

**AGENDA**  
**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**  
October 15, 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:** John Baker  
**Property Address:** 956 Charleston Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 19, 2007  
Paint building in the following BLP color scheme:
  - Body – Suffolk Tan, RC38
  - Trim – White, 25-16
  - Doors – Black
  - Porch Deck and Steps – Kerr's Tavern, RC13
2. **Applicant's Name:** Scott Phillips  
**Property Address:** 261 South Ann Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 25, 2007  
Install new roof on main house using Timberline shingles, Estate Gray in color.
3. **Applicant's Name:** J.C. Duke  
**Property Address:** 1223 Selma Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 25, 2007  
Replace damaged wood on the front porch with materials to match existing. Paint in the existing color scheme.
4. **Applicant's Name:** Tom and Tissa Loehr  
**Property Address:** 201 South Dearborn Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 25, 2007  
Construct an 8'-0" x 12'-0" shed in the rear yard following the standard design for a lap-siding basic storage structure supplied by the MHDC.
5. **Applicant's Name:** Marwa G. Allen  
**Property Address:** 311 North Joachim Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 25, 2007  
Install new roof to include new decking as necessary, light gray or dark gray architectural shingles. Repair to rotten wood as necessary to include siding, foundation, 1x4 tongue and groove porch decking, steps, etc.
6. **Applicant's Name:** Mary Schalin  
**Property Address:** 116 Providence Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 25, 2007  
Repair/replace rotted wood siding with siding to match existing. Paint residence in the existing color scheme.
7. **Applicant's Name:** John Pyron  
**Property Address:** 128 North Julia Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 26, 2007  
Reclad the roof with Black 3-tab shingles.
8. **Applicant's Name:** Margie Crawford  
**Property Address:** 104 North Julia Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 26, 2007  
Repaint in the existing color scheme:
  - Body – Sherwin-Williams Sage Green, SW2860
  - Trim – Sherwin-Williams Classical White, SW2829

9. **Applicant's Name:** David Trammell  
**Property Address:** 357 Regina Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** September 26, 2007  
Repair/replace as needed wood siding and architectural details with siding and details to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint residence in the existing color scheme:
- Body – Blue/Gray
  - Trim – White
10. **Applicant's Name:** Kern Jackson  
**Property Address:** 912 Savannah Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 28, 2007  
Repair/replace as needed the rotted wood handrail with MHDC stock handrail #1. Repair/replace as needed the rotted wood posts with posts to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint to match the existing color scheme.
11. **Applicant's Name:** J Gardner  
**Property Address:** 359 Regina Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** October 1, 2007  
Paint in the existing color scheme.
12. **Applicant's Name:** Mary Schalin  
**Property Address:** 26 South Lafayette Street  
**Date of Approval:** October 1, 2007  
Paint in the existing color scheme.
13. **Applicant's Name:** Geoffrey and Avery Fick  
**Property Address:** 1319 Old Shell Road  
**Date of Approval:** October 1, 2007  
Paint in the existing color scheme.
14. **Applicant's Name:** Bill Host  
**Property Address:** 1661 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** October 1, 2007  
Paint in the existing color scheme. Construct new 12'-0" x 12'-0" storage shed per MHDC pre-approved plans. The shed will have a gable roof with shingles to match house, Hardiplank siding in a board and batten pattern painted to match the house and a wood door.

#### C. OLD BUSINESS

1. **136-07-CA:** 354 Regina Avenue  
**Applicant:** Ronald and Ruth Suggs  
**Request:** Construct a rear addition.

#### D. NEW BUSINESS

1. **171-07-CA:** 115-117 North Julia Street  
**Applicant:** Providence Homes LLC  
**Request:** Construct four townhouses.
2. **172-07-CA:** 1703 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Justin Merrick  
**Request:** Extend the existing fences.
3. **173-07-CA:** 62 North Reed Avenue  
**Applicant:** Tom Radcliff  
**Request:** Add a covered back porch.
4. **174-07-CA:** 105 Beverly Court  
**Applicant:** Jake Epker  
**Request:** Demolish the existing one-story carport to build a new two-story carport.

