

**AGENDA**  
**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

June 11, 2007 – 3:00 P.M.  
Pre-Council Chambers – Mobile Government Plaza  
205 Government Street

**A. CALL TO ORDER – Chair**

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Approval of Mid-Month Requests Approved by Staff

**B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS**

1. **Applicant's Name:** Carson and Brandy Strickland  
**Property Address:** 1007 Savannah Street  
**Date of Approval:** May 8, 2007  
Repair/replace rotten siding with wood to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint residence in the following Benjamin Moore colors:
  - Body – Santo Domingo Cream, 274
  - Trim – White
  - Porch Deck and Shutters – Black
  - Porch Ceiling – In Your Eyes Blue, 715
  - Fish Scales in Gable – Spanish Red, 1301
2. **Applicant's Name:** Ashley Sharer  
**Property Address:** 1721 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** May 8, 2007  
Install new roof using Corning shingles in Williamsburg Gray
3. **Applicant's Name:** Stephanie DeAnda  
**Property Address:** 70 North Reed Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** May 8, 2007  
Repair damaged wood privacy fence with boards to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
4. **Applicant's Name:** Dharm Pannu  
**Property Address:** 204 North Franklin Street  
**Date of Approval:** May 9, 2007  
Paint touch up to match existing colors.
5. **Applicant's Name:** Tony Atchison  
**Property Address:** 551 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** May 10, 2007  
Within the next 30 days: remove east portion of rotten canopy, seal lunette in east elevation, stow fallen ironwork, board two second story windows in rear ell, paint all boards red and remove rotten wood on rear ell eave. Develop full renovation plan once clear title is obtained.
6. **Applicant's Name:** Saralee Lambert  
**Property Address:** 1304 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** May 10, 2007  
Paint exterior in the following Sherwin Williams colors:
  - Body – Burlap, SW6137
  - Trim – Muslin, SW6133
7. **Applicant's Name:** Patricia Felis  
**Property Address:** 206 South Broad Street  
**Date of Approval:** May 10, 2007  
Repair roof with materials to match existing in material, profile, color and dimension.

8. **Applicant's Name:** Fat Daddy's  
**Property Address:** 224 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** May 10, 2007  
Repair the exterior masonry as necessary. Strip and refinish all the exterior Mahogany wood. Paint building in the following colors:
- Body – BLP Poindexter Hill Cream, RC22
  - Window Hoods, Cornice Accents, Brackets, Keystones – BLP Stuyvesant Grove Tan, RC14
  - Pilasters – Benjamin Moore Yorktown Green, HC133
  - Medallion Interiors – Gold
  - Iron Balcony, Iron Posts – BLP Bellingrath Green
9. **Applicant's Name:** Bowen Maintenance  
**Property Address:** 18 North Julia Street  
**Date of Approval:** May 14, 2007  
Replace rotten siding with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint building in the existing colors.
10. **Applicant's Name:** John Mallory  
**Property Address:** 300 George Street  
**Date of Approval:** May 15, 2007  
Repaint the residence in the same color scheme as the residence at 1062 Church Street:
- Body – Green
  - Trim – White
11. **Applicant's Name:** Barbara Sims  
**Property Address:** 154 Macy Place  
**Date of Approval:** May 16, 2007  
Repair rear property line of fence with 5'-0" privacy fence to match existing fence on north and south sides.
12. **Applicant's Name:** Jan Dabney  
**Property Address:** 1707 Laurel Street  
**Date of Approval:** May 16, 2007  
Repair damaged roof on the garage and re clad it with metal panels to match existing metal panels.
13. **Applicant's Name:** Ormandos Jackson  
**Property Address:** 305 Marine Street  
**Date of Approval:** May 18, 2007  
Repaint building trim in a Hunter Green from Glidden. The brick will remain unpainted.
14. **Applicant's Name:** Hunter Compton  
**Property Address:** 200 Dexter Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** May 18, 2007  
Repair/replace rotten wood on garage with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint in the following Sherwin-Williams colors:
- Body – Full Moon, SW6679
  - Trim – White
15. **Applicant's Name:** Walker Brothers Investments  
**Property Address:** 558 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** May 18, 2007  
Remove the plywood from the building and repair/replace all the rotted wood throughout the exterior with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint in the existing colors.
16. **Applicant's Name:** Walker Brothers Investments  
**Property Address:** 476 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** May 18, 2007  
Replace the boards on the third story windows of the west elevation and paint them to match the building. Repair the broken transom on the west elevation with a transom to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Replace the missing vent on the north elevation with a new wood vent.

