

**MINUTES**  
**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

January 16, 2008 – 3:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Tilmon Brown called the meeting to order at 3:00. MHDC Staff member Aileen de la Torre called the roll as follows:

- **Members Present:** Barja Wilson, Harris Oswalt, Tilmon Brown, Bunky Ralph, Craig Roberts and Tom Karwinski
- **Staff Present:** Aileen de la Torre, Devereaux Bemis and John Lawler

The minutes as posted on the web were unanimously approved per the motion of Bunky Ralph and second of Craig Roberts. The mid-months as presented were unanimously approved per the motion of Tom Karwinski and second of Bunky Ralph.

**MID-MONTH APPROVALS**

1. **Applicant's Name:** Patsy Dow  
**Property Address:** 262 Roper Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** December 27, 2007  
Paint the house in the following Benjamin Moore color scheme:
  - Body – Butte Rock
  - Trim – Bone White
  - Shutters – Black
2. **Applicant's Name:** Ben & Marie Payne  
**Property Address:** 952 Charleston Street  
**Date of Approval:** December 27, 2007  
Repair/replace rotten wood to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Do repair in preparation for painting. Paint the house with a color scheme to be submitted.
3. **Applicant's Name:** Superior Painting and Contracting  
**Property Address:** 1101 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** December 27, 2007  
Repair fascia to match the existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint all white to match existing.
4. **Applicant's Name:** Kinnon Phillips  
**Property Address:** 1108 Old Shell Road  
**Date of Approval:** December 27, 2007  
Build 6'-0" wooden, dog-eared privacy fence in accordance with the COA issued to the Mobile Revolving Fund for Historic Properties on 05/27/07.
5. **Applicant's Name:** Scott Eastman/Advanced Construction  
**Property Address:** 1211 Palmetto Street  
**Date of Approval:** December 28, 2007  
Replace rotten siding, window framing, fascia, soffit and rear door. All materials are to match the existing in profile, dimension and material.
6. **Applicant's Name:** Kenbow Roofing  
**Property Address:** 209 Tuttle Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** December 31, 2007  
Reroof house using 25-year fiberglass shingles in black.
7. **Applicant's Name:** Amy Morrisette  
**Property Address:** 1161 Texas Street  
**Date of Approval:** January 7, 2008  
Remove the remaining aluminum siding. Repair/replace as needed the rotten and fire-damaged exterior wood elements to include siding, porch decking, doors, windows and one of the front posts with materials to match existing. Reroof residence with either dark brown or charcoal grey shingles. Replace the missing transom at the front door with new glass. Rebuild the handrail per MHDC stock plans. Construct a rear shed per MHDC stock plans. Repaint residence (colors to be determined).
8. **Applicant's Name:** Ralph Reynolds Roofing  
**Property Address:** 53 North Georgia Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** January 8, 2008  
Reroof residence with 25-year, 3-tab shingles in charcoal.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

1. **205-07-CA:** 202 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Zito Russell Architects  
**Request:** Install a coiling grille garage door on Conception.  
**Approved**
2. **232-07-CA:** 51 Semmes Avenue  
**Applicant:** Jamie Price of Professional Remodeling  
**Request:** Add a cover to the rear deck and replace the front door.  
**Approved**

## **NEW BUSINESS**

1. **235-07-CA:** 3 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Walcott Adams Verneuille, Architects  
**Request:** Repaint, add shutters and install a sign.  
**Approved**
2. **236-07-CA:** 2 South Water Street  
**Applicant:** Walcott Adams Verneuille, Architects  
**Request:** Repaint, add a covered canopy and replace the entry paving.  
**Approved per the new design submitted**
3. **237-07-CA:** 1108 Old Shell Road  
**Applicant:** Kinnon Phillips  
**Request:** Screen-in the western porch.  
**Approved**
4. **238-07-CA:** 3 South Royal Street  
**Applicant:** John Serda  
**Request:** Install new signs.  
**Approved with conditions**
5. **239-07-CA:** 304 Marine Street  
**Applicant:** Mark Cochran  
**Request:** Remodel residence per the submitted plans.  
**Approved with conditions**
6. **240-07-CA:** 157-159 North Conception Street  
**Applicant:** Jeffrey Jensen for the U.S. General Services Administration  
**Request:** Do general repairs.  
**Approved**
7. **001-08-CA:** 165 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** HDS Architecture Inc  
**Request:** Convert the former department store building into residential/commercial space.  
**Approved**

