

MINUTES
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
January 2, 2008 – 3:00 P.M.

A. CALL TO ORDER – Chair

The Meeting was called to order by the chair at 3:00 p.m.

- **Members Present:** Andrew Martin, Carlos Gant, Harris Oswalt, Tilmon Brown, Bunky Ralph, Craig Roberts, Jim Wagoner, David Barr and Cameron Pfeiffer.
- **Staff Present:** Aileen de la Torre and Devereaux Bemis.

Andrew Martin moved to approve the minutes as posted on the Internet. Tilmon Brown seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Tilmon Brown moved to approve the mid-month requests as submitted. Jim Wagoner seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant's Name:** Robert Petro
Property Address: 253 West Street
Date of Approval: November 30, 2007
Repaint residence in the existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant's Name:** Casey Ginn
Property Address: 9 North Cedar Street
Date of Approval: December 4, 2007
Do an emergency roof repair to protect the decking and rear of the residence until such time as the applicant comes before the ARB. The roof will match existing in material (v-crimp).
3. **Applicant's Name:** Eugene Caldwell
Property Address: 404 Chatham Street
Date of Approval: December 7, 2007
Replace rotted fascia with wood to match existing in profile and dimension.
4. **Applicant's Name:** Café Royal
Property Address: 101 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: December 7, 2007
Repaint the front entrance and windows in BLP Theater Street Gold.
5. **Applicant's Name:** John Switzer
Property Address: 756 Government Street/63 South Bayou Street
Date of Approval: December 7, 2007
Renewal of 01/24/07 COA – Add garage to connect 756 Government and 63 South Bayou per plans submitted to the ARB. Partial demolition of existing for new construction to follow the plan submitted 11/07.
6. **Applicant's Name:** Eric Oliver
Property Address: 1110 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: December 10, 2007
Install a 3'-0" wood picket fence with a pointed top per stock MHDC plans around the front yard.
7. **Applicant's Name:** Edgar Hughes
Property Address: 1050 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: December 11, 2007
Install new horizontal lattice between foundation piers and paint it gray.
8. **Applicant's Name:** Kelvin Buchanon
Property Address: 1013 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: December 12, 2007
Replace rotted siding as necessary to match original. Replace the window to match existing.

9. **Applicant's Name:** Wayne Askew Contracting Inc
Property Address: 153 Levert Avenue
Date of Approval: December 12, 2007
Replace rotted siding to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint to match existing color scheme.
10. **Applicant's Name:** G David Koen
Property Address: 962 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: December 12, 2007
Repair rotten wood and windows to match existing in dimension and profile. Paint in the existing colors.
11. **Applicant's Name:** Robert Sims
Property Address: 1109 Government Street
Date of Approval: December 13, 2007
Paint in the following Sherwin Williams colors:
- Body – Craftsman Brown
 - Trim – Vellum
 - Accent – Oak
12. **Applicant's Name:** Robert Sims
Property Address: 1110 Church Street
Date of Approval: December 13, 2007
Repair rotten wood to match existing. Paint in the following Sherwin Williams colors:
- Body – Craftsman Brown
 - Trim – Vellum
 - Accent – Oak
13. **Applicant's Name:** Jaime Betbeze
Property Address: 1210 Selma Street
Date of Approval: December 14, 2007
Restucco and paint foundation with materials to match existing. Repair/replace as needed rotten wood with materials to match existing in material, profile, color and dimension. Paint to match existing colors scheme.
14. **Applicant's Name:** Jane Montgomery
Property Address: 8 Oakland Terrace
Date of Approval: December 17, 2007
Reroof residence with architectural shingles in either black or grey.
15. **Applicant's Name:** David Brazell
Property Address: 659 St. Francis Street
Date of Approval: December 18, 2007
Reclad the built-up roof with modified bitumen.
16. **Applicant's Name:** Holmes and Holmes
Property Address: 207 Lanier Avenue
Date of Approval: December 18, 2007
Changes to ARB approved plan. The Board reviewed changes on 12/17/07 for staff mid-month approval:
- Corrections to the previous application:
 - Chimney on the north side was previously removed.
 - Two existing windows on the north in the entry hall were double-hung, not casements.
 - Changes to the addition of the previous application:
 - Not build the two chimneys proposed for the south elevation.
 - Install a panel as on the garage rather than a window (third from the west) as shown.
 - Changes to the existing building from the previous application:
 - Change the original window adjacent to the door on the north elevation to a smaller window matching the others along that elevation in order to fit kitchen cabinets.
 - Install a concrete porch floor as opposed to a coated wood floor.
 - Alter proposed columns to remove verticals, creating a simple Tuscan column look.