17. **Applicant's Name:** Jerry Paul Foy and Donnie Crammond

**Property Address:** 1363 Brown Street

**Date of Approval:** May 21, 2007

Repaint the residence and rear workshop in the following Benjamin Moore colors:

- Body – Platinum Gray, 71
- Trim – Wickham Gray, HC171
- Accents – Garrison Red, HC66

18. **Applicant's Name:** WRICO Signs/Quiznos

**Property Address:** 1500 Government Street

**Date of Approval:** May 21, 2007

Install one 31 SF reverse channel lit wall sign with the Quiznos name. The colors will be red and green to match the restaurant's corporate color scheme.

19. **Applicant's Name:** David McConnell

**Property Address:** 150-164 Government Street

**Date of Approval:** May 21, 2007

Replace two window sashes to match existing in dimension and profile.

20. **Applicant's Name:** Michelle Brown

**Property Address:** 1200 New St. Francis Street

**Date of Approval:** May 22, 2007

Replace the rotted porch decking and other wood elements throughout the exterior with new wood to match existing in profile and dimension.

21. **Applicant's Name:** Robert Dueitt Construction/Joe Zoghby

**Property Address:** 7 North Claiborne Street

**Date of Approval:** May 22, 2007

Repair rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile. Paint exterior in the existing color scheme.

22. **Applicant's Name:** Edith Kay Previto

**Property Address:** 68-70 South Royal Street

**Date of Approval:** May 22, 2007

Repair stucco and continue banding to match 68 South Royal. Add black fabric to existing awning frame.

23. **Applicant's Name:** Norman and Louisa Stockman

**Property Address:** 11 North Reed Avenue

**Date of Approval:** May 22, 2007

Repaint the residence to match the existing colors.

24. **Applicant's Name:** Advanced Construction

**Property Address:** 1203 Selma Street

**Date of Approval:** May 24, 2007

Repair/replace rotten siding, porch elements and fascia as necessary. New materials must match existing in profile, dimension and material.

25. **Applicant's Name:** Nicholas A. Vrakelos

**Property Address:** 56 LeMoyne Place

**Date of Approval:** May 24, 2007

Repair and/or replace damaged and deteriorated wood cornice, soffit and fascia as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme. Install new roof with architectural grade shingles either in black, weathered wood or charcoal gray. This COA replaces the COA dated July 7, 2006.

26. **Applicant's Name:** Tuan Titlestad

**Property Address:** 206 Marine Street

**Date of Approval:** May 24, 2007

Level foundation. Repair rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing colors.

27. **Applicant's Name:** Mobile Opera/Mobile Symphony

**Property Address:** 257 Dauphin Street

**Date of Approval:** May 25, 2007

Prep and repaint the exterior in the existing colors, which are outlined in the COA dated July 10, 2001.

28. **Applicant's Name:** Sean Coley

**Property Address:** 159-161 Dauphin Street

**Date of Approval:** May 25, 2007

Repair broken glass and broken ceiling and perform general maintenance, matching the existing in profile, dimension, materials and color.

29. **Applicant's Name:** Brent Blankenship

**Property Address:** 18 Semmes Avenue

**Date of Approval:** May 29, 2007

Construct an 8'-0" by 12'-0" storage shed in the rear of the property per MHDC stock plans.

30. **Applicant's Name:** Debbie Hicks

**Property Address:** 1402 Blacklawn

**Date of Approval:** May 29, 2007

Install a wood handicapped access ramp at the rear of the residence. Ramp will not be visible from the street.