## **OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- Tilmon Brown announced that there would be quarterly training sessions for the Board, following the regular meetings.
- The dates for the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions will be July 10-13. Board members who are interested in attending are requested to verify as soon as possible in order to secure a favorable room rate.
- Toni Cherri, the enforcement officer for the District of Columbia and board member of the NAPC, has been invited to Mobile the first week of May. She will give a talk to the ARB before the May 7 meeting. Review Board members are asked to set the time aside to meet and talk with Toni.

**There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:15.**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**205-07-CA:** 202 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Zito Russell Architects  
**Received:** 11/19/07                   **Resubmitted:** 12/05/07                   **Resubmitted:** 01/03/08  
**Meeting:** 12/03/07                   **Meeting:** 12/17/07                   **Meeting:** 01/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Church Street East  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-4  
**Project:** Add a coiling grille garage door to the Conception Street façade.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this mid-twentieth century building was originally the Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Building. It has undergone a number of alterations 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. This building will be the office of Sullivan-St. Clair. An application was approved on 12/03/07 for an aluminum garage door on Conception. However, for a number of reasons, they will not be able to install it. All other work, including the approved iron gates on Government and the iron vents, will remain the same. An application was denied on 12/17/07 for a coiling door.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[w]ood or metal garage doors should be simple in design and compatible with the main building.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to install coiling grille doors per the submitted photo on the Conception Street façade.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Because the proposed garage door has an open grille, Staff believes it may satisfy the primary concern the Board had with the solid to void ratio of the Conception Street façade. Staff also feels the proposed grille doors will fit the industrial look of the façade.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Angie Odom was present and discussed the variety of gates that had been considered. She believes that the gate presented would be appropriate and asked the Board for its approval.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no further Board discussion.

**FINDING OF FACT**

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

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, 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 Barja Wilson and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/16/09.**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**232-07-CA:** 51 Semmes Avenue  
**Applicant:** Jamie Price of Professional Remodeling  
**Received:** 12/17/07                   **Resubmitted:** 01/03/08  
**Meeting:** 01/02/08                   **Meeting:** 01/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Add a cover to the back deck and replace the front door.

**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. A previous deck cover and solid four-panel door was denied on 01/02/08.
- 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.
    - a. The roof will be galvanized, 5v-crimp metal panels to match the main roof tied onto the residence with bolts and metal flashing.
    - b. It will have 6x6 square posts to match the front porch and 2x6 rafters with overhanging eaves.
  - 2. Replace the existing half-light front door with a ¾-light front door.

**RECOMMENDATION**

As mentioned above, the Board denied the four-panel door originally proposed for this residence on 01/02/08 because solid doors are not typical of residences of this era. Therefore, the applicant is proposing a ¾-light door. Staff feels that this is acceptable; however, final approval should be contingent upon staff seeing a photo or specifications of the proposed door. Staff also feels that the proposed back deck cover is acceptable. Shed roof covers on rear decks or historic porches are not uncommon. It will also have detailing in keeping with the rest of the house, including the roof material and posts. The taller posts will replace the existing rail posts at the corners of the deck, but the rest of the handrail will remain unchanged.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Jamie Price, the contractor, was present and discussed the deck and door. He stated that the door was being milled to match the design for the triple light, Craftsman door in the Guidelines. The door will be a 6’8” to match the existing opening.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board sought from the applicant and received assurances that the door would match that illustrated in the Guidelines.

