

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
February 26, 2007

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair, Bunky Ralph.

Aileen de la Torre called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Tilmon Brown, Michael Mayberry, Harris Oswalt, Cameron Pfeiffer, Bunky Ralph, Jim Wagoner.

Members Absent: Robert Brown, Joe Sackett, David Tharp.

Staff Members Present: Aileen de la Torre, Anne Crutcher, Devereaux Bemis, John Lawler

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Harold Dodd	5112 Bradford Dr. Pace, FL 32571	020-07CA
William Christian	510 Monroe St.	019-07CA
Norman Pharr	510 Monroe St.	019-07CA
Dandi Dolbear	157 S. Jefferson St.	019-07CA
Alan C. Ivy	1009 Savannah St.	022-07CA
Douglas Kearley	10 Wisteria Ave.	019-07CA
Celia Lewis	158 S. Jefferson St.	019-07CA
Mack Lewis	158 S. Jefferson St.	019-07CA
John & Mary Bridler	255 N. Jackson St	023-07CA.
Carl Tokes for Nextel	6506 N. Davis Hwy Pensacola 32502	018-07CA
E. Sanders	216 Dauphin Street	019-07CA

Tilmon Brown moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting as emailed. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Tilmon Brown moved to approve the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

- 1. Applicant's Name:** Contractors of Today
Property Address: 13 Common Street
Date of Approval: January 23, 2007
Replace rotten wood as necessary with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint house in the existing color scheme
- 2. Applicant's Name:** American Roofing Company
Property Address: 1160 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: January 23, 2007
Re-roof building with 30-year charcoal Timberline shingles.
- 3. Applicant's Name:** Taco Bell
Property Address: 1115 Government Street
Date of Approval: January 23, 2007
Replace rotten wood on fascia with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
- 4. Applicant's Name:** Ralph Reynolds
Property Address: 16 South Reed Street
Date of Approval: January 24, 2007
Re-roof building with Patriot (architectural) shingles in Weathered Wood.

5. **Applicant's Name:** Ralph Reynolds
Property Address: 800 Monroe Street
Date of Approval: January 24, 2007
 Re-roof building with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
6. **Applicant's Name:** Earl Harris Construction
Property Address: 1005 Savannah Street
Date of Approval: January 24, 2007
 Foundation repair as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension. Misc rotten wood repair with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Repair windows to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint exterior with colors to be submitted prior to work. Replace doors with doors to match existing in profile and dimension.
7. **Applicant's Name:** Ralph Reynolds
Property Address: 518 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: January 25, 2007
 Re-roof building with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
8. **Applicant's Name:** Al Pennington
Property Address: 25 South Julia Street
Date of Approval: January 25, 2007
 Replace rotten wood with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint materials to match existing color scheme.
9. **Applicant's Name:** Earl Ponquinette
Property Address: 963 Selma Street
Date of Approval: January 25, 2007
 Replace rotten wood with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint materials to match existing color scheme.
10. **Applicant's Name:** Tom Neese
Property Address: 1324 Chamberlain Avenue
Date of Approval: January 26, 2007
 Re-roof building with black 3-tab fiberglass shingles.
11. **Applicant's Name:** Arlo Investments
Property Address: 906 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: January 30, 2007
 Paint house in the following Sherwin-Williams color scheme:
 - Body – Silver Strand, SW7057
 - Trim – White
 - Porch Deck and Door – Black
12. **Applicant's Name:** Tuan Titlestad
Property Address: 109 Bradford Avenue
Date of Approval: January 30, 2007
 Replace rear porch using MHDC stock rail design 1. Wrap existing supports in 1x10 boards. Paint to match. Replace missing siding on rear using lap siding.
13. **Applicant's Name:** Felix Vereen
Property Address: 1750 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: January 31, 2007
 Replace rotten wood with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint materials to match existing color scheme.