### C. NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS

1. No NOVs or MOTs were issued.

### D. NEW BUSINESS

1. **074-07-CA:** 1552 Fearnway

**Applicant:** Bowden Architecture

**Request:** Install a new brick drive and motor court.

2. **075-07-CA:** 1201 Springhill Avenue

**Applicant:** Franklin Primary Health Center, Inc

**Request:** Install a 6'-0" iron fence with two 12'-0" wide gates.

3. **076-07-CA:** 261 South Ann Street

**Applicant:** Scott Phillips

**Request:** Update the garage apartment and reconfigure parking.

4. **077-07-CA:** 1705 Conti Street

**Applicant:** Francis Forrest

**Request:** Demolish the residence.

5. **078-07-CA:** 114 North Lafayette Street

**Applicant:** James M. Clark

**Request:** Continue the existing fence, stepping down to 6'-0" and 3'-0".

6. **079-07-CA:** 959 Dauphin Street

**Applicant:** John and Joy Klotz

**Request:** Replace the chain link fence with a 3'-0" and 5'-0" picket fence.

7. **080-07-CA:** 1805 Dauphin Street

**Applicant:** Charles Howard and Jim Wagoner

**Request:** Replace the metal garage doors with new metal garage doors.

8. **081-07-CA:** 1559 Dauphin Street

**Applicant:** Mark and Denise Burks

**Request:** Replace the metal handrail with a new wood handrail to match existing.

9. **082-07-CA:** 109 Beverly Court  
**Applicant:** Catherine Sisson  
**Request:** Add a rear shed roof dormer.
10. **083-07-CA:** 18 Semmes Avenue  
**Applicant:** Brent Blankenship  
**Request:** Replace the 1x4 tongue and groove porch decking with 1x6 tongue and groove porch decking.
11. **084-07-CA:** 1500 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Quality Signs  
**Request:** Install two 30 SF signs.
12. **085-07-CA:** 57 North Monterey Street  
**Applicant:** Douglas Kearley  
**Request:** Replace a non-historic fixed window with a pair of French doors with transom.
13. **086-07-CA:** 153 Houston Street  
**Applicant:** Travis Foote  
**Request:** Paint the brick porch.

#### **E. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. Review Board resolutions.

#### **F. ADJOURNMENT**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**074-07-CA:** 1552 Fearnway  
**Applicant:** Bowden Architecture  
**Received:** 05/14/07 (+45 Days: 06/28/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/11/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Install a driveway.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story brick Ranch residence was built in 1948. It is located in the Fearnway area of the Old Dauphin Way district, which is notable as a local example of picturesque town planning.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This residence is located on Fearnway, which was developed as a suburban outgrowth of the City Beautiful Movement. Though the City Beautiful Movement used Beaux Arts monumental architecture, it also relied on beautiful settings. This was translated in suburban planning to a simplified planning tool generally using large lots with deep setbacks in a park like setting. Though not all houses in Fearnway maintained the generously sized lots, the front yards of all the structures are an important characteristic of the neighborhood. In many cases, front drives were not part of the plan or were only minor intrusions leading to rear parking that was also often accessible by rear alleyways. Vehicular access to the majority of residences along this side of the street is from rear alleys.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that driveways and parking areas should have a “design, location and materials [that are] compatible with the property. The appearance...should be minimized through good site planning and design [and] screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences or landscaping.”
- C. The proposed work will install a new brick drive and motor court per the submitted site plan. A new 13'-8" curb cut will be installed and a brick sidewalk will lead to the backyard.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed drive and motor court will impair the historic integrity of the building and the district.

The proposed driveway/motor court will be landscaped and use brick pavers; however, its location in front of the residence and its large size will have a substantial negative impact on the property. Additionally, as mentioned above, Fearnway was developed in the picturesque mold. The pastoral quality of the street and the separation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic are important characteristics.

Staff recommends denying the application.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**075-07-CA:** 1201 Springhill Avenue  
**Applicant:** Franklin Primary Health Center Inc  
**Received:** 05/15/07 (+45 Days: 06/30/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/11/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-3  
**Project:** Install a 6'-0" iron fence around the property.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story brick commercial building was built in 1950.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that "the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district..."

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. There is currently a chain link fence along the east side of the property, a brick wall along the rear and a landscaped border along the front. The parking lot is behind the building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines say fences should "complement the building and not detract from it."
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  - 1. Install a 6'-0" black classic steel fence with spear topped posts per the submitted site plan.
  - 2. Install two 6'-0" by 12'-0" black classic steel vehicular gates at Michael Donald Avenue (east).

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The proposed fence and gates fall within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines. Also, the fence and gates are similar to the fencing that surrounds many of the commercial and institutional properties in this area.