5. **175-07-CA:** 1001 Augusta Street  
**Applicant:** Kevin Cross  
**Request:** Remove a rear door and several window AC units.
6. **176-07-CA:** 359 Regina Avenue  
**Applicant:** DeWayne Gardner  
**Request:** Add on to a rear bathroom.
7. **177-07-CA:** 27 Hannon Street  
**Applicant:** Katie Jernigan  
**Request:** Replace some windows.
8. **178-07-CA:** 308 St. Louis Street  
**Applicant:** Steven Barr  
**Request:** Add awnings to the south elevation.
9. **179-07-CA:** 26 South Lafayette Street  
**Applicant:** Mary Schalin  
**Request:** Add a rear dormer.
10. **180-07-CA:** 116 Providence Street  
**Applicant:** Mary Schalin  
**Request:** Increase the porch roof pitch.
11. **181-07-CA:** 67 North Reed Avenue  
**Applicant:** Gail and Hugh McCain  
**Request:** Add a rear dormer.
12. **182-07-CA:** 1604 Springhill Avenue  
**Applicant:** Douglas Kearley  
**Request:** Install a handicapped access ramp.
13. **183-07-CA:** 173 South Georgia Avenue  
**Applicant:** Margaret Meaher  
**Request:** Rebuild the rear garage.
14. **184-07-CA:** 200 Dexter Avenue  
**Applicant:** Hunter and Lisa Compton  
**Request:** Install new fences and reconfigure the drives and walks.
15. **185-07-CA:** 10 South Julia Street  
**Applicant:** Steven Milling  
**Request:** Paint the brick.
16. **186-07-CA:** 203 South Warren Street  
**Applicant:** Darrel Williams  
**Request:** Paint and stain the front porch.
17. **187-07-CA:** 1703 Conti Street  
**Applicant:** Marion Forrest/Volkert  
**Request:** Construct a water pumping station.
18. **188-07-CA:** 461 Marine Street  
**Applicant:** Willie Jones  
**Request:** Add a rear sunroom.

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

1. No other business.

#### **F. ADJOURNMENT**

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

**136-07-CA:** 354 Regina Avenue  
**Applicant:** Ronald and Ruth Suggs  
**Received:** 08/13/07 (+45 Days: 09/27/07)  
**Meeting:** 08/27/07  
**Resubmitted:** 09/28/07  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Construct an addition.

**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 "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. Mr. and Mrs. Suggs received a CoA for work on the residence in February 2005, which included the replacement of rotted wood and painting. However, during the course of the work, they started to put up walls on an existing concrete block foundation for an addition to the rear. Although work has been stopped for a while, staff recently received a complaint from an Oakleigh Garden Historic District resident that the work was not being done as approved, and an NoV was issued on July 18, 2007. The Suggs came before the Board in August 2007. The Board voted to table the application at that time pending new elevations showing how the roof will be treated and corrected window proportions.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that new additions should respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed plan includes the following:
1. Attach an 8'-0" x 30'-0" two-story addition per the submitted plans.
    - a. It will sit on the existing concrete block foundation.
    - b. There will be a 6'-0" x 8'-0" double French door with 15-lights located on the left side of the rear elevation.
    - c. There will be 4'-0" x 6'-0" single-pane wood fixed windows on the second floor of the rear elevation with one smaller fixed window.
    - d. The existing 4'-0" x 9'-0" 2/2 wood sash windows will be relocated to the new side and rear elevations.
    - e. The materials and design elements such as the siding, trim, fascia, roof overhang, etc will match existing.
  2. Prep and paint the entire residence in the existing color scheme.
  3. Reassemble the rear deck in the new location.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Because the original submission did not have complete elevations showing how the new addition was going to fit the existing residence, the Board tabled the application pending new drawings. Also, the original plans had incorrect window proportions, calling for smaller windows on the first floor and larger windows on the second floor. Mr. and Mrs. Suggs' new application has complete elevations and correct window proportions. The design and materials of the new construction will match the existing residence. The historic windows, some of which were removed during an earlier renovation, and the non-historic rear deck will be reused/reassembled on the new addition. However, staff believes there are still some elements of the proposed work that will impair the historic integrity of the building.