14. **Applicant's Name:** Jennifer Blankenship
Property Address: 206 George Street
Date of Approval: February 1, 2007
Replace rotten wood with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint house in the following color scheme:
- Body – Fort Morgan Sand
 - Trim – White
 - Shutters and Porch Deck – Bellingrath Green
15. **Applicant's Name:** Ann Cottrell
Property Address: 203 South Georgia Avenue
Date of Approval: February 1, 2007
Paint house in the existing color scheme.
16. **Applicant's Name:** Floyd C. Hendricks Jr.
Property Address: 1118 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: February 2, 2007
Replace rotten wood with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint materials to match existing color scheme. Install masonry piers underneath the kitchen of the residence in order to add extra support.
17. **Applicant's Name:** Alicia Baria
Property Address: 63 South Hallett Street
Date of Approval: February 6, 2007
Replace rotten wood with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint house in the following color scheme:
- Body – White
 - Shutters – Bellingrath Green
18. **Applicant's Name:** Joseph Stewart
Property Address: 358 South Broad Street
Date of Approval: February 6, 2007
Replace decking on front and back porches with painted 1x4 tongue and groove boards. Replace damaged siding with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Reconstruct a roof beam and decking damaged by Katrina to recreate a hipped corner and valley. Reclad roof with architectural shingles to match existing in color, profile and dimension. Repair/replace as necessary the rotted wood on the existing privacy fence with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Construct a 6x6 utility shed per MHDC stock plans. Rebuild two 6 over 3 windows to make them 6 over 6.
19. **Applicant's Name:** Mobile Revolving Fund
Property Address: 1108 Old shell Road
Date of Approval: February 8, 2007
Install handrail per MHDC stock plans.
20. **Applicant's Name:** The Galvez Company
Property Address: 216 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: February 9, 2007
Paint house in the existing color scheme.
21. **Applicant's Name:** Dobson Roofing Inc.
Property Address: 201 Rapier Avenue
Date of Approval: February 12, 2007

Re-roof building with black shingles to match existing.

22. **Applicant's Name:** Keith Fordham
Property Address: 601 Church Street
Date of Approval: February 12, 2007
Paint house in the following color scheme:
- Body – Beige
 - Trim – White
 - Shutters and Porch Deck – Dark Green
23. **Applicant's Name:** Ron Smith/CSA Services
Property Address: 1564 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: February 12, 2007
Prep to paint. Repair brick under kitchen drainpipe materials to match existing in color, profile and dimension. Paint house in the existing color scheme. Unpainted brick to remain unpainted.
24. **Applicant's Name:** Ken Baggett
Property Address: 1354 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: February 13, 2007
Replace rotten wood with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint materials to match existing color scheme.
25. **Applicant's Name:** Cathy Barfield
Property Address: 1216 Government Street
Date of Approval: February 15, 2007
Replace dormer with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint materials to match existing color scheme. Repair copper flashing around dormer.

NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS

No NoVs or MoTs were written during this time period.

OLD BUSINESS

1. **003-07-CA:** 109 Chatham Street
Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Kevin Egan
Request: Replace Ludowici tiles with Decra stone-coated metal tiles.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS

2. **016-07-CA:** 256 Roper Street
Applicant: John Baumhauer/Baytown Construction
Request: Add second story.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

3. **017-07-CA:** 63 North Monterey Street
Applicant: Melissa Nissen
Request: Install two doors and a hood over rear deck.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

4. **018-07-CA:** 251 Government Street
Applicant: Nextel Inc
Request: Install cell tower antennas.

TABLED. Certified Record attached.

5. **019-07-CA:** 805 Church Street
Applicant: City Management LLC
Request: Alter original porch and windows. Resurface parking area.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

6. **020-07-CA:** 1402 Government Street
Applicant: RBC Centura Bank/Florida Certified Sign Erectors
Request: Install new monument sign.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

7. **021-07-CA:** 1015 Savannah Street
Applicant: DeAngelo and Carolyn Parker
Request: Do multiple renovations.

APPROVED Certified Record attached.

8. **022-07-CA:** 1009 Savannah Street
Applicant: Alan Ivy
Request: Build new rear addition.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

9. **023-07-CA:** 304 State Street
Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Bridler
Request: Build new residence.

TABLED Certified Record attached.

10. **024-07-CA:** 550 Church Street
Applicant: National Signs
Request: Install new signage.

APPROVED-DOOR SIGNAGE. DENIED INTERNALLY LIT SIGN. Certified record attached.

11. **025-07-CA:** 1411 Brown Street
Applicant: Sarah and Len Stewart
Request: Install new rear fence.

STAFF GIVEN AUTHORITY TO APPROVE. Certified Record attached.

12. **026-07-CA:** 1108 Old Shell Road
Applicant: MHDC Revolving Fund
Request: Add new decorative elements.

