ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
August 21\textsuperscript{st}, 2019 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Steve Stone, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. John Sledge, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
   - **Members Present**: Steve Stone, Catarina Echols, Kim Harden, Craig Roberts, Joseph Rodrigues, and Jim Wagoner.
   - **Members Absent**: Nick Holmes, Abby Davis, Andre Rathle, Robert Brown, and David Barr.
   - **Staff Members Present**: John Sledge, Bridget Daniel, Flo Kessler and Marion McElroy.

2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes of the August 7, 2019 meeting. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the Mid-Months as written. Mr. Wagoner seconded the motion. The Mid-Months were approved unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant**: Phillip Berry of Central Services, LLC
   a. Property Address: 12 S. Monterey Street
   b. Date of Approval: 7/22/2019
   c. Project: Repair damaged wood to match existing in dimension, profile and material. Repaint with white body, gray accents, and gray or black shutters.

2. **Applicant**: Ron Diegan Construction
   a. Property Address: 909 Old Shell Road
   b. Date of Approval: 07/23/2019
   c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in charcoal.

3. **Applicant**: Russ Wilson
   a. Property Address: 1745 Hunter Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 07/23/2019
   c. Project: Replace 12 foot section six foot privacy fence as per existing.

4. **Applicant**: ASHA LLC
   a. Property Address: 252 Church Street
   b. Date of Approval: 07/23/2019
   c. Project: Hanging blade sign on iron pipe.

5. **Applicant**: Horace Quimby
   a. Property Address: 714 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 07/25/2019
   c. Project: Repaint as existing.

6. **Applicant**: Wendell Quimby
   a. Property Address: 258 N Franklin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 07/25/2019
   c. Project: Replace non-historic metal windows with aluminum windows, stucco cinder block.

7. **Applicant**: M Lacy Contracting Inc.
   a. Property Address: 709 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 07/25/2019
   c. Project: Repair and replace shutters to match existing in dimension, profile and material.
8. Applicant: Michelle Harbin
   a. Property Address: 312 N Jackson Street
   b. Date of Approval: 07/25/2019
   c. Project: Construct brick steps and front and back entrances.

9. Applicant: Paul Bridges
   a. Property Address: 156 St Anthony Street
   b. Date of Approval: 07/31/2019
   c. Project: Add missing second story balcony railing on front of building with historically appropriate pattern.

10. Applicant: George Baird Painting Service
    a. Property Address: 1101 Savannah Street
    b. Date of Approval: 07/31/2019
    c. Project: Repair/replace rotten column bases to match original in material, dimension, and profile, Repaint existing color.

11. Applicant: Michael & Michele Rumpf
    a. Property Address: 963 Palmetto Street
    b. Date of Approval: 08/01/2019
    c. Project: Repair front porch. Reinstall railing based on photograph. Repair any damaged structural beams, decking, columns, fascia, and other deteriorated wood on porch to match existing in dimension, profile and material. Any wood that is replaced will match existing.

12. Applicant: Anthony Moore
    a. Property Address: 310 Dauphin Street
    b. Date of Approval: 08/01/2019
    c. Project: Repair and replace window components and wood siding to match existing in dimension, profile, and material. Repaint to match.

13. Applicant: Elizabeth Collins
    a. Property Address: 363 Marine Street
    b. Date of Approval: 08/02/2019
    c. Project: Repair roof, repaint house and shed, replace lattice, repair all rotten wood to match original in materials, profile and dimension, rework deck and steps to reduce tripping hazards.

14. Applicant: David Legett
    a. Property Address: 1208 Selma Street
    b. Date of Approval: 08/05/2019
    c. Project: Repaint house per existing. Repair/replace rotten wood as necessary to match original.

15. Applicant: Patriot Home Construction Inc
    a. Property Address: 1402 Dauphin Street
    b. Date of Approval: 08/06/2019
    c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles to match existing.

16. Applicant: All Weather Roofing and Construction LLC
    a. Property Address: 27 Macy Place
    b. Date of Approval: 08/07/2019
    c. Project: Reroof with shingles to match.

17. Applicant: Lance Lynch
    a. Property Address: 1110 Palmetto Street
    b. Date of Approval: 08/07/2019
    c. Project: Repaint house shittake (trim) and ivory lace (body).
18. Applicant: **David & Chinnita Thomas**  
a. Property Address: 201 S Warren Street  
b. Date of Approval: 08/07/2019  
c. Project: Erect eight foot privacy fence, rear of property.