**FINDING OF FACT**

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

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, 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 Tom Karwinski and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/16/09.**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**235-07-CA:** 3 Dauphin Street (historically, 53-55 Dauphin Street)  
**Applicant:** Walcott Adams Verneuille, Architects  
**Received:** 12/17/07 (+45 Days: 01/31/08)  
**Meeting:** 01/02/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin Street Commercial  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-4  
**Project:** Repaint, add shutters and install a sign.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous research, this two-story masonry commercial building was constructed circa 1970.

**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 façade of this building has very little ornamentation. It also has no signs.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile state that signs shall “not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building...shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property...shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs...should match the historic materials of the building...[and] shall use focused, low intensity illumination.” The Design Review Guidelines call for rehabilitations and new additions to respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  1. Install a 24SF double-faced (12SF per side) wood and iron projecting wall sign above the entry.
  2. Install operable wood shutters at the doors and windows per the submitted plans.
  3. Paint in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
    - a. Body – Oyster Bay, SW6206
    - b. Trim – Retreat, SW6207
    - c. Accents – Pewter Green, SW6208

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the plans submitted in this application, staff feels the work will not impair the historic integrity of the district. This is a non-historic, non-contributing building with minimal detailing. The proposed sign falls within the standards of the Guidelines.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Clay Adams was present to answer any questions.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no further Board discussion.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, 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: 1/16/09.**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**236-07-CA:** 2 South Water Street (historically, 51 Dauphin Street)  
**Applicant:** Walcott Adams Verneuille, Architects  
**Received:** 12/17/07 (+45 Days: 01/31/08)  
**Meeting:** 01/02/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin Street Commercial  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-4  
**Project:** Repair, add a covered canopy and replace the entry paving.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous research, this four-story commercial building was built in 1860 as a department store. It has the last remaining historic cast iron façade in the City and is individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

**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. At one time the Dauphin Street side, which is historically significant for its iron façade, was the primary entrance. Now, however, the less ornamented Water Street side is the main entry.
- B. The Guidelines call for rehabilitations and new additions to respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  - 1. Replace the Water Street entry paving with slate pavers.
  - 2. Install a canopy at the Water Street entrance per the submitted plans. Materials and details will match the existing building.
  - 3. Paint building in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
    - a. Body – Favorite Tan, SW6157
    - b. Trim – Rice Grain, SW6155
    - c. Window – Superior Bronze, SW6152

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the plans submitted in this application, staff feels the work will not impair the integrity of the building or district. Because the new canopy will be placed on the Water Street side of the building in order to provide cover and protection, the significant façade will be unaffected. While the materials will match the existing building, staff would like to note that this is a modern interpretation of the columns. The new iron columns are longer and thinner than the historic iron columns on the rest of the building.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Clay Adams was present and discussed that he had created three alternatives more in keeping with the Italianate influence. His main concern was tying the posts into the ground. He presented the three alternatives along with the original sketch for the canopy. He felt that trying to mimic the historic ironwork failed because the parts were no longer available. He suggested at sketch C, a modern interpretation, would be the most appropriate. Craig Roberts agreed with the modern interpretation; Bunky Ralph pointed out that it was more in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

Craig Roberts pointed out that the paint colors were a major change from the monochromatic paint scheme that had existed on the building for decades. The Board discussed the color choice but staff pointed out that Italianate buildings were often polychromatic.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report but with item C.2 being amended to read, “Install a canopy at the Water Street entrance per the submitted plans. Materials and details will match the existing building per the newly submitted plan C.” The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, 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: 1/16/09.**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**237-07-CA:** 1108 Old Shell Road  
**Applicant:** Kinnon Phillips  
**Received:** 12/28/07 (+45 Days: 02/11/08)  
**Meeting:** 01/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Screen-in the western porch.  
**Disclosures:** Tilmon Brown disclosed that he is a member of the Mobile Revolving Fund for Historic Properties, which sold the building to the current owner. He recused himself and left the room. Bunky Ralph took the chair in the absence of Cameron Pfeiffer, the vice-chair. Devereaux Bemis and Aileen de la Torre disclosed that they too were members of the Mobile Revolving Fund, but as staff members and non-voting, they remained in the room to answer any questions of the Board.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This residence is two buildings recently combined into one. According to previous records, these residences were built circa 1900. However, during the renovation it was discovered that parts of both buildings are peg construction, indicating an earlier construction date.