Staff recommends approving the application.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**076-07-CA:** 261 South Ann Street  
**Applicant:** Scott Phillips  
**Received:** 05/17/07 (+45 Days: 07/01/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/11/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing (Garage Apartment) and Contributing (Main Residence)  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Update garage apartment and reconfigure parking.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

Previous records in MHDC's files date this garage apartment to 1945, although a one-story structure with a 259 South Ann Street address appears on this site on the 1925 Sanborn map. It is difficult to tell, however, if it is the current building. The garage is now part of 261 South Ann Street. The main residence has been used as multiple units since at least 1925.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that "the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district..."

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This garage structure was an apartment. It is currently vacant, as is the main residence. Both buildings are currently being converted into condominiums.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building. They also state that parking areas should have a "design, location and materials [that are] compatible with the property. The appearance...should be minimized through good site planning and design [and] screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences or landscaping."
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  1. Convert the garage apartment into a two-story townhouse per the submitted plan.
    - a. Construct a balcony on the 2<sup>nd</sup> story with tongue and groove hardwood decking and a Colonial handrail.
    - b. Replace the 3/1 windows on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor with paired French double doors with 12 true divided lights each.
    - c. Construct a patio on the 1<sup>st</sup> story with Herringbone brick pavers and a Colonial picket fence with gate.
    - d. Replace the garage doors on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor with paired French double doors with 12 true divided lights each.
    - e. Remove the existing exterior stairs and door on the south elevation.
    - f. Open new window holes on the north, south and east for new wood 6/6 sash windows with true divided lights.
    - g. Match all new window and door trims to existing.
    - h. Locate the new HVAC unit at the rear of the building.



2. Reconfigure the parking for the property per the submitted plan.
  - a. Enlarge the 21'-0" wide curb cut at South Ann Street to 24'-0" wide.
  - b. Enlarge the existing concrete driveway at South Ann Street to allow four 8'-0" by 18'-0" parking spaces.
  - c. Enlarge the 8'-0" wide curb cut at Texas Street to 24'-0" wide.
  - d. Enlarge the existing gravel parking pad at Texas Street to allow three 8'-0" by 18'-0" parking spaces.
  - e. Install a brick walk from the street to the garage building.
  - f. Install a 6'-0" dog-eared wood privacy fence to separate the parking area from the garage building.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that there are elements to the proposed work that will impair the historic integrity of the building and the district.

Rather than installing new windows in the proposed openings on the north, south and east elevations, the applicant should reuse the windows that were removed from the west elevation. The handrail should match that of the main building. Staff feels that the remainder of the work proposed for the garage apartment will not impair the building or the district. It is currently a non-contributing outbuilding to the main residence with little defining character.

The areas being proposed for parking are already being used as such. The proposed condominium project will have either four or five units. The proposed amount of parking is seven spaces – four at South Ann Street, which will only be minimally enlarged, and three at Texas Street, which will be paved with an alternate material such as gravel or grasscrete to reduce its impact. The privacy fence falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines.

Staff recommends that Item C1(f) be amended to have the applicant reused the existing removed windows. Staff recommends that new elements, including the handrails, match the existing elements of the main residence. Staff recommends approving the remainder of the application.

The applicant will need to speak with Traffic Engineering and Right-of-Way regarding the curb cuts. The applicant will also need to speak with Urban Forestry regarding any tree removal.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**077-07-CA:** 1705 Conti Street  
**Applicant:** Francis Forrest  
**Received:** 05/21/07 (+45 Days: 07/05/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/11/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Demolish residence.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This one-story frame late Victorian cottage was built circa 1910. In 1984, Mr. Charlie Vaughn, who was the owner at the time, constructed an addition to the residence with the help of MHDC's Free Design Clinic.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

**Section 44-79 of the Mobile City Code – Demolition/Relocation of structures within the Historic Districts:**

- (a) *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:
- (1) The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
  - (2) The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
  - (3) The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
  - (4) 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;
  - (5) 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.
- (b) *Content of applications.* All applications to demolish or remove a structure in a historic district shall contain the following minimum information:
- (1) The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
  - (2) The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
  - (3) Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
  - (4) 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;
  - (5) Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;

- (6) 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
  - (7) Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
- (c) *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.

