole signs were installed. Starting the 1960s, some areas, such as the area now known as DeTonti Square Historic District, received new cast iron street lamps. During the 1990s, cast iron street lamps were installed along Dauphin Street, Government Street, and other downtown thoroughfares.

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 application involves the removal and replacement of 198 pole lamps with cast iron street lamps featuring energy efficient LED fixtures.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Lighting can be an important element in the historic districts. Therefore, where lighting impacts the exterior appearance of a building or a district in which the building is located, it shall be reviewed for appropriateness as any other element.
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Remove approximately 198 concrete, aluminum, and timber pole lights.
 - 2. Install replacement cast iron street lamps (of two designs).
 - a. The design of the street lamps will be the same as the existing City-installed cast iron street lamps located in the Lower Dauphin and Church Street East Historic Districts.
 - b. The majority of the cast iron street lamp posts will measure approximately 11’ in height.
 - c. The acrylic street lamp globes and their aluminum decorative aluminum cages will measure approximately 3’ in height. An intervening section of decorative necking will comprise a portion of the aforementioned cage height. A black cap

- will be at the top as part of the new LED lighting system.
- d. The street lamps surrounding Bienville Square will feature a different design. Said lamps will feature downward cast globe shaped lights. The design is based on another historic prototype designed specifically for Bienville Square.
- e. The street lamps will employ energy efficient LED lighting.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the removal and replacement of existing pole lamps with cast iron street lamps.

Throughout the course of the past two centuries, Mobile citizens and the municipal government employed varying types of external lighting solutions in downtown Mobile. During the late 19th Century and early 20th twentieth Century, cast iron lamps were installed by the City. Among the designs employed were examples similar to the two types of proposed replacement lamps.

The existing pole lamps are not in keeping with historic and architectural character typifying the area now known as the Hank Aaron Loop. Selected for installation in the City's oldest settled and most highly trafficked areas, the proposed lamps would not only recapture lost historical character, but would also utilize a more energy efficient means of lighting. Said lighting would neither adversely affect pedestrian nor vehicular traffic. The cast iron posts along with their surmounting globes and gages would be in keeping with the area's architectural surroundings and historical associations.

On account of the existing pole fixtures' lack of historical significance, Staff believes their removal and replacement with more historically and architecturally appropriate cast iron street lamps would not impair the architectural and historical integrity of Hank Aaron Loop.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff does not believe the proposed replacement of the existing pole lamps with the proposed cast iron street lamps would impair the architectural or the historical character of the Lower Dauphin Commercial Historic District, Church Street East Historic District, and the surrounding environs within the Hank Aaron Loop. Staff recommends approval of this application. Staff also recommends approval of the installation of the recreated Bienville Square lights.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Bemis addressed the Board. He said that in the interest of full disclosure that he and other City officials have been heavily involved in this proposal. He told the Board that while funds were not currently available, the City would still like to have the project approved.

Mr. Karwinski asked for clarification as to the logic of proposed replacement locations. Mr. Bemis said that the cobra head signs would be the first to be removed.

Mr. Oswalt asked if the existing lamps could be salvaged. Mr. Bemis addressed Mr. Oswalt's query.

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: 10/19/12