17. **Applicant's Name:** Mrs. McDonald
Property Address: 913 Government Street
Date of Approval: December 18, 2007
Repaint residence in the following color scheme:
- Body – Avocado, SW2861
 - Trim – Buff, SW7683

18. **Applicant's Name:** Tom Neese
Property Address: 1324 Chamberlain Avenue
Date of Approval: December 18, 2007
Repaint residence in the following BLP color scheme:
- Body – Pitch Pine
 - Trim – White
 - Accents – Butternut

C. OLD BUSINESS

1. **164-07-CA:** 207 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Holmes and Holmes, Architects
Request: Install fiberglass balusters.
Approved with the facts amended for clarification
2. **161-07-CA:** 151-153 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Request: Install fiberglass shutters.
Approved

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. **228-07-CA:** 257 St. Francis Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Request: Replace shutters, repair windows and install a gutter.
Approved
2. **229-07-CA:** 509 Eslava Street
Applicant: Ben Cummings
Request: Replace attic vents with operable windows.
Approved with facts amended for clarification
3. **230-07-CA:** 1412 Eslava Street
Applicant: Greg Rawls
Request: Perform general repairs and add a rear porch.
Approved with facts amended for clarification
4. **231-07-CA:** 1410 Eslava Street
Applicant: Greg Rawls
Request: Perform general repairs, rebuild front porch, add rear porch and remove one front door.
Approved with facts amended for clarification
5. **232-07-CA:** 51 Semmes Avenue
Applicant: Jamie Price of Professional Remodeling
Request: Add a cover to the deck, replace the front door with and replace the living room window.
Denied
6. **233-07-CA:** 507 Monroe Street
Applicant: Randall Skalsky
Request: Leave gilt accent on salvaged ironwork.
Approved with facts amended for clarification

7. **234-07-CA:** 207 Levert Avenue
Applicant: Mack Lewis
Request: Construct a rear addition with a covered porch.
Approved

E. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Discussion.

There was discussion about the staff requesting that original materials be stored on the property when they were removed from a building. Staff explained that integrity of materials is part of the criteria for the National Register. When historic materials are replaced by something with a similar design, staff believes it is important that a record of the original be kept in case it is desired to restore the building to its original appearance.

This led into a discussion of the difference in standards for the ARB, which has a minimum standard and the Marking Committee of the MHDC, which has a high standard of restoration. It was decided to put in the new guidelines and on the ARB application a statement of these differences.

The new guidelines were discussed. Staff wants to have the guidelines professionally illustrated and mesh with the new master plan being developed by EDSA for the City. If the ARB can get the guidelines written, staff will look for money to have EDSA participate in the final adoption and illustration. The ARB members will look over the new guidelines that were distributed and a meeting will be set at the end of a regular ARB meeting to discuss and plan for their adoption. The editing was done in two phases.

2. Election of Officers

The election of officers was held. Tilmon Brown was nominated and duly seconded as chair. He was unanimously elected. Cameron Pfeiffer was nominated and duly seconded as vice-chair. She was unanimously elected. They will begin to serve in their positions at the close of the present meeting.

F. ADJOURNMENT

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

164-07-CA: 207 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Holmes and Holmes, Architects
Received: 09/04/07 **Resubmitted:** 12/17/07
Meeting: 09/24/07 **Meeting:** 01/02/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install fiberglass balusters.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story Mediterranean-influenced residence was built circa 1912.

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 an addendum to the previously approved application for two new additions and some rehabilitation work from 09/24/07. On 12/17/07, the Board reviewed some changes/corrections to the original application for staff to approve as a mid-month. This is an additional change from the original application.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that rehabilitations and new additions should respect the age and style of the building.
- C. Mr. Holmes is proposing to rebuild the second-floor balustrade on the front porch in fiberglass.