#### **STAFF REPORT**

- A. Currently, 1705 Conti Street is in a decrepit state. Ms. Marion Forrest, the current owner, considered renovating the property, but she found that the deterioration was too extensive and costly. The City recently declared the property a public nuisance, and it has directed that the owner repair or demolish the building.
- B. In considering demolitions, the Design Review Guidelines refer to **Section 44-79 of the Mobile City Code**, discussed above.
- C. The proposed work will demolish the existing residence and either sell or donate any salvageable elements.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Until recently, a family member lived in the home, but did not adequately maintain it. Since vacating the property, there has been no other attempt by Ms. Forrest to improve upon or reuse the property or sell the residence. In addition, there are no definite post-demolition plans.

As a contributing building to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District, the demolition or removal of this building would result not only in an impairment of the historic structure, but also the historic district. Staff recommends denial of this application.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**078-07-CA:** 114 North Lafayette Street  
**Applicant:** James Clark  
**Received:** 05/23/07 (+45 Days: 07/07/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/11/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Install a privacy fence around the property.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story brick Ranch was built circa 1955.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that "the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district..."

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. There is currently an 8'-0" wood privacy fence along the north property line.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines say fences should "complement the building and not detract from it."
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  - 1. Install a 6'-0" wood privacy fence along the east property line per the submitted site plan to match the existing 8'-0" fence in material and profile.
  - 2. Install a 3'-0" wood privacy fence along the east and south property lines per the submitted site plan to match the existing 8'-0" fence in material and profile.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The proposed fence falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines.

Staff recommends approving the application.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**079-07-CA:** 959 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** John W. and Joy Klotz  
**Received:** 05/23/07 (+45 Days: 07/07/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/11/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-1  
**Project:** Repair and extend the existing picket fence.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story side-hall town house has elements of Italianate and Greek Revival throughout its interior/exterior. It was built in 1859 for Lieutenant Colonel Charles Stewart and his family. The Neo-Classical front porch was added in 1909.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that "the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district..."

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. There is currently a picket fence on the north and east sides of the parking pad and a chain link fence on the south side.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines say fences should "complement the building and not detract from it." Furthermore, the Guidelines state that a wood picket fence is an appropriate option.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  - 1. Repair the 5'-0" picket fence with materials matching in material, profile and dimension.
  - 2. Replace the chain link fence with a new 40'-8" wood picket fence to match existing.
    - a. It will be 3'-0" tall to 20'-0" from the west lot line and 5'-0" tall for the remaining 20'-8".
    - b. It will not impact the south neighbor's windows.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The proposed fence falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines.

Staff recommends approving the application.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**080-07-CA:** 1805 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Charles Howard and Jim Wagoner  
**Received:** 05/23/07 (+45 Days: 07/07/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/11/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Replace the existing metal garage doors with new metal garage doors.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story frame Victorian residence was built circa 1910.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district..”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. The current garage doors are standard multi-panel metal doors.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “wood or metal garage doors should be simple in design and compatible with the main building.”
- C. The proposed work will replace the current metal 16-panel garage doors with white Coachman 4-layer steel doors – Series One, Model C11. The spade lift handles and strap hinges will be black.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The new garage door is compatible to the main residence.

Staff recommends approving the application.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**081-07-CA:** 1559 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Mark and Denise Burks  
**Received:** 05/29/07 (+45 Days: 07/13/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/11/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Replace the damaged handrail with a new handrail.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story frame residence with a circular porch was built circa 1900.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. The east-side stairs leading to the second floor are a non-historic addition to the residence. The existing metal handrails are in poor condition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work will replace the existing metal handrail on the east side of the residence with a new wood handrail that matches the existing rails on the rest of the building.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The existing non-historic stairs are not original to the residence and the handrail is in poor condition. The new rail will match that of the rest of the residence.

Staff recommends approving the application.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**082-07-CA:** 109 Beverly Court  
**Applicant:** Catherine Sisson  
**Received:** 05/29/07 (+45 Days: 07/13/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/11/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Add a rear shed roof dormer.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story brick Colonial Revival residence was built in 1931.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. The Sissons are renovating the top floors of the residence to create more space for their family. In order to meet current building and fire codes, the existing stairs and attic must be reconfigured. This includes additional access and ventilation for the attic space.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work will add a shed roof dormer on the rear elevation of the residence. All new materials will match existing materials to include the wood lap siding, wood trim, wood corner boards and shingle roof. The windows will be wood casements with true divided lights.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the changes will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The dormer is a small addition that will be minimally seen and all the new materials will match existing materials. Also, as can be seen in the submitted floor plan, the shape and pitch of the dormer has been dictated by the interior.

