

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

June 25, 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:** Affordable Roofing  
**Property Address:** 1004 Charleston Street  
**Date of Approval:** May 30, 2007  
Install new architectural shingle roof, charcoal in color.
2. **Applicant's Name:** Wesley Blackshear (executor of the estate of Harriet C. Strong)  
**Property Address:** 10 South Lafayette Street  
**Date of Approval:** May 31, 2007  
Reclad the roof with Owens Corning 3-tab shingles in either Estate Gray or Quarry Gray. Repair/replace rotted wood elements throughout the exterior with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint the residence in the following Behr Premium colors:
  - Body (including the previously painted Brick Chimney and Columns) – Koala Bear, 780D4
  - Trim – White
  - Concrete Pillar Tops, Porch Decking – Witch Hazel, 780D6
3. **Applicant's Name:** David Rasp  
**Property Address:** 72 South Royal Street  
**Date of Approval:** June 1, 2007  
Install temporary fencing: 6x8 posts with lattice infill. Fence to be removed within six months or a permanent Certificate of Appropriateness obtained from the Architectural Review Board. Fence to be erected along the south side and rear property line.
4. **Applicant's Name:** Malloy, Rubenstein, Rosenthal and Ezell LLC  
**Property Address:** 109 North Pine Street  
**Date of Approval:** June 1, 2007  
Repair rotted wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint the building in the following Sherwin Williams colors:
  - Body – Colonial Revival Yellow, SW2830
  - Trim – White
5. **Applicant's Name:** Malloy, Rubenstein, Rosenthal and Ezell LLC  
**Property Address:** 108 North Pine Street  
**Date of Approval:** June 1, 2007  
Repair rotted wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint the building in the following BLP colors:
  - Body – Hazlett House, RC8
  - Trim – White
6. **Applicant's Name:** Preston Bolt/Fred South Construction  
**Property Address:** 162 South Georgia Street  
**Date of Approval:** June 4, 2007  
Repair the porch roof – open up tar and gravel roof over front porch where there is a hole, determine extent of the damage, assess cost of repairs, temporarily cover opened area until repairs can be made and remove debris from site.

7. **Applicant's Name:** Yolanda Reddick  
**Property Address:** 504 St. Francis Street  
**Date of Approval:** June 5, 2007  
Repair rotted wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint the residence in the existing color scheme.
8. **Applicant's Name:** Callie Andreades  
**Property Address:** 21 South Julia Street  
**Date of Approval:** June 6, 2007  
Repair/replace rotten porch deck with new 1x4 tongue and groove. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
9. **Applicant's Name:** Don Salter  
**Property Address:** 1201 New St. Francis Street  
**Date of Approval:** June 7, 2007  
Remove the remaining non-historic shed that was damaged in Katrina. Construct a basic carport structure per MHDC stock plans with one car bay and a storage area (Floor Plan #3).
10. **Applicant's Name:** Neese Properties  
**Property Address:** 51 North Julia Street  
**Date of Approval:** June 7, 2007  
Repaint the residence in the existing color scheme.
11. **Applicant's Name:** Gulf Construction  
**Property Address:** 57 North Broad Street  
**Date of Approval:** June 7, 2007  
Repair roof with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Repair/replace rotten wood with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
12. **Applicant's Name:** Louis Felis  
**Property Address:** 206 South Broad Street  
**Date of Approval:** June 8, 2007  
Repair roof with materials to match existing slate roof in profile and dimension. Repair water damaged wood on fascia and siding as necessary with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint new materials in existing color scheme. This is a renewal of the COA dated February 21, 2005.
13. **Applicant's Name:** Orren Kickliter  
**Property Address:** 31 South Lafayette Street  
**Date of Approval:** June 11, 2007  
Repaint building in the existing color scheme.
14. **Applicant's Name:** Erline Dennis  
**Property Address:** 208 South Dearborn Street  
**Date of Approval:** June 11, 2007  
Repair/replace rotten wood with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint to match the existing colors. Install a new 3-tab shingle roof in Charcoal.