19. Applicant: **Jerry Arnold**  
a. Property Address: 558 Conti Street  
b. Date of Approval: 08/08/2019  
c. Project: Repaint to match existing.

20. Applicant: **Nicholson Roofing**  
a. Property Address: 1654 Hunter Avenue  
b. Date of Approval: 08/08/2019  
c. Project: Reroof charcoal gray.

21. Applicant: **Mary Dickey**  
a. Property Address: 1258 Elmira Street  
b. Date of Approval: 08/08/2019  
c. Project: Replace deteriorated wood to match in dimension, profile and material. Repaint in the following scheme: Ceiling-light blue (Lighter than Avery Blue); Body-Waterfall SW 6750 (blue); Trim-White; Decking- Navy Blue (In the Navy SW9128); Door- Green (Jitterbug Green).

22. Applicant: **Alabama Iron Works**  
a. Property Address: 206 State Street  
b. Date of Approval: 08/08/2019  
c. Project: Install 3’0”x 3’0” “Hanging Blade” sign composed of painted wood with iron frame. The decorative work on the iron frame will not exceed 1’0” square total. Therefore the total size of the sign will not exceed 10’0” square each side.

23. Applicant: **Ronnie Hawthorne**  
a. Property Address: 62 N Monterey Street  
b. Date of Approval: 08/09/2019  
c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood to match in dimension, profile and material. Wood includes siding, porch decking, columnar posts, balustrade, etc. Repair wooden windows to match. Repaint body in Church Street Grey or similar. Trim in white. Decking and skirt in dark grey.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2019-33-CA: 1673 Government Street**  
a. Applicant: Mr. Robert Dueitt of Robert Dueitt Construction on behalf of Dr. Guillermo Herrera  
**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

2. **2019-34-CA: 658 Government Street**  
a. Applicant: Scott Services on behalf of McDonald’s Real Estate Company  
b. Project: Sign Related: Remove existing menu board signs and install digital menu boards.  
**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

a. Applicant: Mr. Craig Roberts of Eastern Shore Sign on behalf of All In Credit Union  
b. Project: Sign Related: Replace existing signage.  
**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

D. OTHER BUSINESS
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-33-CA: 1673 Government Street
Applicant: Mr. Robert Dueitt of Robert Dueitt Construction on behalf of Dr. Guillermo Herrara
Received: 7/15/2019
Meeting: 8/21/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

The Paterson house was constructed in 1925 and designed by local architect John Platt Roberts.

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 not appeared before the Architectural Review Board according to the MHDC vertical files. The proposed scope of work includes a rear addition.
B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. Design an addition so there is the least possible loss of historic fabric and so the character-defining features of the historic building are not destroyed, damaged or obscured.
   2. Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site (site topography, character-defining site features, trees, and significant district vistas and public views) are retained.
   3. Wherever possible, construct an addition in such a manner that, if the addition were to be removed, the essential form and integrity of the historic structure would be unimpaired.
   4. Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material and character of the property, neighborhood and environment.
   5. Design the building components (roof, foundation, doors and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.
   6. Maintain the relationship of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building.
   7. Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color and/or wall plane. Alternative materials, such as cement fiberboard, are allowed when the addition is properly differentiated from the original structure.
8. If the style of an addition is different than the original, use a style that is compatible with the historic context.

9. Section 6.9: Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.

10. Section 6.10: Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.

11. Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.

12. Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights of an addition to those of the historic building.

13. Design the exterior walls of an addition to be compatible in scale and rhythm with the original historic structure.

14. Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.

15. Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.

16. 6.12: Clearly differentiate the exterior walls of an addition from the original historic structure.

17. Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.

18. Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.

19. Exterior materials of additions should be compatible with the exterior materials existing on the historic structure in size, composition and arrangement.

20. 6.13: Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension and composition.

21. Modern building materials will be evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original historic structure on an individual basis, with the objective of ensuring the materials are similar in their profile, dimension, and composition to those of the original historic structure.

22. Utilize an alternative material for siding as necessary, such as cement-based fiber board, provided that it matches the siding of the historic building in profile, character and finish.

23. Use a material with proven durability. Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.

24. Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.

25. Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.

26. Do not use a faux stucco application.

27. Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension, and composition. The addition shown here, to the right of the original structure, uses siding with a similar profile, dimension and composition.

28. The roof of a new addition should be compatible with the existing historic building. The roof of a new addition should also promote the addition as subordinate in comparison to the historic building.