Staff feels that the second-story windows on the rear elevation appear awkward and incorrectly scaled and that they should be reconfigured to better fit the residence. Staff believes that the 4'-0" x 6'-0" fixed windows should be either sash windows similar to the existing ones or enlarged to give the impression of an enclosed porch (the applicants have indicated that this will be a den or sunroom). Also, the small fixed window on the second story should have different proportions. The concrete block foundation on which the new addition will rest, which is an existing element, is unfinished and must be stuccoed. Primarily, staff believes that the submitted elevations do not give a clear picture of what the proposed addition will look like. Mr. and Mrs. Suggs have indicated that their addition will be very similar to a neighbor's existing addition. Staff feels that if this is so, they should either submit the neighbor's drawings or photographs of that addition along with the current supplemental material.

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

**171-07-CA:** 115-117 North Julia Street  
**Applicant:** Providence Homes LLC  
**Received:** 09/24/07 (+45 Days: 11/08/07)  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-1  
**Project:** Construct 4 new townhouses.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

There is currently a vacant lot on these two properties.

**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. As mentioned above, this is currently a vacant lot. Originally proposed as eight townhouses, staff received many calls in opposition to the large number of units. Ultimately, the Board determined that eight units in this neighborhood would impair the historic integrity of the district. Members of the Board suggested that a four-unit building, historic examples of which can be found throughout Old Dauphin Way, would be more appropriate.
- B. The Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction state “the goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
1. Construct four new townhouses per the submitted plans.
    - a. The building will face North Julia Street and have a 2'-0" Ole Virginia Brick floating slab foundation with decorative cast iron vents.
    - b. The first floor will be 10'-0" and the second floor will be 9'-0" with a hipped roof and three cross gables.
    - c. It will be clad in Hardiplank lap siding with Hardiplank trim.
    - d. The front doors will be wood with a six-pane light and one decorative panel; the rear doors will be wood with four decorative panels.
    - e. The windows will be vinyl-clad wood 1/1 sashes with factory screens and single-pane fixed.
    - f. The roof will be clad in Charcoal blend Timberline architectural shingles.
    - g. The front (east) façade will have inset doors, second-story balconies, awnings on the middle paired windows and wood steps and wood handrails leading to the front doors.
    - h. There will be stoops with wood rails, steps and awnings at the rear (west) elevation.
    - i. Ornamentation will be minimal, consisting of a water table and iron vents at the foundation, crown molding at the eaves, brackets at the awnings, gable vents and trim.
    - j. There will be eight parking spaces on the north side of the property; the lot will be landscaped and paved with crushed limestone.
    - k. There will be a back yard area with a small gazebo included as part of the landscape plan.
  2. Extend the existing privacy fence on the south side per the requirements of Urban Development.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff believes that the plan is much more appropriate for the neighborhood. The number has been reduced from two buildings with eight units to one building with four units, and quadruplexes are historic and common building types throughout Old Dauphin Way. The principal façade of the building is fronted to face North Julia with a setback similar to the other residences on the street. Also, the parking area has been reduced to eight spaces that sit at the back of the lot with heavy landscaping. There is also a large greenspace in the rear, which creates a backyard for residents.

The design of the buildings is more appropriate as well. While ornamentation is minimal, inset doors, second-story balconies, awnings on the middle paired windows and cross gables break up the front of the building. This allows each unit to read separately from the others. The side and rear elevations have less movement, but are still somewhat broken up by porches, awnings and door placement. Staff recommends approving the application.