RECOMMENDATION

The original balusters on the front porch were replaced some time ago with the iron rails currently on this residence. Because this is essentially a reconstruction – that is, no original materials are being replaced – staff feels that the fiberglass balustrade should not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The Design Review Guidelines state, “materials should blend with the style of the building.”

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak to the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the use of a synthetic material and the height of the rail. Several Board members were familiar with the fiberglass and assured the Board that it would be virtually indistinguishable from wood. There was some concern that there might be a requirement to change the height of the rail to meet code, but the plans showed the new rail at the current height. It was decided that this needed to be confirmed in the facts.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report amending C to read, “Mr. Holmes is proposing to rebuild the second-floor balustrade on the front porch in fiberglass to match the height of the existing balustrade.” The motion was seconded by Andrew Martin and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the amended facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/3/09.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

161-07-CA: 151-153 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Received: 09/10/07 **Resubmitted:** 12/12/07
Meeting: 09/24/07 **Meeting:** 01/02/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install fiberglass shutters.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story brick commercial building was constructed circa 1836. The significant alteration in the surface treatment of the building occurred circa 1945. Since then the building has been so altered that it was considered non-contributing; however, a 1993 restoration returned the façade to a more appropriate configuration and it is now a contributing part of the district.

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 an addendum to the previously approved application from 09/24/07. At that time, the shutters were removed from consideration until the Board could see a material sample of the proposed fiberglass option. Mr. Kearley brought a sample to the Board in October. In their evaluation, they found the shutters to be acceptable.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[b]linds 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.”
- C. Mr. Kearley is proposing to install operable fiberglass shutters at the upper floor windows of the east elevation.

RECOMMENDATION

As mentioned above, the Board had the opportunity to view a material sample of the proposed shutters and found them to be an acceptable option in this case. Staff recommends approving the application. Although wood shutters are the most appropriate option for historic buildings and the Guidelines state that lightweight plastic shutters are inappropriate, better materials are emerging that mimics wood to such an extent that the Board feels it prudent to review shutter requests on a case-by-case basis.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no present to address the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the appropriateness of the vinyl shutters on the building. Because of the nature of the material, the Board reiterated the necessity of reviewing each of these requests individually.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Carlos Gant and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/3/09.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

228-07-CA: 257 St. Francis Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Received: 12/12/07 (+45 Days: 01/26/08)
Meeting: 01/02/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Replace shutters, repair windows and install a gutter.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, the 1845 Silver House is an Italianate building. As is typical of the time, it was built for both commercial and residential use.

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 non-operable shutters on the second and third floors of this building and no gutter.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[b]linds 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.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 1. Repair/replace as needed the existing shutters on the second and third floors with materials to match existing in material, profile, color and dimension.
 2. Install new hardware as scheduled.
 3. Repair/replace as needed windows on the second and third floors with materials to match existing in material, profile, color and dimension.
 4. Install a 5” by 5” 16oz copper gutter with a 3” 16oz rain leader at the south elevation.

RECOMMENDATION

The work proposed in this application consists primarily of general maintenance and repair. The shutters, which are currently non-operable, will be repaired to an operable condition. The proposed gutters will be located on the south side and therefore will not be seen from the street. Staff recommends approving the application. This building has an easement, so the properties committee will need to approve all work before it commences.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no present to address the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the use of the wooden shutters on the building.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Carlos Gant and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Andrew Martin and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/3/09.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