29. 6.14: Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.

30. Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.
31. Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze boards, moldings or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.
32. Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.
33. 6.15: Design roofs such that the addition remains subordinate to the existing historic buildings in the district. Where possible, locate a dormer or skylight on a new addition in an inconspicuous location.
34. In most cases, match a roof and window on a dormer to those of the original building.
35. The number and placement of doors can impact the compatibility of an addition with the existing historic building. A door for additions should be designed to be compatible with the existing building.
36. 6.16: Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
37. If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the addition.
38. Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.
39. Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.
40. Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.
41. Design the scale of a doorway on an addition to be in keeping with the overall mass, scale and design of the addition as a whole.

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

1. Construct a rear addition.
   a. Addition will be constructed above the current first story southwest wing, and extend from the west elevation.
   b. The aforementioned second story addition above the southwest wing will set upon an existing portion of the structure that measures 34’2-5/8” in depth and 14’1” in width.
   c. The addition will be surmounted by a hipped roof.
   d. A two story addition extending from the west elevation will be 15’6” in width and 13’5” in depth.
   e. The addition will be surmounted by a hipped roof.
   f. The overall addition will cover a footprint that is 34’9-3/4” in depth and 30’3” in width.
   g. The roofs will be sheathed using terra cotta clay barrel tiles to match those of the existing house.
   h. Rafter tails will surmount roof to match those existing.
   i. The walls will be treated with stucco to match existing.
   j. The building will employ metal casement windows or doors with terra cotta sills to match existing.
   k. The aforementioned windows will be multi-lite in configuration.
   l. French doors will be multi-lite in configuration.
   m. The addition extending from the west elevation will sit upon a raised concrete slab with stucco treatment.

2. North (façade) Elevation
   a. Additions will be constructed from the southwest corner of the house
   b. The addition will be setback from the front façade line.
c. The first story fenestration will feature a double window.
d. The second story fenestration will feature a faux/ blind wooden shutter.
e. Fenestration for both stories will be centrally located on the new façade.

3. West (side) Elevation
   a. Construct a second story above an existing first story.
   b. Construct a two story addition in advanced of west elevation.
   c. A first floor French door will be removed to allow for the advanced two story addition.
   d. The advanced portion of the addition will feature a set of two windows on the first floor, and a recessed portion of stucco to mimic an opening on the second floor.
   e. The hipped roof on the aforementioned advanced portion will truncate into the new second story addition above the existing one story.
   f. The existing central set of French doors will be removed and recessed stucco to mimic an opening will be constructed.
   g. The southernmost French doors on the first story will be changed to a multi-lite pattern.
   h. The second story addition above the existing first floor will feature fenestration as follows in an northerly to southerly direction: multi-lite window, multi-lite window, double window.

4. South (rear) Elevation
   a. Extend elevation from existing portion of house. The addition will extend from the West side and be constructed above an existing first story portion.
   b. The portion of the new two story addition extending from the west (side) elevation will be recessed from the second story addition.
   c. The advanced story fenestration sequence will be as follows for the advanced portion: first story will feature new French doors in an existing opening; second story will feature a set of casement windows.
   d. The recessed portion will feature fenestration as follows: the first story will feature a centrally located French door. The second story will feature a double metal casement window.

5. East (side) Elevation (facing terrace)
   a. A second story addition will be constructed on an existing first story.
   b. Three sets of existing first floor French doors will be employed with new multi-lite doors.
   c. The second floor will feature three sets of multi-pane double windows.

6. Site Improvements
   a. A new terrace will be constructed in the courtyard between the east and west wings.
   b. A 15’0” x 30’0” pool will be constructed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

When addressing the nature of redevelopment the design of the addition comes into consideration. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state new additions shall be constructed in such a way that does not impair the original design or details of the existing house (See B-1). The placement, footprint, elevation, and height of the addition serve to make it subordinate to the main body of the residence (See B-2). The addition will be located towards the southwest rear corner of house. The addition will be recessed from the front façade line.