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

**172-07-CA:** 1703 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Justin Merrick  
**Received:** 09/20/07 (+45 Days: 11/04/07)  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Extend existing fences.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story frame Victorian residence was constructed circa 1890.

**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 6'-0" wood privacy fence at the north and west boundaries and a variable height (4'-0" to 5'-0") fence along the south boundary. The residence is next to the Senior Center.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[fences] should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet...the finished side of the fence should face toward public view.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  - 1. Extend the existing variable height fence approximately 8'-0" to the west and 50'-0" to the north per the submitted site plan.
  - 2. Erect a similar style fence 3'-0" in height to separate the parking area and back yard per the submitted site plan.

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Staff recommends approving the application.

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

**173-07-CA:** 62 North Reed Avenue  
**Applicant:** Tom Radcliff  
**Received:** 09/24/07 (+45 Days: 11/08/07)  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Add a covered porch to the back of the house.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story frame Bungalow residence was constructed circa 1915. However, the front porch columns appear too small compared to the scale of the residence and older Sanborn maps show a different porch configuration, which suggests that the porch and/or posts are not original. The second front door was likely added to the residence during WWII when many single-family homes were split into multiple dwellings due to the housing shortage.

**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 no back porch for this residence.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that new additions should respect the age and style of the building.
- C. Mr. Radcliff is proposing to attach a 12'-0" x 27'-6" one-story porch to the rear of the residence per the submitted plans that will mimic the front porch.
  - 1. The proposed rear porch will be detailed to match the existing front porch, including square wood columns with capitals and a beam across the top (the rear elevation drawing does not show the detailing).
  - 2. The back door and two windows will be replaced with two sets of paired 3'-0" x 8'-0" doors with nine lights each.
  - 3. All details and materials will match existing to include the roof pitch, roof shingles, exposed rafter tails, 10x10 wood columns, brick bases, brick piers and masonry steps.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff believes the design and materials of the proposed back porch will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. However, the arrangement of two sets of double doors is not typical of this period and staff suggests leaving a window in place of one set of double doors. Also, any removed historic windows should be salvaged.

Staff recommends approving the application with the above modifications.

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

**174-07-CA:** 105 Beverly Court  
**Applicant:** Melissa and Jake Epker  
**Received:** 09/28/07 (+45 Days: 11/11/07)  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Replace the one-story carport with a two-story carport.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story brick Colonial Revival was constructed circa 1940 for Ben F. Adams.

**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 one-story wood frame carport at the northwest corner of the lot. Mr. and Mrs. Epker recently came before the Board for a new carport; however, the application was denied because the proposed design did not complement the main residence.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[a]n accessory structure...includes, but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like...[it] should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. The Epkers are proposing to demolish the existing one-story carport to construct a two-story carport:
  - 1. It will sit on the existing footprint and **will not** be attached to the main residence as in the submitted plans.
  - 2. The roof pitch will match that of the main residence and the roof will be clad in shingles to match the main residence. The overall height of the structure will be one to two feet shorter than the gable on the house.
  - 3. It will have Hardiplank siding to mimic the wood siding on the main residence.
  - 4. There will be 6/6 paired wood windows with true divided lights at the east (front) and north elevations and single 6/6 wood windows with true divided lights at the west and south elevations. They will have operable wood shutters to match the main residence.
  - 5. The first floor will be a carport that will be open on the east (front) and north elevations, partially open on the south elevation and enclosed on the west elevation.
  - 6. There will be a wing on the south elevation with a door and stairs leading to the second floor.
  - 7. Ornamentation will match the main residence including gable returns, supporting columns and shutters.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Because the original submission called for a Craftsman style garage, which did not fit the Colonial Revival style of the main residence, the Board denied the application and requested a new plan. Also, the original plans were not clear regarding whether the Epkers were going to construct the structure with an open carport or an enclosed garage. Mr. and Mrs. Epker’s new application addresses these questions.