229-07-CA: 509 Eslava Street
Applicant: Ben Cummings
Received: 12/10/07 (+45 Days: 01/24/08)
Meeting: 01/02/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace attic vents with operable windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story brick residence was built 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. This house was built as part of a new Church Street East subdivision in the 1990s. The upper floor is currently attic space with vents leading to the outside.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[t]he type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration on the building help establish the historic character of the building...the size and placement of new windows...should be compatible with the general character of the building.” The Guidelines also call for all to work to respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 1. Replace the attic vent on the right elevation with a sash window.
 - a. It will fit within the existing opening.
 - b. It will match the other existing windows in material, profile and dimension.
 2. Replace the attic vent on the left elevation with a sash window.
 - a. The opening will be enlarged to fit a 4’-6” x 2’-8” window.
 - b. It will match the other existing windows in material, profile and dimension.
 3. Brick-in an existing first floor window in the right elevation.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the district. This is a non-historic, non-contributing building and the new windows will go into existing openings. However, while staff does not object to enclosing the first floor window, staff does feel that a panel or recess should be placed at the location of the removed window in order to break up the large expanse of blank wall that will be created. Staff recommends that part C3 of the application reflect the aforementioned concern and approving the rest of the work.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no present to address the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was considerable discussion concerning the size of the windows in the attic vent and closing of the window on the side. There was a concern expressed that the enclosed window would result in too large of a blank wall that might impair the district and that it might be difficult to find a matching brick.

FINDING OF FACT

Andrew Martin moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report amending fact C3 to read, “Brick-in an existing first floor window in the right elevation with brick to match the existing.” The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Andrew Martin moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Carlos Gant and approved with one dissenting vote. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/3/09.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

230-07-CA: 1412 Eslava Street
Applicant: Greg Rawls
Received: 12/17/07 (+45 Days: 01/31/08)
Meeting: 01/02/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Perform general repairs and add a rear porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story frame multi-family residence was built circa 1906.

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 former multi-family building is being rehabilitated into a single-family home
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[p]orches are an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture.” The Guidelines also call for rehabilitations and new additions to respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Repair/rebuild as needed the two-story front porch with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
 - 2. Construct a two-story rear porch at the southwest corner per the submitted drawing.
 - a. The roof pitch and foundation will match existing
 - b. All new materials and designs will match the front porch in material, profile and dimension.
 - c. If matching columns and balusters cannot be found or made cost-effectively, the rear porch will have square columns wrapped with 1x6 and 2x2 square balusters.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that the work consisting of rehabilitation and general maintenance, such as repairing/replacing as needed elements of the front porch, will not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and recommends approval.

Staff also feels that the new rear porch will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. However, it was typical for historic rear porches to have simpler columns and/or balusters. Therefore, staff does not object to square or chamfered posts on the rear if Mr. Rawls finds it to be more cost-effective. Staff does feel, however, that 2x2 balusters are too thick and recommends either true 1x1 or 1½x1½ balusters. Also, the balusters appear to be spaced too far apart, although that may be due to the drawing not being to scale.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Greg Rawls was present to discuss his application. He explained that his plan was to use true 1 ½ “ square balusters set no further than 4 inches apart. The porch deck would be tongue and groove and the new porch deck will extend to the rear line of the house.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board asked about the type of roofing shingles that would be used and Mr. Rawls replied that he was investigating an asphalt shingle to match the current asbestos shingles on the house. The Board also pointed out that the piers of the addition should match those of the house.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report with the following amendments: C2(a) The roof pitch and foundation piers will match existing; C2(c) If matching columns and balusters cannot be found or made cost-effectively, the rear porch will have square columns wrapped with true 1 ½" square balusters; C2(d) The roof shingle will be submitted to staff for final approval. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/3/09.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

231-07-CA: 1410 Eslava Street
Applicant: Greg Rawls
Received: 12/17/07 (+45 Days: 01/31/08)
Meeting: 01/02/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Perform general repairs, rebuild front porch, add rear porch and remove one front door.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story frame multi-family residence was built circa 1906.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This former multi-family building is being rehabilitated into a single-family home. There are two doors leading to the front porch, one of which was added when the west side of the porch was filled-in.
- B. The Guidelines state, “[p]orches are an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture.” The Guidelines also call for rehabilitations and new additions to respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 1. Fill-in the door on the west side of the front façade with siding to match existing.
 2. Rebuild the two-story front porch to its original configuration.
 - a. All new materials and designs will match the existing original column and balusters.
 - b. If matching columns and balusters cannot be found or made cost-effectively, the first floor columns will be rebuilt as square columns with 1x6 capitals and 2x2 square balusters.
 3. Construct a two-story rear porch at the southwest corner per the submitted drawing.
 - a. The roof pitch and foundation will match existing
 - b. All new materials and designs will match the front porch.
 - c. If matching columns and balusters cannot be found or made cost-effectively, the rear porch will have square columns wrapped with 1x6 and 2x2 square balusters.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels the rehabilitation and maintenance work, such as repairing/replacing the wood elements throughout the exterior, will not impair the historic integrity of the district or building and recommends approval. Although the second front door is an unsympathetic addition, staff remains guarded about enclosing it with siding and suggests installing a small window similar to the one on the second floor to maintain the solid to void ratio.