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

1. No NOVs or MOTs were issued.

#### **D. OLD BUSINESS**

1. **071-07-CA:** 115-117 North Julia Street  
**Applicant:** Springhill Avenue Corporation  
**Request:** New construction.

## E. NEW BUSINESS

1. **087-07-CA:** 13 Common Street (Withdrawn)  
**Applicant:** Shari Webster  
**Request:** Approve existing privacy fence.
2. **088-07-CA:** 1005 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Bill and Leslie Cutts  
**Request:** Install metal awnings at the carriage doors.
3. **089-07-CA:** 66 South Royal Street  
**Applicant:** Mike Cowart of Cowart Hospitality Services LLC  
**Request:** Install shutters on the north elevation. Clean and repair the north wall.
4. **090-07-CA:** 1564 Blair Avenue  
**Applicant:** Cynthia Karns  
**Request:** Replace the chain link fence with a privacy fence.
5. **091-07-CA:** 1750 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Paul and Sheila Gerhardt  
**Request:** Extend the existing privacy fence. Repair/repave the existing driveway and walkway.
6. **092-07-CA:** 4 St. Emanuel Street  
**Applicant:** Scott Gonzalez  
**Request:** Repair windows on upper floors. Temporarily board the storefronts. Repaint.
7. **093-07-CA:** 56 North Monterey Street  
**Applicant:** Gene and Teresa Coleman  
**Request:** Construct a rear garage.
8. **094-07-CA:** 207 South Cedar Street  
**Applicant:** Norman Pharr  
**Request:** Replace the existing front door.
9. **096-07-CA:** 20 Kenneth Street  
**Applicant:** Jean Ellen and Gabriel Tynes  
**Request:** Install a privacy fence.
10. **097-07-CA:** 1056 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Janine Stebbins  
**Request:** Replace the existing damaged roof with new cast-cement tiles.
11. **098-07-CA:** 8 North Reed Avenue  
**Applicant:** Stuart Clotworthy  
**Request:** Replace the existing fence. Repaint in the existing colors. Demolish the shed.
12. **099-07-CA:** 400 Michigan Avenue  
**Applicant:** June Chambliss/Norman Pharr  
**Request:** Expand rear addition, reconfiguring gable. Add access ramp.

## F. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Tabled items.

## G. ADJOURNMENT

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

**071-07-CA:** 115-117 North Julia Street  
**Applicant:** Springhill Avenue Corporation  
**Received:** 05/10/07 (+45 Days: 06/26/07)  
**Meeting:** 05/24/07  
**Resubmitted:** **06/07/07**  
**Meeting:** **06/25/07**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-1  
**Project:** Construct 8 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. Staff has received many calls of concern regarding the proposed construction.
- 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 eight new affordable townhouses – two buildings with four residences each – per the submitted plans.
    - a. The buildings will sit in an L-shape on the lot per the submitted plans and have floating slab foundations.
    - b. They will be clad in Hardiplank siding per the submitted plans.
    - c. The front doors will be wood with a fan light and four decorative panels per the submitted plans.
    - d. The rear doors will be steel fiberglass or wood with six decorative panels per the submitted plans.
    - e. The windows will be vinyl-clad wood 1/1 sashes per the submitted plans.
    - f. There will be a stoop with three steps leading to each of the paired front and rear doors per the submitted plans.
    - g. Ornamentation will be minimal, consisting of a water table and iron vents at the foundation, lintels at the windows and handrails, which have not been defined.
    - h. There will be 16 parking spaces on a lot in the center of the property; the lot will be asphalt or a concrete aggregate per the submitted plans.
  2. Extend the existing privacy fence on the south side per the requirements of Urban Development.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Although the applicant altered the building significantly from the original design in order to better fit the neighborhood, staff believes that, based on the new information submitted in the proposal, the proposed construction will still impair the historic integrity of the district.