The design of the new construction will match the main residence, including the gable returns, columns, shutters, windows, roof pitch and material profiles. The first floor will be an open carport similar to the existing carport on the property. Staff feels that the two-story garage will not impair the integrity of the building or district and recommends approving the application. Two-story garages are historically found in this neighborhood and the style of this proposed structure will complement the main residence. Specifications for the door, however, will need to be submitted to staff before installation.



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

**175-07-CA:** 1001 Augusta Street  
**Applicant:** Kevin Cross  
**Received:** 09/24/07 (+45 Days: 11/07/07)  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Remove the AC wall units and a rear door, awning and brick stair.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story Classical Revival residence was built circa 1870. At some point in time, the residence was turned into a multi-family dwelling. It is being returned to a single-family residence.

**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. As mentioned above, at one point in time, this residence was turned into a multi-family dwelling with a second entrance located at the rear of the building. Air conditioning wall units were also installed for the apartments.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building and that “[r]eplacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
- C. Mr. Cross is proposing to replace the AC wall units and a rear door, awning and brick stair, which are later alterations to the residence, with siding to match existing. The new siding will be painted in the existing color scheme.

**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 proposed work seeks to reconfigure later, unsympathetic alterations into something more appropriate and historically accurate. The new materials will match existing in material, profile and dimension. Although staff remains guarded about enclosing a door that may now be historic in and of itself, the impact will be minimal as the door, awning and landing are located at the rear of the residence.

Staff recommends approving the application.

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

**176-07-CA:** 359 Regina Avenue  
**Applicant:** J. DeWayne Gardner  
**Received:** 10/01/07 (+45 Days: 11/14/07)  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Add on to a rear bathroom.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story frame residence was built circa 1904 with later porch modifications. At some point in time, a bedroom, bathroom and laundry room was added to the rear.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states “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 vacant and being renovated. As mentioned above, there is a later addition on the back of the residence.
- B. The Design Guidelines state that new additions should respect the age and style of the building.
- C. Mr. Gardner is proposing to enlarge the rear bathroom 6'-4" x 4'-2". A non-historic window will be removed and all new design and materials will match existing.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels the new addition will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The new addition is a small bump out onto a later alteration and the design and materials will match existing.

Staff recommends approving the application.

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

**177-07-CA:** 27 Hannon Avenue  
**Applicant:** Mary C. (Katie) Jernigan  
**Received:** 10/01/07 (+45 Days: 11/14/07)  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Replace some windows.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story frame Bungalow was constructed circa 1930.

**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. Currently, a number of windows along the sides of the residence are rotted and must be replaced.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[o]riginal window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing...where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  - 1. Replace seven historic windows with new wood 6/6 sashes with true divided lights to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
  - 2. Repaint the residence in the existing color scheme except for the underpinning, which will be painted dark green.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the application, staff feels that the proposed work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. Ms. Jernigan is doing general maintenance and repair on her residence. The windows that are being replaced are those that are in too poor a condition to repair. They are being replaced with windows to match existing in material, profile and dimension.

Staff recommends approving the application.

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

**178-07-CA:** 308 St. Louis Street  
**Applicant:** Steven Barr  
**Received:** 10/01/07 (+45 Days: 11/14/07)  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** DeTonti Square  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-4  
**Project:** Add additional awnings to the St. Louis elevation of the building.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This two-story masonry commercial building was the Mobile Fixture warehouse. The Board approved a plan in August 2006 to redevelop it into 21 residential condominiums. The majority of the building lies outside of the district; however, a small section at the northeast side is in DeTonti Square.

**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 St. Louis Street elevation of the building currently has no awnings. Awnings were approved for the Claiborne Street elevation.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines do not specifically address awnings, but rather states that they will be “reviewed on a case by case basis.”
- C. Mr. Barr is proposing to add awnings on the section of the building that fronts St. Louis Street. There will be either one or three awnings. If one is added, it will be located over the entry/exit doors. If three are added, they will be located over the entry/exit doors and both first floor windows. The awnings will be identical in color and style to the awnings that were approved for the Claiborne Street elevation (Sunbrella Gaston – Jewel).