The front porch has been significantly altered with the west side being filled-in and Craftsman-style masonry plinths replacing the full-height columns (still evident in the remaining one at the southeast corner). Therefore, staff feels that removing the plinths and matching the existing column will not impair the historic integrity of the district or building. However, it is a common historic treatment for each level of a multiple story porch to have had a different style of column. On occasion this manifested itself in smaller versions of the first floor columns, but often the columns were completely different. Although evidence suggests this was not the case here, staff would not object to rebuilding the square columns if Mr. Rawls finds it to be more cost-effective.

Staff also feels the new rear porch will not impair the historic integrity of the building or district. However, it was typical for historic rear porches to have simpler detailing. Therefore, staff does not object to square or chamfered posts on the rear if Mr. Rawls finds it to be more cost-effective. Staff does feel, however, that 2x2 balusters are too thick and recommends

either true 1x1 or 1½x1½ balusters. Also, the balusters appear to be spaced too far apart, although that may be due to the drawing not being to scale.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Greg Rawls was present to discuss the application. He pointed out that this house would be very similar to the house at 1412 when both were finished. He stated that the upper right turned post was original to the house and it was his desire to match it or to replace all the front supports with a similar post. Staff asked that any original posts or balustrades removed be saved on site to guide any future restoration, and Mr. Rawls agreed to do so. The spacing of the balusters will meet code and the elements on the front and rear porches will be separately consistent.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed that the rear porch would match the rear porch just approved at 1412 Eslava. There was also discussion about the enclosing of the front left door and whether a window of some type should be installed. It was pointed out that this would actually alter the symmetry of the house. The owner will investigate the practicality of installing a transom type window.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report with the following amendments: C2(b) The first floor supports will be turned posts to match the original or all the turned posts will be replaced with similar posts and the originals will be stored on site; the balusters will be round to match the existing or true 1½ square balusters and the originals will be stored on site; C3(c) If matching columns and balusters cannot be found or made cost-effectively, the rear porch will have square columns wrapped with true 1½ square balusters. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/3/09.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

232-07-CA: 51 Semmes Avenue
Applicant: Jamie Price of Professional Remodeling
Received: 12/17/07 (+45 Days: 01/31/08)
Meeting: 01/02/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Add a cover to the deck, replace the front door with and replace the living room window.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story frame residence was built circa 1940. It was moved onto this lot from its original location on Florida just south of Old Shell Road in 1991.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The existing front door has one light and there is an existing rear deck. As mentioned above, this residence was moved into this district from the Midtown district in 1991.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[n]ew windows must be compatible to the existing” and “[o]ften one of the most important decorative features...doorways reflect the age and style of a building.” The Guidelines also call for rehabilitations and new additions to respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Add an 8’-0” by 14’-0” shed roof cover to the existing rear deck with a galvanized metal panel roof and 6x6 square posts to match existing elements.
 - 2. Replace the existing one-light front door with a four-panel front door.
 - 3. Replace the rotted living room window with a new window to match existing.

RECOMMENDATION

Concerned about safety and efficiency, the homeowner would like to replace his current door. After working closely with staff, it was determined that a four-panel door, which is a style contemporary to the era of the residence, would be an acceptable solution. This door would support the homeowner’s needs while respecting the age and style of the building as required in the Guidelines. Staff is requesting that the current door be saved and properly stored for future homeowners.