TABLED

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

003-07-CA: 109 Chatham Street
Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Kevin Egan
Received: 01/06/07 (+45 Days: 02/20/07)
Meeting: 01/22/07
Resubmitted: 01/22/07 (+45 days: 03/08/07)
Meeting: 02/05/07
Resubmitted: 02/05/07 (+45 days: 03/22/07)
Meeting: 02/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace Ludowici clay tiles on roof with Decra stone-coated metal tiles.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story masonry Craftsman/Mediterranean Revival was built circa 1908 by architect George Rogers.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. Currently, many of the Ludowici roof tiles on 109 Chatham are worn, chipped, broken or generally damaged. Also, the applicants have stated that the roof is leaking. There is a one-story extension at the rear (east) elevation with a dark-colored standing seam metal roof.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that a roof “is one of the most dominant features of a building [and] materials should be appropriate.”
- C. The proposed plan for the roof includes the following:
 - 1. Remove the existing roof system, including the Ludowici tiles and any leak barriers;
 - 2. Install a Decra stone-coated metal tile roof system with a color and profile similar to existing.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff and the applicant are currently trying to find alternatives to the Decra stone-coated metal tiles.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. and Mrs. Egan were present to discuss the application. They explained their lack of success in getting any additional quotes to install a new tile roof other than the \$51,000 quote they had originally obtained. This included Ralph Reynolds Roofing and “The Tile Man” who recommended a man from Florida with whom they were not able to connect. Dura Loc is the same system as the Deca Stone previously requested, although it is available in the Spanish S curve. The cost of this roof would be approximately \$16,9000. Staff stated that it had worked with the Egans to come up with a solution that would respect the style of the house and also not be beyond the cost they were able to expend.

The Board commented that the existing tile roof is one of the building's most defining features. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report noting that C2 should read:” Install a Dura Loc stone-coated metal tile roof system in Mission Terracotta.” The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown 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 according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and approved with Cameron Pfeiffer voting in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/26/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

016-07-CA: 256 Roper Street
Applicant: John D. Baumhauer/Baytown Construction
Received: 02/01/07 (+45 Days: 03/18/07)
Meeting: 02/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Add a second story to the residence per the submitted plans.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story brick duplex was built circa 1960.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This residence appears vacant. It sits on a 50’ x 174’ lot across the street from Oakleigh.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that additions “shall be...compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
- C. The proposed second story addition to the front third of the residence includes the following:
 - 1. Alter the residence from a vernacular building with few defining features to a Classical-style building with a two-story pedimented porch.
 - 2. Leave the existing brick on the first floor; all the brick will be painted.
 - 3. Leave the existing sash windows on the left, right and rear façades.
 - 4. Install Hardiplank siding on the second story.
 - 5. Clad the roof in neutral-colored architectural shingles (new and existing).
 - 6. Install 6/6 wood sash windows with true divided lights on the front façade and second story; one window on the left (south) elevation will be wood sash with an arch.
 - 7. Install three new wood French double doors with 4 lights and panels on the front façade; the door on the second story will have a transom.
 - 8. Feature a two-story porch with stucco masonry piers on the first floor and wood columns with capitals on the second floor on the front façade.
 - 9. Install a wood rail per MHDC stock plans on the second floor of the porch.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the new addition will not impair the historic integrity the district. The current residence is a non-historic masonry duplex that would likely be non-contributing to the district even if it were more than 50 years old. The scale and detail of the proposed improvements will allow this residence to better fit within the context of the Oakleigh neighborhood.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Architect Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He explained that paint colors will be submitted at a later date. He also stated that windows on the side will remain and that the rest of the windows will be wood. The first story columns will be stucco over masonry. Hardiplank lap siding will be used on the sides; it will be flush on the front.

There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Jim Wagoner 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 Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Jim Wagoner 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 according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/26/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

017-07-CA: 63 North Monterey Street
Applicant: Melissa Nissen
Received: 02/12/07 (+45 Days: 03/30/07)
Meeting: 02/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace the existing door at the rear elevation with two French double doors. Install a wood hood.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, Joseph H. Patterson built this two-story American Foursquare with Classical Revival detailing circa 1913. The back of the residence was extended circa 1970 and a rear deck was added in 2003.

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 residence has non-historic addition and deck. As it is currently, the rear façade appears imbalanced.
- 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 includes the following:
 - 1. Replace the existing single rear door with French double doors.
 - a. The opening will be moved from the center to the left side of the rear elevation.
 - b. The doors will be wood single-light with transoms.
 - c. All siding will be replaced with materials to match existing.
 - 2. Install a wood canopy with brackets; it will be clad in asphalt shingles to match the main roof.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the new door and hood will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Architect Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application.
There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.
Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

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. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown 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 according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/26/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

018-07-CA: 251 Government Street
Applicant: Chris Reynolds of Nextel Partners Inc
Received: 02/01/07 (+45 Days: 03/18/07)
Meeting: 02/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install a stealth antenna on the building side and an antenna and repeater on the roof.

BUILDING HISTORY

This twelve-story masonry building opened in 1940 as the Admiral Semmes Manor hotel. It is currently part of the Radisson chain of mid to high range business and leisure hotels.