The proposed construction does not follow the setback and orientation pattern of residences in the vicinity. The two buildings are oriented in an L-shape in order to fit them on the lot, which leaves a side elevation facing the street. There is very little ornamentation to connect it to the streetscape. The massing and scale of the buildings, including the first-floor heights and the roof pitches, are not proportional to the buildings typical of the street. Although, per a previous suggestion, the applicant did install taller windows on the first floor in order to give the illusion of height, there is still a disconnect between the scale of this building to the rest of the street. Other ornamentation such as the front stoops, 4x4 wood porch posts, doors and window lintels have little connection to the existing housing stock on the block.

There are many elements that staff feels should be changed in order to better blend into the district, some of which are increasing the height of the floors, adding decorative features to the 4x4 posts such as caps and bases, defining the handrail, enlarging the overhang, altering the pitch of the roof, installing a wider fascia and reconfiguring the side elevation that faces the street.

Staff recommends denying the application and suggests that the owner meet with the design committee.

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

**087-07-CA:** 13 Common Street  
**Applicant:** Shari Webster  
**Received:** 05/22/07 (+45 Days: 07/06/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/25/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Approve the existing 10'-0" privacy fence.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story frame Sidehall residence was built circa 1907 for Alida Parker. The Italianate handrail was added in 1976 when the building was renovated. The rear deck was added in 1996.

**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" fence that sits on the rear deck, which is raised 2'-0" from the ground. Therefore, the total fence height is 10'-0". Urban Development recently cited Ms. Webster regarding the height of the fence. The MHDC has also received complaints regarding the height of the fence.
- 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, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight-foot fence may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face toward public view. All variances required by the Board of Zoning Adjustment must be obtained prior to issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness."
- C. The proposed work asks to approve the existing 10'-0" wood privacy fence.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed work will impair the historic integrity of the building and the district. The existing fence is 10'-0" tall, which is above the 6'-0" height limit maintained by the Board. Moreover, it is above the 8'-0" limit allowed per the City's Zoning Ordinance.

Staff recommends that the fence be reduced to a total height of 6'-0".

**This application has been withdrawn. Urban Development is allowing Ms. Webster to keep the fence after she signed an affidavit stating the fence has been there since 1996.**

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

**088-07-CA:** 1005 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Bill and Leslie Cutts  
**Received:** 05/30/07 (+45 Days: 07/14/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/25/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-2  
**Project:** Install metal awnings at the carriage doors.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, George Cox built this residence circa 1865 for George Rapelje. Some exterior modifications were by George Rogers in 1906. The rear Carriage House is contemporary with the main building, having been constructed in 1865 with exterior modifications done in 1906. By the 1980s, Rogers' additions to the Carriage House had severely deteriorated and subsequent renovations removed much of it.

**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 are currently no awnings on the Carriage House. As mentioned above, it has gone through a number of major alterations throughout the years, including the removal of the Rogers addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building. The Guidelines also state, "Awnings will be reviewed on a case by case basis."
- C. The proposed work will install 3'-4" by 2'-0" standing seam copper awnings at the carriage doors per the submitted plans and specifications.

**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 awnings, which are minor and sympathetic additions to the property, will be located on a secondary structure that has undergone a number of modifications located behind the main residence.

Staff recommends approving the application.

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

**089-07-CA:** 66 South Royal Street  
**Applicant:** Mike Cowart of Cowart Hospitality Services LLC  
**Received:** 06/04/07 (+45 Days: 07/19/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/25/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Church Street East  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-4  
**Project:** Install shutters on the north elevation. Clean and repair the north wall.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story commercial building with an ornamental concrete block façade was built circa 1899. An iron balcony was added in 1999 based on historic maps of the property. The building has been a number of things, including a clothing store and a leather goods store. It is now a bar/restaurant.