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the district. The awnings will match those that have already been approved for this building. Staff feels that either one or three awnings is acceptable.

Staff recommends approving the application.

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

**179-07-CA:** 26 South Lafayette Street  
**Applicant:** Mary Schalin  
**Received:** 10/01/07 (+45 Days: 11/14/07)  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07

**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 frame Creole Cottage was built circa 1867. The rear of the residence has been considerably altered.

**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 owners are renovating the top floor of the residence to create more living space.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[a]ccessory roof elements not original to the structure...shall be located inconspicuously.”
- C. The proposed work will add a shed roof dormer (approximately 1’-0” x 7’-0”) 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. There will be a single-pane fixed window.

**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; the existing roof and the interior have dictated its size, shape and pitch. Staff is nonetheless concerned about the proposed window for the dormer and feels that sash or casement windows would be more appropriate. However, it is possible that the small size of the dormer will prevent a typical window.

Staff recommends approving the application with casement or sash windows if possible.

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

**180-07-CA:** 116 Providence Street  
**Applicant:** Mary Schalin  
**Received:** 10/01/07 (+45 Days: 11/14/07)  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Raise pitch of the porch roof.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story frame Bungalow was built circa 1911. The front porch has been considerably altered throughout the years.

**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. Currently, the porch roof is flat, which has been causing considerable rot where the roof meets the house. As mentioned above, the porch has been altered throughout the years, although it is not clear if it always had a flat roof or if it once had a pitched roof.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[a] roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
- C. The proposed work will raise the pitch of the porch roof to allow for water run-off. All new materials will match existing materials and no architectural details will be altered. The roofline will be below the woodwork.

**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. Although the porch roof is being altered, the pitch will be very slight to allow for water run-off. Also, none of the architectural detailing in the façade will be disturbed. As mentioned above, the front porch has been altered throughout the years. Therefore, it is possible that the original roofline was also altered.

Staff recommends approving the application.

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

**181-07-CA:** 67 North Reed Avenue  
**Applicant:** Gail and Hugh McCain  
**Received:** 10/01/07 (+45 Days: 11/14/07)  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Add a rear dormer and a rail on front stairs.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story frame Bungalow was built circa 1911 by Minnie Shackelford.

**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. Mr. and Mrs. McCain are renovating the top floor of the residence to create more living space.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[a]ccessory roof elements not original to the structure...shall be located inconspicuously.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  - 1. Add a gable dormer on the rear elevation of the residence.
    - a. All new materials will match existing materials to include the wood lap siding, wood trim, wood corner boards and shingle roof.
    - b. There will be a 3'-0" x 3'-0" wood casement window.
  - 2. Install a 1½" black iron pipe rail on the north side of the front stair.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the installation of a dormer and pipe rail will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The proposed pipe rail has been recommended in the past to add necessary support while remaining inconspicuous. The dormer will be minimally seen and all the new materials will match existing materials; the existing roof and proposed interior dictate its size, shape and pitch. However, staff does feel that the dormer should be offset from the main roofline.

Staff recommends approving the application with an offset dormer if possible.

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

**182-07-CA:** 1604 Springhill Avenue  
**Applicant:** Douglas Kearley  
**Received:** 10/01/07 (+45 Days: 11/14/07)  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

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

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this frame residence was constructed circa 1866 as a Creole Cottage. Extensive alterations around 1905 converted it to its present incarnation.

**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 was recently given to the USA Foundation. It is currently being repaired due to Ivan/Katrina damage and fitted out for offices.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for new exterior materials, finishes and elements to reflect the age and style of the building.
- C. Mr. Kearley is proposing to install an access ramp at the east elevation per the submitted plans.
  - 1. It will have wood decking on piers with wood lattice.
  - 2. The posts and rails will be treated and painted to match the existing color scheme.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information contained in the application, staff feels that the proposed work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The ramp will be inconspicuously located along the east side of the residence behind the front porch. The area will also be landscaped; however, staff recommends more landscaping than what is shown in order to soften the look of the ramp.