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 a number of antennas on the roof of the building, which can only be seen from high elevations. A Radisson sign was formerly located at the area of the proposed stealth antenna. The wiring from the sign is still there. The MHDC maintains an easement on the façade.
- B. There are no specific guidelines regarding cell towers and antennas, so the Architectural Review Board examines each application on a case-by-case basis.
- C. The proposed plans include the following:
 1. Flush mount an 8'-0" x 2'-0" x 1'-0" dipole antenna on the side of the building per submitted plans.
 - a. It will be located on the northeast side.
 - b. It will be encased in a 7' tall box painted to match the bricks.
 - c. A coaxial cable will run down to the antenna; it will be painted to match the bricks and band.
 2. Place a 2'-6" x 7'-3" Yagi antenna and 6'-0" x 3'-0" repeater on the roof per submitted plans.
 - a. The antenna will be placed 1'-0" inside the parapet wall on the existing equipment platform.
 - b. The repeater will be placed 8'-0" inside the parapet wall on the existing equipment platform.
 - c. The antenna and repeater will be placed on the west side by the parking garage and should be minimally visible from the street

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information contained in the application, the proposed work impairs the historic integrity of the building or the district.

The rooftop antenna and repeater will not be seen from the street. In addition, they are much smaller in comparison to the antennas currently on the roof. However, although the antenna along the side will be stealth, staff remains guarded about allowing it in such a prominent spot on the building.

Staff recommends approving Item C2. Staff recommends finding an alternative solution to Item C1. Due to the easement on the property, ARB approval must be conditioned by the approval of the Properties Committee of the MHDC.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

A representative of Nextel was present to discuss the application. He explained that this installation will provide coverage through the tunnel. The antennae must be mounted in approximately the requested location in order for the signal to be beamed directly into the tunnel. It might be possible to install it somewhat higher on the façade. The antennae will be encased in a brick painted Styrofoam-like box. He also explained that the company had received a 106 clearance letter from the SHPO. He will provide a copy of that letter for the Board. Board members questioned whether the antennae could be located on the east side of the tunnel. The representative responded that an engineering study would have to establish whether it could be installed elsewhere than on the Admiral Semmes. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was discussion concerning the fact that the MHDC holds an easement on 251 Government Street. The Properties Committee of the MHDC will also have to meet to discuss this request despite any ruling of the ARB.

FINDING OF FACT

There was no finding of fact.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved to table the application for 30 days pending engineering studies to determine other possible locations for the tower. The motion was seconded by Mike Mayberry and unanimously approved.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

019-07-CA: 805 Church Street
Applicant: City Management Company LLC
Received: 02/02/07 (+45 Days: 03/19/07)
Meeting: 02/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a two-story wood balcony. Install sash windows. Pave the parking lot.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story warehouse/office complex was the Appliance Parts and Supply Company. The building was constructed in the latter half of the twentieth century. It sits next to the Church Street Graveyard and across the street from Big Zion AME Church.

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 received Board approval on 11/14/05 to renovate the existing warehouse. The plan that was approved, however, called for a two-story metal balcony and casement windows. Additionally, the COA required submittal of a landscape plan and appropriate fencing solution to the Board before installation.
- 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 includes the following:
 1. Construct a two-story wood balcony.
 - a. The balcony will have square wood posts.
 - b. The second floor will have a wood rail with vertical balusters.
 - c. The balcony has already been built.
 - d. Staff has received many complaints from neighborhood residents and a letter from the Church Street East Neighborhood Association concerned about the balcony material/design as built.
 - e. The Board approved balcony had cast iron posts and a horizontal metal rail.
 2. Install sash windows.
 - a. The windows will be wood.
 - b. They have already been installed.
 - c. The Board-approved windows were casement.
 3. Pave the parking lot.
 - a. The lot will be asphalt.
 - b. The fence will be chain link.
 - c. The asphalt has already been poured and the fence installed.
 - d. Staff has received many complaints from neighborhood residents and a letter from the Church Street East Neighborhood Association concerned about the lack of permitting and consultation with the Board regarding a landscape plan.

- e. As mentioned, the Certificate of Appropriateness issued on 11/14/05 required that a landscape plan and appropriate fencing solution be submitted to the Board before installation.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that there are parts of the application that will impair the historic integrity of the district.

Although wood porches/balconies are typical of residential buildings in the Church Street East neighborhood, a wood porch/balcony is not appropriate for an industrial building. The original plan called for a more suitable balcony that reflected the style and use of the building through its design and material. Staff feels, however, that sash windows are an acceptable substitution to the casement windows originally planned for the building.

The Design Review Guidelines require that the impact of parking areas be minimized through appropriate materials and site and landscape design. The black asphalt, lack of landscaping and chain link fence does not satisfy this requirement. In addition, the work was completed without Board consultation and approval, which does not meet the terms of the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Staff recommends allowing the new sash windows to remain. Staff recommends reconstructing the balcony to the original specifications that were approved by the Board in November 2005. Staff also recommends reconfiguring the parking area to minimize its impact through the use of acceptable paving material, landscape design and appropriate fencing. A new landscape plan taking these items into thought should be submitted for Board consideration.