**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. Cowart Hospitality Services LLC, which is building a Hampton Inn next to this building, will be locating their pool/courtyard area next to Veets' north wall. Therefore, they have obtained an easement from Veets to decorate and maintain it. This wall currently has a number of bricked-in windows and is in need of cleaning and minor repairs.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “Blinds and shutters were integral functional components of historic buildings. Blinds and shutters should be sized to fit the reveal of the window opening precisely. Operable units, hung with appropriate hinges are encouraged. Where blinds or shutters must be fixed, they should be hung on the window casing in a manner to replicate those that are operable.” The Guidelines also state that because mortar mixtures are significantly different today, “particular care must be taken with masonry [when exterior repair is needed, and applicants must] consult with staff concerning the mortar mixture for repointing historic brick. Bricks and mortar should match the original in color, finish (strike) and thickness.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  - 1. Install non-operable wood shutters on the north elevation of the building per the submitted drawings and specifications.
  - 2. Clean and repair the north wall to include removing vegetation and unused conduit, repairing and repointing the masonry and repainting.

**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 shutters will be fixed, they will be sized to fit within the window openings and be hung to appear operable. The remaining work is basic repair and maintenance, although, as mentioned above, an appropriate mortar mixture must be used.

Staff recommends approving the application.



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

**090-07-CA:** 1564 Blair Avenue  
**Applicant:** Cynthia Karns  
**Received:** 06/06/07 (+45 Days: 07/21/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/25/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Replace the chain link fence with an 8'-0" and 6'-0" privacy fence.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story brick residence was built in 1981.

**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 damaged chain link fence around the rear yard. The back property line abuts an apartment complex.
- 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, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight-foot fence may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face toward public view."
- C. The proposed work will replace the current metal chain link fence with an 8'-0" dog-eared wood privacy fence along the north boundary and a 6'-0" dog-eared wood privacy fence along the east and west boundaries to the back corners of the residence. There will be 6'-0" tall wood gates at the south lines of the fence.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed work will not impair the historic integrity of the district. As mentioned above, the rear property line abuts an apartment complex, whose residents often cut through Ms. Karns' yard; therefore, the 8'-0" fence for the rear boundary would be appropriate. The remaining fence falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines.

Staff recommends approving the application.

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

**091-07-CA:** 1750 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Paul and Sheila Gerhardt  
**Received:** 06/06/07 (+45 Days: 07/21/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/25/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-3  
**Project:** Extend the existing privacy fence. Repair and repave the existing driveway and walkway.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story brick apartment building was built 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. There is currently a 6'-0" dog-eared privacy fence that surrounds the rear yard of the property. There is an existing gravel driveway on the east side of the property leading to the rear parking area and a walkway in the front yard leading from the sidewalk to the building.
- 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, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight-foot fence may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face toward public view.” The Design Review Guidelines also state, “[I]t is important that the design, location and materials [of drives and walks] be compatible with the property.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  - 1. Extend the existing 6'-0" privacy fence forward approximately 32'-0" to the southeast corner of the building; the new fence will match existing.
  - 2. Repave the existing driveway with light-colored concrete, adding a small raised curb (approximately 6") along the east property line for a future iron fence.
  - 3. Repair the existing front walkway and add a walkway in the back leading to the parking area with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.

**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 fence is an extension of the existing fence, which falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines. Also, the proposed work for the drive and walkways are essentially minimal changes to existing elements that will not significantly alter the characteristics of the property.

Staff recommends approving the application.

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

**092-07-CA:** 4 St. Emanuel Street  
**Applicant:** Scott Gonzalez  
**Received:** 06/07/07 (+45 Days: 07/22/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/25/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin Street Commercial  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-4  
**Project:** Repair windows on upper floors. Temporarily board up the storefronts. Repaint.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this three-story brick commercial building was constructed circa 1869. A change in the fenestration and surface treatment of the building occurred in the 1930s. The first-floor storefronts have been altered a number of times.