Continuing on the topic of additions, the Design Review Guidelines require they shall be differentiated “from a historic structure using changes in material, color and or wall plane” (See B-7). The addition is differentiated by recessed placement of the addition. The truncated hipped roofs that surmount the design further distinguish the addition from its existing counterparts.
The Design Review Guidelines also state that “building components (roof, foundations, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture” (See B-5). The stucco treatment, terra cotta clay barrel roof tiles, metal casement windows match in configuration, and rafter tails will match those found on the existing residence.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-5), Staff does not believe this application would impair either the architectural or the historical significance of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Robert Dueitt, applicant’s representative, was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed the applicant and asked if he had a site plan available. Mr. Dueitt stated he would send revised site plans to staff. Mr. Roberts commented landscaping needs to be indicated on the site plan as well.

Mr. Sledge asked if the pond would be removed in the back. Mr. Dueitt replied a proposed pool would be installed and measure 16’ x 30’ and that the removal of the pond has not been discussed. He explained the current owner is very diligent and plans to restore the house. Mr. Roberts expressed his excitement for the restoration of the house. Mr. Dueitt stated he will submit the requested site plans.

No further discussion from the Board ensued at that time.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Stone 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 property or neighborhood and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

The motion received a second by Mr. Rodrigues and was approved unanimously.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-34-CA: 658 Government Street
Applicant: Scott Services on behalf of McDonald’s Real Estate Company
Received: 7/30/19
Meeting: 8/21/19

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: T5.1
Project: Sign Related: Remove existing menu board signs and install digital menu boards.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one story brick veneer building was constructed circa 2005.

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 March 17, 2005 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time a request to demolish an existing building and construct a new one-story commercial building was approved. The following signage was also approved at that time: one menu board per drive-thru lane with canopy over menu boards, and four golden “M”.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Design a sign to be compatible with the character of the building and the district.”
   2. “When installing a new sign on a historic building, avoid damaging or obscuring the key architectural features.”
   3. “New signs are limited to a maximum of 64 square feet. Directional signage is not counted toward the total square footage allotment.”
   4. “Place new sign to be compatible with those in the district.”
   5. “Use a sign material that is compatible with the materials of the building on which it is placed and the district. New materials that achieve the effect of traditional materials and lighting solutions will be considered on a case by case basis.”
   6. “Do not use highly reflective material for a sign. All plastic face box signs are not allowed.”
   7. “Design a sign to be subordinate to the building façade.”
   8. “Where necessary, use a compatible, shielded light source to illuminate a sign.”
   9. “Consider direct lighting from an external, shielded lamp when possible.”
   10. “If halo lighting is used, to accentuate a sign or building, locate the light source so that it is not visible.”
   11. “If a back-lit is used, illuminate each individual letter or element separately.”
   12. “If a back-lit sign is used, illuminate each latter or element separately.”
13. Traditional signs include: “Awning or canopy; wall signs; window signs; directional signs; projecting or hanging blade signs; pole-mounted signs; murals; sandwich board or temporary signs; and monument signs.”
14. Acceptable sign materials: “painted or carved wood; individual wood or cast metal letters or symbols; stone; painted, gilded or sandblasted glass; and metal.”
15. Unacceptable materials: “whole plastic face and metal inappropriate for the building.

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

1. Remove existing menu boards.
2. Install two new digital menu boards.
3. Menu boards will be 17.6 square feet total.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application proposes the removal of existing menu boards and installation of two new digital menu boards. The menu boards will total 17.6 square feet each. The total square of the new signs will be 35.2 square feet, which is under the maximum size of signage in historic districts (See B-3). The proposed signs will be illuminated internally. The Design Review Guidelines states that when using lighting, the source shall be external such a “compatible, shielded” light source or “back-lit” or “halo” (See B-8-12).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (8-12), Staff believes the application will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the properties or district by using a light source that is not compatible with the district since it is internally illuminated. Staff recommends denial of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. James Joiner on behalf of Scott Services for McDonald’s, applicant’s representative, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed the applicant and asked if he had any questions, comments or clarifications.
Mr. Joiner stated current boards are internally illuminated. He explained the digital LED is very dim and that the menu board is located on the rear of the property and will not be near the right of way. Mr. Sledge commented we did not have time to do research on these type menu boards. Mr. Joiner replied we did do some research. These menu boards have been allowed in other historic areas.

Ms. Dyson, resident of 203 S Dearborn Street in the Church Street East Historic District, stated her opposition to the proposed signs. She explained her concerns the signs do not meet the guidelines and impairs the district. She then stated her concern for precedent.

Mr. Roberts commented other fast food franchises have been forced to use digital signs because of brand standards. He stated drive thru signs are all over and everywhere in historic districts.
Mr. Stone responded the new proposed sign is smaller. Mr. Joiner confirmed the new sign is smaller.