Staff recommends approving the application.



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

**183-07-CA:** 173 South Georgia Avenue  
**Applicant:** Margaret L. Meaher  
**Received:** 10/01/07 (+45 Days: 11/14/07)  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Remove fire damaged portions of garage structure and rebuild or, if required, remove garage structure from site and construct entirely new garage. Remove connection to outbuilding and add fence on east side.

**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. Lightning caused a fire that damaged the existing wood frame garage. The owner will salvage as much of the burned garage as possible or an entirely new structure will be constructed on the footprint of the old foundation.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for new exterior materials, finishes and elements to reflect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  1. Construct a garage.
    - a. Roof slope will be increased to be more compatible with adjacent structures and new shingle roof will be installed. Shingles to match the color of Spanish clay tile as closely as possible. The roof will be hipped at the front and gabled to the rear.
    - b. The exterior will be constructed of smooth Hardiplank in a board and batten pattern.
    - c. New roll up doors mimicking a historic door configuration to be installed.
  2. Repair adjacent outbuilding and add fencing.
    - a. Connector between former garage and outbuilding to be removed.
    - b. New 8'-0" wood privacy fence to be installed in space between garage and outbuilding on east end of structures.
    - c. Outbuilding to be restored to original appearance, including roofing, siding, etc.

**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.

Staff recommends approving the application.

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

**184-07-CA:** 200 Dexter Avenue  
**Applicant:** Hunter and Lisa Compton  
**Received:** 10/01/07 (+45 Days: 11/14/07)  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Leinkauf  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Replace front walk, install concrete driveway, complete garage driveway, expand apron for garbage pen and install two types of fencing.

**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 no fence for this property.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[fences] should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet...the finished side of the fence should face toward public view.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  - 1. Remove existing front walk from in front of house and in right of way. Replace with new concrete walk of narrower design from house to sidewalk and plant grass in place of right of way walk area.
  - 2. Construct new concrete drive on Dexter Avenue where there is currently an existing curb cut and a ribbon drive. The architect proposes a solid surface visually broken up by panels of aggregate set in between ribbons of smooth concrete. While parking ribbons and a curb cut are an existing condition in this location, the creation of a short concrete drive effectively creates a parking pad in the front yard of the residence.
  - 3. Repair broken sidewalk with new concrete sidewalks as necessary.
  - 4. Expand garage driveway on Church Street where there is a second curb cut. Surface will be smooth concrete, extend this surface to create a garbage can pen.
  - 5. Install two types of fencing.
    - a. A 3'-0" picket fence with gates along Dexter and Church Streets behind the sidewalk. Gates that will slide shut are also proposed.
    - b. A 6'-0" picket semi-privacy fence is proposed for two locations – the south side of the house running to the south property line at the end of the proposed parking pad; and from the rear of the house to the garbage can pen. There is a 25'-0" front set back and a 20'-0" side setback before fencing can be higher than 3'-0". Applicant may need to obtain a variance or employ the Historic District Overlay Ordinance to avoid a side setback variance requirement. Note: If the cost of the 6'-0" privacy fence as designed is too great, the owners want permission to install a standard 6'-0" privacy fence.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed work, exclusive of the parking pad on Dexter Avenue, will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and should be approved. Front parking pads are not permitted in the Design Guidelines and should be denied. It should also be noted that if a standard 6'-0" privacy fence is built, it should have a finished cap.

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

**185-07-CA:** 10 South Julia Street  
**Applicant:** Stephen Milling  
**Received:** 10/01/07 (+45 Days: 11/14/07)  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

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

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story brick veneer residence 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. The brick veneer on this residence has never been painted.
- B. The Guidelines state, “[t]he painting of unpainted brick is...inappropriate in most cases.”
- C. Mr. Milling is proposing to paint the brick body of this residence in Sherwin-Williams Sprout (SW7728).