**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 building is currently vacant and boarded. Mr. Gonzalez was recently cited for lack of maintenance; however, he is in the process of renovating the building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original 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. The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.” The MHDC’s guide to mothballing buildings state, “Mothballing buildings is important...to secure the building from threat, either manmade or natural, and to ensure the health, safety and welfare of the general public...[T]he quality of materials and the installation of those materials is critical to a successful project.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  - 1. Repair the existing windows on the upper floors of the building, replacing when necessary with materials that match existing in material, profile and dimension.
  - 2. Temporarily board up the storefront with sheets of 4x8 plywood and batten strips per the submitted drawing.
  - 3. Repaint the building in colors to be determined at a later date.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed work will not impair the historic integrity of the building and the district. The majority of the proposed work consists of basic repairing and maintenance. The boards placed on the storefront are temporary until the first floor is renovated.

Staff recommends approving the application.

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

**093-07-CA:** 56 North Monterey Street  
**Applicant:** Gene and Teresa Coleman  
**Received:** 06/07/07 (+45 Days: 07/22/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/25/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Construct a rear garage.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, Victoria Houston built this one-story frame bungalow 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. Mr. and Mrs. Coleman recently received a Certificate of Appropriateness to build a garage per MHDC stock plans. However, they have found it necessary to modify the plans to better fit their needs.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction [and the] structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. The proposed work will construct a rear garage on the property using stock MHDC plans with some alterations per the submitted plans and specifications. The alterations include enlarging the unit to 20'-0" by 22'-0" and moving the garage openings to the long side of the structure.

**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. As mentioned above, the garage structure mainly follows the stock plans on file at the offices of the MHDC.

Staff recommends approving the application.

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

**094-07-CA:** 207 South Cedar Street  
**Applicant:** Norman Pharr  
**Received:** 06/08/07 (+45 Days: 07/23/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/25/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Church Street East  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Replace the existing front door with a new front door.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story frame Victorian residence was built in 1889. Formerly located at 103 Jefferson, the residence was moved approximately twenty years ago to its present site at 207 South Cedar Street. The existing Gothic front doors were taken from another building, possibly a church, and installed on the house in the 1980s.

**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 set of double-leaf wood doors with decorative Gothic panels at the front, which are not original to the building. The residence was recently sold to Mr. and Mrs. Franz with the stipulation that these existing front doors will go with the former owner.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building. Doors with leaded or art glass may be appropriate when documentation exists for their use, or when they are compatible with the design and style of the structure.”
- C. The proposed work will replace the existing doors with new double-leaf wood doors with decorative panels and leaded glass per the submitted drawings.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will impair the historic integrity of the building. The proposed door contains leaded glass panels, which are more appropriate to buildings of a later vintage such as Colonial Revival. It is suggested that a simpler glass panel or wood paneled doors be used. Some decorative etching of the glass could be appropriate.

Staff recommends installing doors that are more appropriate to the style of the residence.

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

**096-07-CA:** 20 Kenneth Street  
**Applicant:** Jean Ellen and Gabriel Tynes  
**Received:** 06/11/07 (+45 Days: 07/26/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/25/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Install a 6'-0" privacy fence.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story frame cottage with classical detailing was built circa 1920.

**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 around the rear of the property, which sits on the corner of Kenneth and New Hamilton.
- 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, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight-foot fence may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face toward public view."
- C. The proposed work will replace the existing chain link fence with a 6'-0" wood privacy fence on three sides of the property per the submitted specifications. The fence will run approximately 20'-0" along the west side, 100'-0" along the north side and 50'-0" along the east side.

**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 fence falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines and, although staff would prefer to not have 6'-0" fences along the sidewalk, there are a number of 6'-0" fences along this street. However, Mr. and Mrs. Tynes will need to clear any possible setback issues along New Hamilton Street with Urban Development before installation.