The applicant was allowed to return to the Board to request a change in plans because a Notice of Violation had not been issued. Therefore, this is being treated as an alteration to a previously approved request. Since the work was done without a Certificate of Appropriateness, a denial of all or part of this application will result in a Notice of Violation being immediately issued. If necessary, a substitute Certificate of Appropriateness will be issued for any approved work.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

A representative of City Management Company was present to discuss the application. He was not familiar with the application and was unable to discuss it.

Elizabeth Sanders appeared on behalf of John Peebles. She stated that 805 Church Street was not a historic building and that the work done by Mr. Peebles has resulted in a remarkably better building that did not impair the adjacent district. While Ms. Sanders stated that Mr. Peebles should have informed the Board of changes, his as-built project should be approved by the Board. Board members asked Ms. Sanders how subsequent cases should be dealt with if someone else does not build in accordance with the approved plans.

Douglas Kearley commented that he drew the original plans. He stated that the modified porch follows the same spirit as the approved plans. He also noted that an overlay of asphalt on the existing parking lot was indicated on the plans and was the intent from the beginning.

Several people spoke in opposition to the Board's approval of the as-built project.

Celia Lewis, who resides at 158 S. Jefferson, stated that she is a 25 year resident of the neighborhood. She has also invested in 161 S. Jefferson Street. She presented a series of photos of the neighborhood. One photo shows that the parking material was virtually gone prior to repaving. She had contacted Rosemary Sawyer in City Engineering who stated that there had been no permit issued for laying asphalt. Mrs. Lewis stated that she had been happy with the original plan. Mr. Peebles should have to adhere to the same standards as other property owners in the district. She felt that the balcony should be rebuilt as approved and that landscaping should be added to the parking area.

Dandi Dolbear lives at 157 S. Jefferson and is also an investor in 161 S. Jefferson. She noted that Mr. Peebles had stated at the beginning of his project that the apartments in the front building were to be luxury apartments. She expressed her concern that he had not done what he said he would.

Marie Dyson, President of the Church Street neighborhood, stated that she resides at 203 S. Dearborn Street. She expressed concern on the part of the neighborhood that Mr. Peebles had not followed the rules and that it appears that some people are held to higher standards than others. She stated that S. Jefferson Street was on the upswing due to efforts of its residents. She also stated that the Mobile Housing Board will build Hope VI houses in the area that will conform to historic standards.

Bill Christian, who resides at 510 Monroe Street, stated that he had been a Review Board member for a number of years. He felt that it was important that the approved plans be followed.

There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no additional comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

Chair Bunky Ralph closed the public hearing portion of the meeting, but reopened it with the arrival of Mr. Peebles.

Mr. Peebles stated that the investment group had erred in making the balcony changes and that he was there “to throw myself on the mercy of the Board.” However, the cost of steel made the project less than cost effective. He felt that the neighbors were criticizing the project because of the non-traditional porch forms. As for the paving, he did not think it would be a problem to repave. He felt that the project is a plus for the neighborhood, particularly since it had been on the market for a year with no credible takers. He asked the Board to take a holistic look at the project and allow him to retain the balcony as built. He stated that he was not aware that changes were to come back to the Board.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board questioned staff regarding any Notice of Violation that would be issued to Mr. Peebles. Staff noted that it had been aware of the changes to the project but did not have the authority to write a Notice of Violation before the new application was submitted. It now has that authority. Once cited, the owner would have to come into compliance (or at least begin coming into compliance) within 7 days. Should the owner not come into compliance with the Board, no Certificate of Occupancy will be issued.

Cameron Pfeiffer reviewed the CoA and stated that other items were out of compliance with the Board. These included: the parking lot, the balcony, the windows; common area with landscaping, roofing color, exterior color; removal of concrete pad, glass block sidelights.

The Board was reminded that the only issues addressed in the current application are the balcony and windows.

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 with the following amendments: 2a The windows will be aluminum and 2c. The Board-approved windows were wood casement.; and the elimination of 3 pertaining to the parking lot. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district according to the Guidelines. The motion died for lack of a second.

Michael Mayberry moved that the porch and windows do materially impair the district. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and approved.

Michael Mayberry moved that the application be denied based upon the issue of impairment. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and approved with Harris Oswalt voting in opposition.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

020-07-CA: 1402 Government Street
Applicant: RBC Centura Bank/Florida Certified Sign Erectors
Received: 02/12/07 (+45 Days: 03/29/07)
Meeting: 02/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Replace the AmSouth monument sign with a new RBC Centura monument sign. Place a temporary banner sign over the current monument sign.

BUILDING HISTORY

This masonry commercial building was built in the latter half of the twentieth century. A drive-thru canopy was added in 2000.