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Board generally does not approve the painting of brick. However, staff feels that in this case it will not impair any historic integrity. The residence is non-contributing and the brick is not a decorative feature.

Staff recommends approving the application.

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

**186-07-CA:** 203 South Warren Street  
**Applicant:** Darrel J. Williams  
**Received:** 10/01/07 (+45 Days: 11/14/07)  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Church Street East  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Paint porch spindles, columns and skirt board. Stain porch deck and top rail.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this 1½-story residence with Greek Revival styling was built circa 1866.

**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 owner of the residence, David McDonald, received a Certificate of Appropriateness to repair/replace as needed rotten wood on the existing front porch with materials to match in profile and dimension. However, as work progressed, it became necessary to replace more than planned. Some of the architectural elements were replaced with new ones that did not match the characteristics of the originals. Staff received several complaints from Church Street East residents and an NOV was issued in July 2007.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[t]he porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period.”
- C. Mr. Williams, on behalf of Mr. McDonald, is proposing to paint the porch per the submitted plans in order to better match the original elements. The rotted sections of the porch were replaced with the exact details of the original features with the exception of the rail spindles and the column capitals. Also, the porch decking, which had been previously inappropriately altered with 2x4 boards, was replaced with appropriate 1x4 tongue and groove decking.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staining is not historically accurate and has proven to not hold up well when exposed to the elements; however, staff believes that staining only the porch deck and the tops of the rails would not significantly alter the feel of the residence. Staff does feel that the spindles and especially the columns should be altered to their historic configuration. The original columns had much smaller and more graceful Tuscan Doric capitals, which served to move the eye up into the entablature. The current columns are much stockier and more masculine, which makes them static and greatly alters the character of the residence. The spindles, too, are less graceful than their original proportion, which also gives the residence a different impression.

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

**187-07-CA:** 1703 Conti Street  
**Applicant:** Marion C. Forrest/Volkert & Associates  
**Received:** 10/01/07 (+45 Days: 11/14/07)  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Non-contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Construct a wastewater pumping station for Mobile Area Water and Sewer System.

**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 is currently a vacant lot with some moderate landscaping.
- B. The proposed work is to construct a pumping station:
  - 1. It will be located toward the rear of the lot.
  - 2. A 6'-0" high wood privacy fence with gates will be constructed to obscure the station.
  - 3. The station will not exceed the height of the fence.
  - 4. There are existing trees located on the site and a moderate amount of additional landscaping will be added to the site to help the facility blend with adjacent properties.
  - 5. A gravel drive will be installed on the eastern portion of the lot that will blend with the residential character of the adjacent properties.

**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.

Staff recommends approving the application.

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

**188-07-CA:** 461 Marine Street  
**Applicant:** Willie E. Jones  
**Received:** 10/01/07 (+45 Days: 11/14/07)  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Add a sunroom to the back of the residence.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

There was a circa 1901 one-story frame residence on this lot until a fire destroyed it in the late 90s/early 00s. Mr. Jones was able to keep a few of the elements of the former residence, such as the front porch, but it is primarily new construction that retains little to no historic integrity.

**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. As mentioned above, this is a new residence. It has brick veneer and vinyl insulated windows.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that new additions should respect the age and style of the residence.
- C. Mr. Jones is proposing to add a sunroom onto the rear of the residence per the submitted plans:
  - 1. It will be a 23'-10" x 20'-0" enclosure resting on a continuous block foundation to match existing.
  - 2. It will have a gable roof that extends from the rear.
  - 3. All details and materials will match existing to include the roof shingles, wood lap siding in the gable, bricks and the insulated sash windows.
  - 4. There will be a small porch with a gable roof, MHDC stock wood handrails, wood columns and a wood door with decorative panels.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted, the proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the district. The new addition matches the existing style and materials of the residence.

Staff recommends approving the addition.