Mr. Stone replied back to Ms. Dyson the sign is proposed on the rear of the lot out of public view.
Mr. Sledge stated on March 17, 2005 approval was given for the COA for the construction for the signs they have now. He read the COA and it listed the current signage total as 64 square feet. Mr. Stone commented only two menu boards will be installed along drive thru.

Mr. Rodrigues asked if there has been any research into what the precedent is for historic districts currently. Mr. Roberts replied if the proposed falls within the 64’ for the tenant, and materials are approvable a COA can be issued. Mr. Joiner confirmed it is an LED sign. Mr. Roberts inquired to staff what the guidelines state. Mr. Sledge responded several signs have been in place for years before the revised guidelines and they have been grandfathered in. Mr. Stone asked Mrs. Kessler if there is a rule to allow menu boards and not include it in the signage square foot allotment. Mrs. Kessler responded she has not looked at it.

Mrs. Kessler read from the guidelines relating to sign materials. Mr. Roberts responded it is very hard to do menu boards with design guidelines set.

Mr. Sledge asked if the current menu board signs have a plastic face. Mr. Joiner responded yes. Mr. Sledge responded they are not allowed under the current guidelines.

Mr. Stone responded the current menu boards were given a COA and it seemed that menu boards were pulled out from under the signage umbrella. Mrs. Harden responded they are allowed under the 64 square feet total. She asked about the face material. Mr. Joiner responded the face is polycarbonate. Mr. Roberts commented it is hanging under trees, and canopies and only comes up on drive thru. He thought it has already been set for internally lit menu boards, and asked if LED menu boards will be a problem.

Mr. Stone asked if there was a way to make the monitor go blank until someone comes up. Mr. Joiner responded no and explained the menu boards scroll and change. He explained have to be within 25’ to 30’ to read the screen. Mr. Joiner responded we have installed approximately 30 of them in Mobile County and stated can’t see them until you drive up. Mr. Rodrigues commented the main issue is to protect the integrity of the historic districts. Mr. Roberts stated the proposed menu boards are aesthetically more pleasing. Mr. Stone responded they are less intrusive. Mrs. Harden commented you cannot see the sign face form Government Street or Washington Avenue. Mr. Stone commented Burger King and Taco Bell have menu boards located on the rear of the property. Mrs. Harden commented Hardees can be seen from Church Street. Existing signage appears to be within square footage. It was also noted the proposed menu boards reduce the current signage, do not face any right of way, and do not impact the residential portion of the neighborhood.

No further discussion from the Board ensued at that time.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Stone 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 impair the historic integrity of the property or neighborhood. He continued by saying due to the fact this is replacing existing signs and less square footage, installs less intrusive lighting, and does not face a neighborhood street or right of way, the Board grants a Certificate of Appropriateness.

The motion received a second by Mr. Rodrigues and was approved unanimously.
INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.2
Project: Sign Related: Replace existing signs.

BUILDING HISTORY

The complex consists of two commercial structures. First, is a two-story Art Deco building with construction dates of 1924 and 1930. Milton Scoble Builders built it for the Van Antwerp family to house the McCrory’s 5 and 10. It also housed a number of other commercial ventures, including Campbell’s Pharmacy. The second is the three-story Beaux Arts style Fitzgerald building built in 1907. While the upper stories of these three buildings retain much of their historic detailing, the first floors have been altered significantly over the years.