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 is currently an AmSouth, which was recently acquired by RBC Centura. The applicants went before the Board on February 5, 2007 for a complete sign package. At the time, the Board approved all but the monument sign.
- 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 sign package includes the following:
 - 1. Install a 50 SF (25 SF per face) double-faced wood sign with sandblasted faces that would have the RBC logo and letters to read “RBC Centura Bank/ 24 Hour Banking” at the location of the current AmSouth monument sign; it will not exceed the 5ft height limitation.
 - 2. Install a temporary banner sign over the current AmSouth monument sign until the new RBC Centura monument sign is delivered.
 - 3. All signs will be unlit.
 - 4. The total sign package – which includes the previously approved signs, but does not include the temporary banner sign – is approximately 94 SF; the Board cannot approve more than 64 SF.
 - 5. The building sits on a large 232’ x 251’ lot.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the signs will not negatively affect the historic integrity of the building or the district.

The size and materials of the proposed monument sign fall within the standards of the Sign Design Guidelines.

The banner sign will be removed as soon as the monument sign is complete.

Staff recommends that the Board approve the sign materials and design, and support the total square footage. The applicant will need to receive a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment. The applicant will also need to receive a variance if the temporary banner sign is up for more than 30 days.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Harold Dodd was present to discuss the application. He stated that the proposed wood monument sign will be 15 square feet per side.

The Board discussed the possibility of using the existing monument sign since the iron work is historic and relates to the remaining ironwork on the building.

Staff informed the Board that the sign is higher than the 5 ft. normally approved by the Board and well in excess of allowable square footage in a monument sign.

Mr. Dodd explained that using the existing monument sign had been one solution explored by the bank. He agreed to use the existing monument post and create a 25 x 25 ft. cabinet with an aluminum panel sign with vinyl lettering. He also said that the bank requested a bag sign for identification until the permanent sign is ready.

Staff informed Mr. Dodd that he would only have to obtain the necessary city permit for the temporary bag sign.

There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

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 as amended: “change sign from wood sandblasted to aluminum panel sign with vinyl lettering and add fact 6. The iron work is historically significant.” The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown 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 according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued provided a final version is acceptable to Staff. The motion was seconded by Michael Mayberry and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/26/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

021-07-CA: 1015 Savannah Street
Applicant: DeAngelo and Carolyn Parker
Received: 02/05/07 (+45 Days: 03/22/07)
Meeting: 02/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace the small closet extension on the back with an 831 SF addition and deck.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame Bungalow was built circa 1915. The closet on the southwest was originally a porch. A new porch was later cut out of the existing residence on the southeast. As a result of alterations throughout the years, this building has no fewer than four different kinds of siding.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This residence is currently vacant. It sits on a 50’ x 120’ lot at the corner of Chatham and Savannah. The owners have wanted to renovate it for a number of years, and have previously been before the Board.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for new exterior materials, finishes and elements to reflect the age and style of the building. The Guidelines also state that additions “shall be...compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
- C. The proposed plan includes the following:
 1. Remove the rear section of the residence.
 - a. The closet extension on the southwest side will be demolished.
 - b. The wall of the rear elevation will be removed.
 - c. The wood sash windows will be reused on the new addition.
 2. Construct an 831 SF addition to match existing in profile, material and detail per submitted plans.
 - a. The addition will rest on brick piers with wood lattice between all piers (new and existing).
 - b. All siding will be 4” lap on the top with a board and batten wainscot for uniformity.
 - c. The roof will be clad in asphalt shingles (new and existing).
 - d. Windows salvaged from the removed wall will be reused; new windows will be vinyl-clad wood sash that match existing in profile and dimension.
 - e. Detailing will match existing to include ornamental wood brackets and a louver in the gable, wood trim and corner boards and fascia.
 3. Construct a rear deck.
 - a. The deck will be wood on wood piers.
 - b. The roof and an 8” square wood column will partially enclose the deck on the southeast.
 - c. The rail will conform to MHDC stock plans.
 4. Replace the enclosed front porch sides with new open railing that conforms to MHDC stock plans.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the new addition will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district with the exception of the stock railing design, which is not appropriate for a Craftsman house. The owners can work with staff to develop an appropriate design.

Staff recommends approving the application with the condition that the rail design be altered to better fit the style of the house.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application.

There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

Staff explained that there were numerous siding types on the building and the applicant was asking to regularize it with horizontal wood siding.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed that a railing will probably not be required since the house is very low to the ground.

However, if a railing is required by code, one that is more compatible with the style of the house should be used.