Staff recommends approving the application on the condition that the top of the fence is no taller than the windowsills of the residence per the submitted plans.

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

**097-07-CA:** 1056 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Janine Stebbins  
**Received:** 06/11/07 (+45 Days: 07/26/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/25/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-1  
**Project:** Replace the existing damaged roof with new cast-cement tiles.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this Neo-Classical residence, one of the best surviving examples of the residential design of Rudolph Benz, was built in 1901 for Charles Hearin and later sold to lumber magnate John Blacksher. For many years it was used as the Abba Temple Shrine. In 1991, it was returned to use as 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. The current tile roof was damaged in Hurricanes Ivan and Katrina.
- 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 replace the existing damaged diamond-shaped asbestos roof tiles with rectangular cast cement tiles (Monier Lifetile) in Stone Mountain Gray; repair/replace the damaged decking as needed.

**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 current roof is not original to the home, having been installed in the 1940s, and damaged from Ivan and Katrina. Although the new roof tiles will be rectangular rather than diamond-shaped, they will still maintain the tiled appearance of the current material.

Staff recommends approving the application.

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

**098-07-CA:** 8 North Reed Avenue  
**Applicant:** Stuart Clotworthy  
**Received:** 06/11/07 (+45 Days: 07/26/07)  
**Meeting:** 06/25/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Replace the existing fence. Repaint residence in the existing colors. Demolish the shed.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story frame Sidehall residence was built circa 1908. The Sanborn Maps on file show an accessory structure at the rear of the property since the main residence was built; however, because more recent maps show the structure at a slightly different location, it is unclear whether the current shed is the same one.

**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 rotted wood privacy fence surrounding the rear yard. In addition, the existing shed is in poor condition.
- 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, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight-foot fence may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face toward public view.” The Guidelines also state that accessory structures should “complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  - 1. Replace the existing rotted wood privacy fence with a new 8’-0” wood privacy fence consisting of 6’-0” wood planks topped with a 2’-0” wood lattice screen.
  - 2. Demolish the existing shed.
  - 3. Repaint the residence in the existing colors.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed fence will impair the historic integrity of the district. The height of the proposed fence is 8’-0” tall, which is above the 6’-0” height limit maintained by the Board. Staff feels the remaining items will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The rear shed is a secondary structure in poor condition and, as mentioned above, it is unclear whether it is original to the property. Also, the residence is being repainted in the existing colors.

Staff recommends amending Item C1 to install a 6’-0” fence. Staff recommends approving the remainder of the application.



**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
STAFF COMMENTS**

**099-07-CA:** 400 Michigan Avenue  
Applicant: June Chambliss/Norman Pharr  
Received: 6/11/07 (+45 Days: 07/26/07)  
Meeting: 06/25/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Leinkauf Historic District  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Extend rear addition, reconfigure access ramp and add code approved handrail.

**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**

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

**A. Extension of rear addition**

1. 400 Michigan Avenue is a two story American Foursquare frame residence with classical details constructed in 1907.
2. The rear of the house has a small addition housing the kitchen and a den included under an uneven gable roof.
3. The proposed porch infill would increase the size of the existing kitchen by 8' and the den by 12'.
4. The gable roof will be reconfigured and spaced evenly over the addition.
5. This change will be visible from the street above the existing fence, however the rear elevation will be regularized.
6. Existing windows will be relocated to the new west wall; the existing rear door will be reused in the new location. One window will be added on the north elevation
7. All existing materials and details will be duplicated on the addition.
8. All new elements will be painted to match the existing color scheme.

**B. Construction of new handicap access ramp**

1. The existing ramp extends from the driveway and turns east to the rear door.
2. The proposed ramp will be located parallel to the rear elevation and turn to the west with a landing provided for turning the wheelchair.
3. The proposed configuration of the new ramp will free up backyard space occupied by the current ramp.
4. The railing will be wood and constructed to meet code.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.