**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. Because it was once two separate residences, the house has two front porches. The main entrance is the eastern porch. The western porch serves as a balcony with no egress for a second bedroom.
- 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 plan will enclose the western porch with a framed screen, following the rails and posts as closely as possible.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Guidelines state, “enclosing the front porch is generally prohibited.” However, the Board often approves enclosing rear and side porches. Staff feels the Board must determine if they consider this a front or a side porch. Staff feels that as this is a secondary porch, it could be considered a side porch, and that Mr Phillips is following the standards of the Guidelines, which require enclosures to “preserve the original configuration of columns, handrails and other important architectural features.” This is a former Mobile Revolving Fund house. Aileen de la Torre and Devereaux Bemis, both staff members, and Tilmon Brown, a Board member, were involved in the sale of this property to Mr. Phillips.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

There was no public testimony.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

It was explained that the supports for the screen would follow the current arrangement of architectural elements, though there would probably be some that would be installed between the porch posts.

**FINDING OF FACT**

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

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Barja Wilson 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 Tom Karwinski and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/16/09.**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**238-07-CA:** 3 South Royal Street  
**Applicant:** John Serda  
**Received:** 12/31/07 (+45 Days: 02/14/08)  
**Meeting:** 01/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin Street Commercial

**Classification:** Contributing

**Zoning:** B-4

**Project:** Install signs.

**Disclosures:** Tilmon Brown announced that he knew the applicant and had business dealings with him in the past. However, he is not currently in business with him and has no interest in this project so Mr. Brown believes there is no conflict of interest.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous research, this three-story masonry commercial building was constructed circa 1850. It once had a fourth story that was removed around 1950.

**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 building has 30 linear feet of frontage. The sign ordinance allows 1.5 square feet of signage per one linear foot of building frontage.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile state that signs shall “not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building...shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property...shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs...should match the historic materials of the building...[and] shall use focused, low intensity illumination.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  - 1. Install two 16SF (totaling 32SF) unlit vinyl window signs at locations one and four.
  - 2. Install two 1SF (totaling 2SF) unlit vinyl window signs at locations two and three.
  - 3. Install one 32SF double-faced (16SF per side) high-density urethane sign with focused spotlights at location five.
  - 4. The total amount of proposed signage is 66SF; the total allowed for this building is 45SF.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff feels that the design, materials and lighting for the signs are acceptable. Both high-density urethane made to look like wood and sticky vinyl are materials the Board has approved previously, and the lighting will be spots focused on the hanging sign. However, staff believes the amount of signage appears excessive. According to the sign ordinance, at 30 linear feet wide, the amount of signage allowable for this building is 45SF. The total amount of signage proposed for this building is 66SF.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

John Serda, the business owner, was present to answer any questions. He was informed that he exceeded the sign allowance and agreed that he would reduce the signage.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board noted that the design was acceptable and suggested that the size problem could be worked out with staff.

**FINDING OF FACT**

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

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued with the condition that the amount of the signage be reduced to an overall total of 45 square feet. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved. The owner will present a scaled down plan to the staff in order to receive a COA.