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. The motion was seconded by Michael Mayberry and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, the proposed application does not impair the building or the district according the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned on a more appropriate porch railing being used. The motion was seconded by Michael Mayberry and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

022-07-CA: 1009 Savannah Street
Applicant: Alan Ivy
Received: 02/09/07 (+45 Days: 03/26/07)
Meeting: 02/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a 23' x 36' new addition on the rear of the residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, the Wulff (alternately spelled Wolf and Wolff) family built this one-story frame Victorian side hall circa 1911. The residence suffered a fire on July 25, 1999 in which 85% of the building was lost. Reconstruction was completed in December 1999.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This residence sits on a 30' x 120' lot on Savannah. As previously noted, much of the building is a 1999 reconstruction.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for new exterior materials, finishes and elements to reflect the age and style of the building. The Guidelines also state that additions “shall be...compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
- C. The proposed plan includes the following:
 - 1. Construct a 23' x 36' addition to match existing in profile, material and detail per submitted plans.
 - a. The addition will rest on brick piers.
 - b. All siding will be wood lap to match existing.
 - c. The roof will be clad in asphalt shingles to match existing.
 - d. Windows will be 6/6 wood sash with true divided lights.
 - e. There will be a wood single-light door on the west elevation with a small wood landing with steps; any railing will conform to MHDC stock plans
 - f. Exterior detailing will match existing to include a louver in the gable, wood trim and fascia.
 - 2. Add a covered porch.
 - a. The new roof will extend over the rear porch.
 - b. The porch will have wood steps and square wood columns with wood capitals and wood bases; any railing will conform to MHDC stock plans.
 - c. Two French single-light double doors will lead onto the porch.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the new addition will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Alan Ivy was present to discuss the application. He explained that the house was small necessitating an addition. He also explained that the house was only about 4 ft. from the next house. He had not included windows on that elevation due to that fact. The side steps will be eliminated since there may be a setback issue. Mr. Ivy stated that the windows will be 1/1 wood to match the existing windows. He explained that the foundation will have hardiboard infill with lattice on the outside to satisfy concerns of his insurance company.

The Board questioned whether the addition would be too large for the site. Staff suggested that the existing historic district overlay should take care of that issue.

The Board also felt that windows were necessary on the side and the owner agreed to install them.

There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

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 amended as follows: "C.1.d. Windows will be 1/1 wood sash and C.1.g. Two windows will be added on the east side and C.2.d. Lattice will be added between piers." The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown 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 according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/26/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

023-07-CA: 304 State Street
Applicant: John and Mary Bridler
Received: 02/12/07 (+45 Days: 03/29/07)
Meeting: 02/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-B
Project: New construction.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is currently an empty lot that once held residential buildings.

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 empty lot at the corner of State and North Claiborne is 56’ x 120’.
- 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 plan includes the following:
 - 1. Construct a contemporary two-story single-family residence on an empty lot per the submitted plans.
 - a. The house will have a 5’ setback and face State Street.
 - b. The house will rest on a 3’ split-faced concrete block foundation.
 - c. The siding will be a combination of brick on the front facade, Thoroseal on the left, right and rear facades and Hardiplank boards on the garage and dormers.
 - d. The roof will be fiberglass shingles and have three dormers.
 - e. The windows will be a combination of 1/1 and small diamond-shaped vinyl clad openings on the first floor and 1/1 vinyl-clad arched openings in the dormers; the first floor 1/1 windows will have lintels.
 - f. The front door will be wood with six-lights and a transom.
 - g. There will be two one-light double doors with iron balconets on the second story of the left elevation.
 - h. There will be a masonry chimney on the right elevation.
 - i. There will be a front porch with four 12" wood columns with simple capitals and masonry steps.
 - 2. Install a concrete driveway.
 - a. It will be located at the rear of the residence.
 - b. The curb cut will be located on North Claiborne.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the new construction will not impair the historic integrity of the district.

The proposed construction follows the setback and orientation pattern of residences in the vicinity. Its massing and scale, including the raised foundation and simple L-shaped footprint, are proportional to buildings typical of the district. It has a front porch, an “important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture.” Ornamentation such as the window lintels, iron balconets and porch columns is inspired by nearby residences, yet has a contemporary look and feel. As such, it succeeds in the ultimate goal of guidelines for new construction, which state, “new designs should relate to the historic context yet read as contemporary” as well as “avoid creating a false sense of history.”

Staff recommends approving the application. The applicant will need to contact Urban Forestry regarding the removal of the Water Oak and Traffic Engineering and Right-of-Way regarding the curb cut of North Claiborne.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicants were present to discuss the application. Mr. Bridler submitted a list of additions and changes to the design at the meeting. He explained that the front door would be an 8 ft. tall 6 panel door. He explained that he would use thoro-seal construction. In response to his request to use hardiplank on the chimney, Board members requested that it be stuccoed. In response the Mr. Bridler’s request to use vinyl windows, the Board responded that the windows must be wood with vinyl coating.