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 March 26, 2007 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time a request to install ATM machines was approved.
B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Design a sign to be compatible with the character of the building and the district.”
   2. “When installing a new sign on a historic building, avoid damaging or obscuring the key architectural features.”
   3. “New signs are limited to a maximum of 64 square feet. Directional signage is not counted toward the total square footage allotment.”
   4. “Place anew sign to be compatible with those in the district.”
   5. “Use a sign material that is compatible with the materials of the building on which it is placed and the district. New materials that achieve the effect of traditional materials and lighting solutions will be considered on a case by case basis.”
   6. “Do not use highly reflective material for a sign. All plastic face box signs are not allowed.”
   7. “Design a sign to be subordinate to the building façade.”
   8. “Where necessary, use a compatible, shielded light source to illuminate a sign.”
   9. “Consider direct lighting from an external, shielded lamp when possible.”
   10. “If halo lighting is used, to accentuate a sign or building, locate the light source so that it is not visible.”
11. “If a back-lit is used, illuminate each individual letter or element separately.”
12. “If a back-lit sign is used, illuminate each letter or element separately.”
13. Traditional signs include: “Awning or canopy; wall signs; window signs; directional signs; projecting or hanging blade signs; pole-mounted signs; murals; sandwich board or temporary signs; and monument signs.”
14. Regarding projection or blade signs: “A projecting sign is attached perpendicular to the wall of a building or structure…it should be designed and located to relate to the building façade and entries. It is appropriate to locate a small projecting sign near the business entrance, just above or to the side of the door to mount a larger projecting sign higher on the building, centered on the façade, or positioned at the corner. The bracket should compliment the sign composition. Note the DDD restrictions for projecting or hanging blade signs.”
15. Regarding window signs: “A window sign is any sign, picture, symbol or combination thereof, designed to communicate information about an activity, business, commodity, event, sale or service that is placed inside within one foot of the inside window pane or upon the window panes or glass, and which is visible from the exterior windows. Window signs should minimize the amount of window covered and preserve transparency at the sidewalk edge. Note the DDD restrictions for window signs.”
16. Acceptable sign materials: “painted or carved wood; individual wood or cast metal letters or symbols; stone; painted, gilded or sandblasted glass; and metal.”
17. Unacceptable materials: “whole plastic face and metal inappropriate for the building.”

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

1. Remove existing signage.
2. Install one painted metal blade sign to be 2’3” x 4’4”.
3. Replace two flat panels 3’7” x 1’2-1/2” with plastic (Lexan) of the same size.
4. Install one window decal with operating hours 1’9” x 2’4”.
5. Install eight decals (4 sets) on different bays of the same size.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application proposes the removal of existing signage and installation of a hanging blade sign, window decal showing operating hours, two ATM replacement panels, and eight window decals with logo. The total square of the new signs will need to total 64 square feet or below to meet the Design Review Guidelines (See B-3). Measurements were given for each sign type except for the 8 window logo decals. Based on the drawings, the aforementioned decals will be about 1’2-1/2” by 3’7” in height. The total of the proposed signage would be about 68.84 square feet and would need to be reduced to meet the maximum amount of 64 square feet total.

The Design Review Guidelines addresses materials of signage in historic decals. The proposed vinyl window decals and painted metal hanging blade sign are approvable (See B-16). The ATM signage as proposed is plastic (Lexan) face (B-17). Staff recommends changing the material of the aforementioned sign to metal to meet the guidelines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on (B-3) and (B-17), Staff believes the application will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the properties or district by using a plastic that is not compatible with the district and because the total size of the signs is larger than the 64 square feet allotment. Staff recommends denial of the application as proposed.
PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Rosalyn Holdefield on behalf of All In Credit Union, applicant’s representative, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed the applicant and asked if she had any clarifications, comments or questions. Ms. Holdefield stated changes to the original submission had been made based upon staff recommendations: minimizing sizes of decals and using metal faces with paint.

Ms. Holdefield confirmed to Mr. Wagoner that this was replacing current signage due to a name alteration.

Mr. Stone also asked about the height minimum of a sign above a sidewalk, and if the applicant had been to CRC. Mrs. McElroy replied to Mr. Stone that she was not aware of this sign.

Ms. Holdefield responded the size of the hanging side would remain the same at 9.75 square feet for each face on the double face sign. She noted the door decal will be reduced and that the plastic faces of the ATM sign will be painted metal. She explained all changes had been made to meet staff recommendations.

Ms. Holdefield confirmed for Mrs. Harden and Mr. Stone that the window decals will be colored vinyl. Ms. Holdefield then confirmed that there would be no vinyl of the ATM panels and that they would be painted metal. Mr. Stone asked if Ms. Holdefield could confirm there would be 4 decals on the Dauphin Street side and 4 decals on the St. Emanuel Street side. Ms. Holdefield responded that was correct. Mr. Roberts asked if the red, white and blue colors have already been determined and stated the colors appeared to be very obtrusive. Mrs. McElroy stated the decals have to be inside the window and have CRC approval too.

Ms. Holdefield stated the ATM signs are being replaced with flat white aluminum replacement faces (2) with graphics being vinyl to match.

No further discussion from the Board ensued at that time.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

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 amended and approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the property or neighborhood and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted noting the application was amended to meet the size requirements and material requirements—except for the vinyl decal on the ATM metal.

The motion received a second by Mr. Rodrigues and was approved unanimously.