Staff recommends approving the application.



**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**083-07-CA:** 18 Semmes Avenue  
**Applicant:** Brent Blankenship  
**Received:** 05/29/07 (+45 Days: 07/13/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/11/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Replace rotted porch decking.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story frame residence was built in 1928.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. The porch decking for this residence is rotted and was recently removed in order to install new decking.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work will replace the rotted 1x4 tongue and groove wood porch decking with 1x6 tongue and groove wood porch decking.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the changes will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The new decking is a minimal change that will not significantly alter the characteristics of the building.

Staff recommends approving the application.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**084-07-CA:** 1500 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Quality Signs/Wow Café and Wingery  
**Received:** 05/29/07 (+45 Days: 07/13/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/11/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** LB-2  
**Project:** New Signage.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This contemporary masonry shopping center was built in 2004.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This building has ten storefronts. Under a previous review, the Board allotted the two anchor stores 64 SF of signage and each of the remaining eight storefronts 30 SF of signage. The proposed Wow Café and Wingery will take up two storefronts.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and along Government Street state that signs shall “not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building...shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property...shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs...should match the historic materials of the building...[and] shall use focused, low intensity illumination.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  - 1. Install one 29 SF wall sign with individual aluminum reverse channel lit letters per the submitted specifications.
  - 2. Install one 30 SF wall sign with individual aluminum reverse channel lit letters per the submitted specifications.
  - 3. The total sign package is approximately 59 SF.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the wall signs will not impair the historic integrity of the district. The proposed signs fall within the standards of the Sign Design Guidelines concerning size, materials and lighting. Also, the applicant has split the sign into two parts in order to fit them within the building’s existing sign panels.

Staff recommends approving the application.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**085-07-CA:** 57 North Monterey Street  
**Applicant:** Douglas Kearley  
**Received:** 05/29/07 (+45 Days: 07/13/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/11/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Replace a window with a pair of French doors.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story frame Sidehall residence was built circa 1908.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. There is currently a fixed 6'-0" wide non-historic wood window located at the rear porch where the doors are proposed.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work will replace the existing fixed 6'-0" wide non-historic wood window with a pair of Spanish cedar French doors with transoms.
  - 1. The doors will be true divided light with 15 panes of tempered glass each.
  - 2. The doors will be 6'-0" wide (3'-0" each) to fit within the existing window opening.
  - 3. The trim and casing will match existing trims and casings.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The proposed doors will be replacing a non-historic window at the rear of the property and will fit within the width of the existing opening. Also, the material and profile of the doors will match existing elements.

Staff recommends approving the application.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**086-07-CA:** 153 Houston Street  
**Applicant:** Travis Foote  
**Received:** 05/29/07 (+45 Days: 07/13/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/11/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Paint the brick on the front porch.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story frame bungalow was built circa 1920. It has undergone a number of changes throughout the years, including vinyl siding, a rear addition and altered windows.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This residence is currently being renovated. A previous Certificate of Appropriateness reflects the work being done, although the paint colors and placement were to be determined at a later date. The paint colors were chosen without staff knowledge, and while staff does not object to the colors, we would have made it known that unpainted brick must remain unpainted.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that the “painting of unpainted brick is...inappropriate in most cases.”
- C. Paint the brick on the front porch with the High Tea accent color. The porch is currently painted the same Rookwood Terra Cotta color as the body of the residence, and staff has received a complaint from a neighbor regarding the color of the porch.

**RECOMMENDATION**

As a rule, the Board does not allow historically unpainted brick to be painted, so staff would normally recommend that the application be denied. However, the Design Review Guidelines does allow for rare exceptions to the rule. Based on this, staff feels the application should be approved due to two factors:

- Removing the paint from the brick could prove to be more damaging than leaving it on. There could also be a sizeable amount of paint left even after cleaning it.
- According to Mr. Foote, there was a considerable amount of masonry repair necessary. After repairing the brick and repointing the mortar, he found that the new work did not match the old.

Staff recommends allowing the paint to remain on the brick, but repainting it in the High Tea accent color in order to break up the amount of Rookwood Terra Cotta on the residence.