There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board requested revised drawings that incorporated these changes. The drawings should show the windows, chimney, foundation, front door and garage doors among its other design elements.

FINDING OF FACT

There was no finding of fact.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Harris Oswald moved to table the application until revised drawings could be submitted. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

024-07-CA: 550 Church Street
Applicant: Kurt Nerlinger for National Signs
Received: 02/12/07 (+45 Days: 03/29/07)
Meeting: 02/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: New signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

This masonry commercial building was built in the latter half of the twentieth century.

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 sits on a 105x111 lot at the corner of Church and South Cedar Streets. It is currently in the process of being renovated into the Talecris Plasma Center.
- 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 sign package includes the following:
 - 1. Install two 25 SF single hinged face illuminated cabinet signs with acrylic faces and vinyl graphics that will have the Talecris Plasma Resources logo.
 - 2. Install two sets of 1 SF sticky vinyl door signs that will have the Talecris Plasma Resources logo on the glass door surfaces.
 - 3. The total sign package is approximately 52 SF.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the cabinet signs will negatively impact the historic integrity of the district.

The material of the proposed cabinet signs, and the fact that they are internally lit, is inappropriate to the district. Staff feels, however, that the vinyl door signs are not an issue. Staff recommends approving Item C2 – the vinyl door signs. Staff recommends denying Item C1.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Michael Mayberry 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 Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the proposed door signage does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that the internally lit plastic sign does impair the district. The motion was seconded by Michael Mayberry and unanimously approved. Tilmon Brown moved that the door signage be approved and the internally lit sign be denied. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/26/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

025-07-CA: 1411 Brown Street
Applicant: Sarah and Len Stewart
Received: 02/12/07 (+45 Days: 03/29/07)
Meeting: 02/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install a 5' picket fence along the rear of the property with two gates.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this residence 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. This residence sits on a 40’ x 122’ lot at the corner of Brown and Parker. The backyard is currently open to the street.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines say fences should "complement the building and not detract from it." Furthermore, the Guidelines state that a wood picket fence is an appropriate option.
- C. The proposed plan includes the following:
 - 1. Install a 5' tall wood picket fence.
 - a. The fence will run along the back of the property beginning at the southeast corner of the residence per the submitted plan.
 - b. The heads of the fence boards will be pointed.
 - c. The fence will be painted white.
 - 2. Add two gates.
 - a. The first gate will be a pedestrian entry on the north side facing Brown Street.
 - b. The second gate will be a vehicular entry on the east side facing Parker Street.
 - c. The gates will match the fence in style, color and dimension.
 - 3. The set backs are not delineated for Parker Street
 - a. Front setbacks are set at 25’ for a closed type of fence over 3’ tall.
 - b. Side setbacks are set at 20’ for the same.
 - c. The applicant needs to determine the appropriate setback for a rear property line on a street.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the fence will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The proposed fence falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines. However, the applicant needs to meet the setback requirements of the City. Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed giving authority to staff to approve a 5 ft. picket fence at this location on a mid-month basis following submission of a drawing that accurately detailed how the fence will be built--for example, will there be a base?; will it have corner posts?; what are the dimensions?

FINDING OF FACT

Jim Wagoner 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 Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Michael Mayberry moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the staff be given authority to approve a 5 ft. picket fence on a mid-month basis. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

026-07-CA: 1108 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Mobile Revolving Fund
Received: 02/12/07 (+45 Days: 03/29/07)
Meeting: 02/26/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Add a scalloped fascia to the porch on the left wing of the residence to match the scalloped fascia on the right wing.

BUILDING HISTORY

This residence is actually two different buildings – 1108 and 1110 Old Shell Road – that were 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. This indicates a much earlier construction date for at least one of the buildings.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This residence, which sits on a 65’ x 141’ lot near the corner of Old Shell Road and Hallett, is currently vacant. As mentioned above, it is two buildings that were combined into one. As a result, there may be some architectural details on one side of the building that are not on the other side. The two porches have very different detailing. It is currently being renovated by the Mobile Revolving Fund.
- 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 add a scalloped fascia to the porch on the left side of the residence to match the one on the right.
 - 1. The right side porch has wide overhanging eaves and rafter tails.
 - 2. The left side porch has gable returns.

RECOMMENDATION

This is a project of the Mobile Revolving Fund for Historic Properties, a committee of the Mobile Historic Development Commission. Two staff members of the ARB sit on this Board. Therefore in the interest of full disclosure and fairness, the staff will defer this opinion to the members of the ARB.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cameron Pfeiffer had left the meeting and Tilmon Brown serves on the Mobile Revolving Fund for Historic Properties. Therefore, only 4 members were present to discuss and vote on the application. It was the decision of the Board to table the application until such time as there is a quorum of 5 members.