As currently proposed, the cover on the back deck will be little more than a lean-to. However, the work will in essence turn the back deck into a back porch. Because this residence is located on a corner lot, the rear deck is very visible from the street. Therefore, staff recommends that the rear work be finished appropriately, with detailing more in keeping with the rest of the house. Staff feels the new window will not impair the historic integrity of the district or building.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to address the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Staff corrected the staff report noting that the owner had reconsidered the application and changed the requested front door to a four panel solid wood door. The Board discussed the various types of doors appropriate to the house and noted that the current door was more appropriate than the one requested. The Board discussed that a covered deck was in fact a porch and that the design submitted was inappropriate for a rear porch. The Board noted that the house was on a corner and the porch would be highly visible. Staff replied to a question from the Board that the front window was essentially a repair and could be approved on a mid-month basis.

FINDING OF FACT

Andrew Martin moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Carlos Gant and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application impairs the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness be denied. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and passed on a 5-4 vote.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

233-07-CA: 507 Monroe Street
Applicant: Randall Skalsky
Received: 12/17/07 (+45 Days: 01/31/08)
Meeting: 01/02/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Leave the gilt accents on the ironwork.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story brick residence was built circa 1965. The ironwork on the building was salvaged from a teardown 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. After Mr. Skalsky painted gilt accents on the ironwork in November. Staff received a complaint about work being done without ARB approval and a notice of violation was sent 11/28/07.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines do not say anything specific regarding painting ironwork. However, there is no evidence that historic ironwork in Mobile had accents painted on it.
- C. Mr. Skalsky is requesting that the Board allow the gilt accent on the ironwork to remain.

RECOMMENDATION

As mentioned above, staff has not found any evidence that historic ironwork in Mobile was accented. Staff feels that if this were a historic building, the accents should be removed. However, this building is non-historic and non-contributing to the district. Also, while this ironwork, which was salvaged from a teardown in DeTonti Square, is historic, it has been placed on a non-historic building outside of its original district, so it no longer has any context. Staff feels the gilt in this case is acceptable, but will defer to the Board.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Randall Skalsky was present to discuss his application. Staff corrected its assertion that there was not evidence in Mobile of gilding ironwork. Further research disclosed the fence at the Cathedral had gilding at one time. Mr. Skalsky stated he did the gilding because he found evidence of gilding on the ironwork when he began to clean it for painting.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the general appropriateness of gilding ironwork in the historic district. There were conflicting opinions on the impact of the gilding on the neighborhood. There was discussion about the amount of gilding on the dropped frieze.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report amending B to read, “...However, there is some evidence that historic ironwork in Mobile had accents painted on it.” The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Carlos Gant moved that, based upon the facts as amended, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by David Barr and approved with one dissenting vote. Following the vote, Mr. Skalsky asked if he could paint over the gilding on the dropped frieze if he wanted and the Board agreed that would be acceptable. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/3/09.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

234-07-CA: 207 Levert Avenue
Applicant: Mack Lewis
Received: 12/19/07 (+45 Days: 02/02/08)
Meeting: 01/02/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a rear addition with a covered porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

This frame residence on a raised basement was constructed circa 1952.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states, "the Board shall not approve an application proposing 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 district..."

STAFF REPORT

- A. There is currently a rear deck on this residence.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that new additions and all renovations should respect the age and style of the residence.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 1. Remove the existing rear deck.
 2. Install a screened porch that steps down to a deck.
 - a. It will feature paired French doors leading from the interior to the screened area, a standing seam metal roof, a gabled dormer vent, mesh screening and screen doors on either side with wood steps leading down to an open area.
 - b. The design and remaining materials will match existing, including the wood porch columns, masonry pier foundation, wood lattice panels and overhanging eaves.
 - c. The existing roof will be extended to cover the screened area of the new rear porch.
 3. Construct an 18'-0" by 18'-0" two-story rear addition on the southwest corner of the residence.
 - a. It will feature two 4-lite wood doors leading to a brick patio.
 - b. The design and materials will match existing, including the smooth-faced lap siding on the top floor and board and batten on the basement floor, brick piers, roof pitch, overhangs, trims, heights, roof material, foundation and 6/1 or 4/1 single or paired wood sash windows.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that the work proposed for this residence will not negatively impact the historic integrity of the building or the district. All work will be located in the back and the design and materials will either match or complement the existing residence. Staff recommends approving the application. Staff also recommends that any existing historic windows removed during the rear demolition be reused in the new addition where possible.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mack Lewis was present to answer questions from the Board.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the location and size of the addition.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/3/09.**