**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**239-07-CA:** 304 Marine Street  
**Applicant:** Mark Cochran  
**Received:** 12/28/07 (+45 Days: 02/11/08)  
**Meeting:** 01/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Remodel residence per the submitted plans.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous research, this 1½-story frame Creole cottage was constructed circa 1868.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Ordinance states, “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds 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 residence has been altered. It has asbestos siding, aluminum windows and a later rear addition.
- B. The Guidelines call for rehabilitations and new additions to respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  - 1. Replace the asbestos siding with wood lap siding.
  - 2. Replace the flat roof on the rear addition with a 5/12-pitch gable roof in order to prevent water buildup.
  - 3. Rebuild the columns on the front porch per the submitted drawings and add stock MHDC rails.
  - 4. Add operable wood shutters.
  - 5. Repair/replace as needed and maintain the remaining existing elements, including the wood louvered vents, aluminum windows, shingle roof, masonry foundation and existing exposed wood elements, with materials to match existing.
  - 6. Replace the north-side front door with a window to match existing windows and turn the south-side window into a paired window.
  - 7. Enclose the rear porch with materials to match existing.
    - a. The siding will be wood lap to match the new siding on the rest of the house.
    - b. A new stoop using stock MHDC rails will be constructed in order to have a landing.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Although much of the work, including the asbestos siding removal, seeks to reverse later unsympathetic changes, the applicant is also proposing a complete modification of the front façade that will alter some of the defining features of Mobile Creole cottages. Staff feels the doors and single windows on the front should remain in their current configuration. One suggestion, as has occasionally happened in situations like this, is enclosing the interior side of the door and maintaining the exterior side as a false front. Staff feels the rest of the work, including the asbestos siding removal, shutter installation, roof reconfiguration on the side addition, rear porch enclosure, stoops, rails and maintenance, is appropriate and follows the standards of the Guidelines. In the rear porch enclosure, staff recommends reusing the existing door and/or window in the rear porch enclosure. Staff also recommends simple square columns on the front porch as opposed to the paneled columns.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mark Cochran, the contractor, was present and suggested an alternate in light of the staff report. He suggested removing the right door and installing either a single or a double window. The owner was also present and joined the discussion about the staff report.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the changes to the house and felt that all but the changes to the front were appropriate. Mr. Brown pointed out that the aluminum windows were probably originally 6/6 wood windows and that returning to them would be appropriate considering the amount of work that was being undertaken.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned on the two front doors and the original front window arrangement remain. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved. The Board did suggest the owners consider replacing the aluminum windows with 6/6 wood windows.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/16/09.**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**240-07-CA:** 157-159 North Conception Street  
**Applicant:** Jeffrey Jensen for the U.S. General Services Administration  
**Received:** 12/28/07 (+45 Days: 02/11/08)  
**Meeting:** 01/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** DeTonti Square  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-B  
**Project:** General repairs.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous research, these three-story masonry townhouses were built in 1852. They were connected during a 1963 renovation.

**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. General repairs such as the work outlined in this application are usually done on a mid-month basis. However, because this is a Federal undertaking, a Section 106 review is needed. Evaluation by the Architectural Review Board will satisfy the 106 requirement.
- B. The Guidelines call for rehabilitations and new additions to respect the age and style of the building. In particular, “care must be taken with masonry...bricks and mortar should match the original in color, finish (strike) and thickness.” Due to the composition of historic brick, new mortar must match the original to prevent spalling and deterioration of historic materials.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  - 1. Reroof with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
  - 2. Clean/repair exterior masonry with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
  - 3. Repaint in the existing color scheme.
  - 4. Perform interior repairs such as replace the plumbing, HVAC and electrical systems and do lead and asbestos abatement.

**RECOMMENDATION**

As mentioned above, evaluation by the Architectural Review Board will satisfy the Section 106 requirement necessary for Federal projects. The exterior work being undertaken on these buildings consists of general maintenance and repair. The Board does not review interior work. Staff recommends approving the application.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

No one was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the cleaning method being employed.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, 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 Barja Wilson and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/16/09.**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**001-08-CA:** 165 Dauphin Street/14 St. Emanuel Street/160 Conti Street  
**Applicant:** HDS Architecture Inc  
**Received:** 01/03/08 (+45 Days: 02/16/08)  
**Meeting:** 01/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin Street Commercial  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-4  
**Project:** Convert the former department store building into residential/commercial space.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This is the former Gayfer's Department Store that closed in 1985. The main façade fronts St. Emanuel Street and this part of the building was constructed circa 1920. It also fronts Conti and Dauphin Streets.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Ordinance states, "the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the proposed change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district..."

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This building has been vacant for 20 years. It is being converted into commercial and residential space.
- B. The Guidelines call for rehabilitations and new additions to respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The applicant is proposing the following:
  - 1. Renovate the existing vacant Gayfer's Department Store building into a 36-unit, four-story, urban residential loft development with ground level parking at the St. Emanuel and Conti sides of the building.
    - a. On St. Emanuel, the closed windows will be opened and recessed to create a balcony behind the original wall. A fabric canopy will be placed across the newly created first floor storefront. Recessed balconies will be installed in the east face of the Conti wing. Some balconies will be separated by a parapet and glass room arrangement. The upper roof will be landscaped.
    - b. Facing Conti will be three main parts: The St. Emanuel wing will use a series of parapets (original wall) and recessed balconies with varied window patterns and balcony materials. To the west, the main façade of the Conti wing shows projecting balconies set slightly off center between uneven bays of windows and solids. The roof top pergola, stair tower and penthouse will be visible. The parking garage door is located on Conti and appears to be glass panels. The stucco at the base shows a water table with scored pattern to look like horizontal stones. The stucco above is scored horizontally with color banding. A combination of iron and glass rail is visible. Fifth floor penthouses are also visible on the St. Emanuel and west elevations.
    - c. The west elevation faces an alley. The material is textured stucco with reveals marking the building horizontally. There is an asymmetrical arrangement of windows and recessed balconies piercing the wall that are internally symmetrical in three groupings with other windows placed in various locations. A canopy will cover the side pedestrian glass door with double and single utility doors to the north. Bands of color and glass balconies relieve the monochromatic effect of the wall. The new stair enclosure is visible but is broken by a window and horizontal reveals.
    - d. The north elevation faces Dauphin. This major pedestrian façades is being used commercially. The plan divides the façade asymmetrically into two major components. To the left is the narrower pedestrian entrance, which is given importance by a heavier treatment and the almost exclusive use of textured stucco and glass. There is also a rooftop addition that accentuates the entrance area. To the right the façade is divided into three vertical bays and three floors. The street level is a glass storefront with an awning running the length of the glass. A heavy wall treatment creates a base for the upper stories, which will use recessed balconies with modern iron railings. The vertical

separations create an upward sweep while the horizontal elements are minimized yet still present a sense of human scale. Horizontal bands with reveals create a cornice. The effect is that of a traditional building with base, shaft and cornice.

2. The first floor plan shows the pocket park at Conti and St. Emanuel being used as a parking area surrounded by an 8'-0" tall stucco wall. On the St. Emanuel façade, a lobby area will be created to present a building space to the pedestrians on the street. The parking has been arranged so that only the door on Conti will have a curb cut. There will be plantings on the corner, a small section of fence on Conti and a gate on St. Emanuel.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff believes that, per the submitted renderings, the plans for the Gayfer's building are an excellent example of modern design integrated into historic fabric. Staff feels that the plans should be approved once the minor question of materials is answered.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Hans Strauch, the architect, was present to answer any questions. He brought accurate samples of the color choices. In the audience were Shaul Zisl, the owner; Johnny Roberts and Chris King of Roberts Brothers Realty; John Vallas of Saad and Vallas Realty; and Green Suttles representing the engineering firm. None spoke to the question.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the appearance of the building and complimented the architect on the design and the submission.

#### **FINDING OF FACT**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

#### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, 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 Barja Wilson and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/16/09.**